

which appeared in 1990, contained the first English translation of *Rousseau Judge of Jean-Jacques*.

Roger took seriously Rousseau's core dilemma that the progress of science makes a life of virtue ever more difficult. Roger believed that political philosophy had to be based on science. That meant human nature had to be understood scientifically to establish the basis for a just and good society. That became a challenge to which Roger increasingly devoted his prodigious intellectual energies. The range of topics he investigated was extraordinarily wide. For the most part, Roger explored novel scientific concerns about human nature to better understand their social and political implications. His intention throughout was to provide data that would facilitate progress toward improving our shared moral order.

Biology, Roger believed, provided the starting point to investigate what scientific discoveries could tell us about human nature. Thus, his focus became the field of sociobiology, that is, identifying the contributions of biological mechanisms that influence political behavior. Roger recognized that scientific discoveries have refuted Rousseau's notion of human evolution. He hypothesized that since humans share most of their genes with primates, they may also behave similarly in certain respects. On the other hand, cultural responses may affect and be affected as they interact with biological factors. Thus, he argued that the binary of nature and nurture must be replaced with a more complex set of interactions.

A series of experiments with his departmental colleague, Denis Sullivan, other colleagues and students, showed that facial displays by politicians communicated reassurance or threat like those expressed by other primates. Politicians' nonverbal displays often turned out to be more influential in shaping voter reactions than the contents of their messages. Later, Roger extended this study to identify neurochemical factors in the brain that influenced emotional responses. At the theoretical level, this led to his co-edited book, *The Neurotransmitter Revolution: Serotonin, Social Behavior, and the Law* (Southern Illinois University Press, 1994).

Later, he engaged in empirical studies of aggression and violence—concerns Rousseau had also considered. Roger and other colleagues, particularly the chemist Myron Coplan, demonstrated that environmental exposure to neurotoxic heavy

metals, lead and manganese, are associated with heightened levels of violent crime. They also showed that elevated levels of lead in the brain and the body may occur when municipalities fluoridate their water with agents that trigger the release of lead from pipes. Roger always took the next step by asking how public policy might be designed in response to these new discoveries of the effects of brain chemistry on personality.

Roger's devotion to collegiality was central to his conception of academic life. He never put boundaries on his participation in the institutions that constitute scholars' communal fellowship. He acted, perhaps not always consciously, by following Rousseau's contention that in a properly constituted society, people would give themselves totally to the community they created. They could then expect to receive back from the community a transformation of what they contributed, that is, a fully engaged society with all others who have joined. He lived by that social contract.

Roger was an astonishing person to work with and to know. He was extraordinarily quick at seeing new ideas and running with them. His willingness to converse touched multitudes of colleagues and students. His invitation to Christopher Kelly to join the Rousseau translation project was typical. They had not met. Roger had served as an outside reviewer for Kelly's promotion and tenure. He asked Kelly in part because he had been impressed with Kelly's disagreement with Roger's interpretation of Rousseau. It hadn't occurred to Nelson Kasfir, when he joined the Government Department at Dartmouth, how much he would learn from Roger. Nor, how willing and eager Roger would be to teach him. Roger's enthusiasm for teaching extended to his students, in whom he invested heavily. He was a fierce advocate for advancing their careers, particularly if they chose to engage in teaching and research. Reflecting Roger's readiness to cross disciplinary boundaries, his former students can be found in departments of philosophy, political science, law and neuroscience—a remarkable achievement for a mentor who only taught undergraduates. His former student, now professor, John Scott insists: "I owe everything I have done and achieved in my career to Roger." Many more can testify how radically Roger influenced their careers. ■

—Nelson Kasfir, Dartmouth Collete

Bruce M. Russett

We have lost a mentor, collaborator, and friend. Bruce Russett died on September 22, 2023, in Hamden, Connecticut at the age of 88. He was Dean Acheson Professor of International Politics at Yale University, where he was an active faculty member from 1962 to 2009 and where, after his retirement, he held a research professorship. Bruce was one of the leading lights of the scientific turn in international relations scholarship. His body of work, which included some truly pioneering contributions incorporating ideas and approaches from the field of economics, addressed an exceptionally diverse range of substantive, theoretical, methodological, and normative questions. Of these, he is best known to the contemporary discipline for his elaboration and extension of democratic peace theory. His influence on so many aspects of the field was felt in many other ways through his training of graduate students, his service to the profession—for example, as president of both the

Peace Science Society (1977-79) and the International Studies Association (1983-84)—and, not least, his editorship of the *Journal of Conflict Resolution* from 1973 to 2009.

A graduate of Williams College, with a bachelor's degree in political economy (1956), Bruce Russett received a graduate diploma in economics from King's College, Cambridge (1957), before attending Yale, where he earned his PhD in political science in 1961. Those early years were formative. His background in economics made him a good fit at Yale, where Robert Dahl and Karl Deutsch were at the forefront of what would become known as the "behavioral revolution" in political science, an effort to apply the scientific method to the study of politics. As his dissertation advisor, Deutsch's influence on Bruce was profound. His dissertation picked up on themes in Deutsch's path-breaking work on international integration and security communities, leading to his first book, *Community and Contention: Britain and America in the Twentieth Century* (MIT Press, 1963).

