

Arch T. Dotson

Arch T. Dotson, professor emeritus of government at Cornell University, died April 6, 2006, at the age of 85. He had been sound of mind and body virtually until the end, teaching until his voice was too weak to be heard. A “country boy” born and bred in Paris, Kentucky, he worked from his early teens on farms managed by his father. Arch left for World War II just short of earning his B.A. from Transylvania College and joined the Army Air Force as a “check pilot,” becoming a jock in every war plane up to the B-29. Discharged with the rank of major, the GI Bill got him through his Harvard Ph.D. and a post-doc at the London School of Economics. His entire academic career was at Cornell, beginning in 1950, as a dedicated teacher, serving beyond his retirement as a teacher, and, respectively, as director of Cornell-in-Washington, director of Cornell Abroad, and director of the Cornell Institute of Public Affairs.

Arch's field, his professional identity, was public administration. As was true of so many in this subfield of political science, Arch was not known well as a publishing scholar. He wrote copiously, but for clients, not journals—and for public clients, not corporate or private clients. He did this exclusively for three years (1958–1960) as a deputy controller of the State of New York. Other clients were, for shorter durations, the UN, the Ford Foundation, and the governments of India, Malaysia, the Philippines, Iran, Jordan, the PRC, Eritrea, and Mexico. Another of his clients was Cornell University. His seven-year stint as chairman of the department of government (1969–1976) was dedicated to rebuilding the department after the campus crisis of the late 1960s. In the 1980s, he was instrumental in the founding and success of Cornell-in-Washington (CIW), Cornell Abroad, and the Cornell Institute of Public Affairs (CIPA).

It would be difficult to identify anyone ever associated with Cornell—faculty, administrators, trustees, or alumni—who has left a more important mark on the institution. The government department now holds its own among the top 10 in the nation. CIW and Cornell Abroad became and continue to be models for universities with Washington programs and programs abroad. And CIPA has grown in size and stature among schools, programs, and institutes of public affairs. The Dotson legacy should not—will not—be forgotten.

Arch chose the path of reform, practice, and teaching; and he pursued that path to the very end with integrity, vigor, honor, and distinction. Arch was one of the exemplars of the great tribute to public service made by Louis Brownlow in the title of volume 2 of his autobiography, *A Passion for Anonymity*.

Milton J. Esmann
Cornell University
Jerome M. Ziegler
Cornell University
Theodore J. Lowi
Cornell University

George J. Graham, Jr.

George J. Graham died on November 30, 2006, after a courageous battle with cancer. He was 68 years old. George is survived by his daughter, Carmen Michelle Graham Christgau of San Francisco and a sister, Joyce Graham Johnson of Sarasota.

George was born in Dayton, Ohio, and earned his bachelor's degree from Wabash College. He received a doctorate in government from Indiana University in 1965. His honors included a John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Fellowship, the Jeffrey Nordhaus Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, and the Ernest A. Jones Faculty Adviser Award in the College of Arts and Science at Vanderbilt. He also was awarded a fellowship at the National Humanities Institute at Yale University. George received a Fulbright grant in 1995 to hold the John Marshall Chair in Political Science at the Budapest University of Economic Sciences in Hungary. There he led graduate-level courses on democratization and American institutions and said that he was pleased to have the opportunity to work with colleagues at a time of transformation for democratic institutions. George was a member of the Vanderbilt faculty for more than 40 years, and served as associate dean in the College of Arts and Science from 1986 to 1988 and from 1997 to 2000. He was also a former chair of the department of political science.

George was a political theorist, with a deep and enduring passion for good arguments and books, whatever their discipline or politics. The evening he left his office for the last time, a Marx reader and a book of Leo Strauss's were open on his desk. Although his first love was for political philosophy, George had a great interest in, and knowledge of, work being done

in the other fields of political science and would regularly scold his fellow theorists if he sensed an intellectual narrowness in them. His publications reflect the breadth of his intellectual engagements: American political thought, Rousseau, ethics and public policy, discourse analysis and research methods. Noteworthy among them was his early book on the *Methodological Foundations of Political Science* (1971) and his articles on the concept of consensus, including “Rousseau's Concept of Consensus” (*Political Science Quarterly*, March, 1970), “Edmund Burke's ‘Developmental Consensus’” (*Midwest Journal of Political Science*, February, 1972), and “The Concept ‘Consensus’ in Political Theory and Research” (*Political Inquiry*, 1974). George was also actively involved in the profession, and took great pride in his role in creating the Foundations of Political Theory Section. His concern with concepts and methods in political research led him to co-found and later serve as president of the Committee on Conceptual and Terminological Analysis (later the Research Committee on Concepts and Methods), the very first official research committee to be acknowledged by the International Political Science Association.