After serving one year as an instructor at MIT, Bruce re-

turned to Yale in 1962 as an assistant professor of political science. There he remained a member of the faculty for the entirety of his academic career, though he also received a number of visiting appointments, including at Columbia, Michigan, Harvard, Free University of Brussels, Soviet Academy of Sciences, Netherlands Institute of Advanced Study, Tel Aviv University, and the University of Tokyo Law School. Continuing his collaboration with Deutsch at Yale, Bruce directed the World Data Analysis Program, which released the first edition of the World Handbook of Political and Social Indicators in 1964. Along with the Correlates of War Project at Michigan, the program at Yale paved the way for a new generation of scholars engaged in quantitative research in international relations and comparative politics.

A subject that Bruce would return to frequently throughout his career was deterrence. In "The Calculus of Deterrence" (*Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1963), he was the first to subject the prevailing rational-choice approaches to a systematic empirical analysis of the conditions contributing to a state's ability to deter an attack on an ally. Bruce was equally concerned with the ethics of deterrence, especially the central moral quandary of nuclear deterrence: how can we threaten to do something that would be morally unacceptable actually to do? His Catholic faith, scholarship, and ethical concerns came together when he served as principal advisor to the US National Conference of Catholic Bishops, which issued its influential Pastoral Letter on War and Peace in 1983. The Letter boldly challenged the legitimacy of any use of nuclear weapons and raised significant moral questions about nuclear deterrent threats. Coming at a time of heightened cold war tensions and a renewal of the nuclear arms race, the Letter received attention far beyond the confines of the Catholic Church and contributed to the broader public discourse on the dangers of the superpowers' military postures and policies. Bruce's concern with the civilian consequences of armed conflict, especially for women and children, also led to pioneering work from the perspective of public health published in the *American Political Science Review* (2003) and *Social Science and Medicine* (2004).

Bruce's work on the Pastoral Letter was not the first time he turned his academic expertise and ethical commitments to a critique of American military policy. In *No Clear and Present Danger* (Cambridge University Press, 1972), while many scholars were questioning the US war in Vietnam, Bruce dared also to challenge the conventional wisdom that Japan's attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 provided an unambiguous and immediate reason for the country to join World War II. Much of the reaction to this book was harsh, and not unexpected, but it showed Bruce's courage as a scholar. He did not shrink from controversy when he thought our understanding of the world could be advanced by considering unconventional subjects, arguments, and approaches.

Much of Bruce's scholarship focused on various influences of the domestic environment on the national security policy of the United States, and vice versa, including the award-winning

What Price Vigilance? The Burdens of National Defense (Yale University Press, 1970), as well as *Military Force and American Society* (Harper & Row, 1973), and *Controlling the Sword: The Democratic Governance of National Security* (Harvard University Press, 1990). Here again, he was a pioneer; this work started appearing when the discipline was still preoccupied with strictly international interactions, like war, arms races, and balances or imbalances of power.

Bruce's most significant and enduring contribution to the discipline is his work on the "democratic peace" – the theory that democracies rarely resort to war with each other. The theory did not originate with Bruce; it can be traced back to Immanuel Kant's essay, "Perpetual Peace." Nor was Bruce the first to subject the notion to empirical testing. But no scholar did more to theorize, test, refine, and extend the democratic peace, or to debate its merits with critics. It became one of the discipline's most recognizable research programs. *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (Princeton University Press, 1993) was Bruce's first comprehensive statement on the subject, and it brought within a single work he had been doing with various colleagues. He continued to advance the research program from there by integrating the pacific effects of economic ties and participation in institutions of global governance, both of which Kant also anticipated. This "Kantian Peace" was the subject of *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2001). The book won the International Studies Association's prize for the best book of the decade.

Throughout his career, Bruce Russett published, individually or with co-authors, more than 250 articles and chapters and 28 books, including a textbook, *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*, which appeared in ten editions. It was one of the first undergraduate textbooks to link theory and research, interweaving concepts across levels of analysis and providing sophisticated introductions to such key concepts as the principal-agent problem, interdependence, collective goods, and tragedy of the commons. Bruce believed that educating undergraduates required not only communicating what we think we know about world politics, but also why we think we know it.

But for all his accomplishments and stature in the discipline, what we have lost most with Bruce's passing is a remarkable human being. He was unfailingly attentive to his graduate students and his mentorship, for us and others, led to rewarding scholarly collaborations and to valued friendships. But countless other young scholars, who were not his students, benefited from Bruce's generosity and genuine interest in their ideas, research, and progress. We say goodbye to one of the greats, an inspiration to so many of us. ■

—Harvey Starr, University of South Carolina;
David Kinsella, Portland State University;
Paul Huth, University of Maryland;
and Charles L. Taylor, Virginia Tech