George was a teacher through and through. His courses on Marx and on the early moderns were legendary among Vanderbilt undergraduates. But it was as a mentor to graduate students, in all subfields, that George excelled. He had an essential kindness about him, not a saccharine bonhomie but an interest in the intellectual welfare of students. He could be a severe critic of their work, when that was called for, but he never sought to demean or belittle them. His concern for them was repaid in their affection for him. It was a rare hour that one walked by George's office without seeing a graduate student there talking with him. When we visited George in the hospital, a few days before his death, his principal worry was for his graduate students and undergraduate classes.

As a scholar and teacher, George contributed to the life of the mind, to his colleagues in the profession, and to his students. As an active member of the profession's institutions, George helped secure a lasting and active place for his subfield in the American Political Science Association. And as an administrator here at Vanderbilt, George will be remembered fondly for his devotion to the College and University, expressed most visibly in his

work as associate dean, and for his deep attachment to the department of political science, in which he served as chair, as colleague, and as teacher.

George led a full and rich life outside of the academy. He was a first-rate chef, and a dinner at his home, or even one of his pastries, was a much sought after treasure. He loved to travel, especially to Budapest, Rome, and Paris. George's walls were covered with photographs from these voyages, and he delighted in regaling visitors with tales of dishes eaten in his newly discovered restaurants.

George Graham was a scholar, teacher, and colleague. He will be sorely missed.

W. James Booth
Vanderbilt University

Glendon A. Schubert

People like Glendon Schubert never die. Glen was an individualist who lived by his work, and I'm one of his products. I was not a born scholar. I had no idea of what "the life of the mind" was all about. College was for me merely four more years of high school. Academic achievement was just competition by other means, and grades were nothing but a way of keeping score.

Michigan State College (MSC, as it was known until my 1954 graduation) was the perfect arena for my kind of play. MSC had doubled its student body by 1949 (my year of entry), brimming with over-aged GI Bill students desperate to make up for lost time. The bloated, emergency-appointed faculty were also in competition—for recognition, promotion, and the all-important tenure. Everything about MSC raised the stakes—my kind of venue.

Glen Schubert was, within my range of experience, the most competitive of all of us, having earned that reputation not only as a champion handball player but through his joy of confrontation with his peers as well as his students. Graduate students and a few motivated undergraduates took his courses with trepidation because of his in-your-face pedagogy. But it was so packed with substance that defeat was as valuable as victory. Forty-five years later, in response to a questionnaire on mentoring circulated by APSA to former presidents, I wrote that Glen Schubert was the first teacher to demonstrate what it means to

be an intellectual. Students also knew of his confrontation with his peers. Although his spot in the department of political science at MSC was Con Law and related subjects—based on his traditionalist Ph.D. from Syracuse—he frequently fought his colleagues against the growing influence of "political behavior." He went so far as to take the summer campus-wide course in "statistics for the social sciences" to prove that his resistance to "the Michigan School" was not due to his fear or incompetence in math. He made the top grade in the class.

Thanks to his aggressive dialogue with constitutionalism, the separation of powers, delegation of power, administrative law, administrative legislation, and administrative adjudication, I decided that law school was actually not for me after all. Law was just too much about method and practice. Yet, I chose graduate school knowing little of what that meant, except that ideas would be units of competition. (I was influenced in my decision for graduate school by Glen Schubert and Joe LaPalombara, who was a rookie instructor at MSC at that time.)

Virtually all of my work since then can be appreciated in light of Glen's teaching at MSC, approaching politics through constitutional principles and political dynamics that emanate from their applications and their violations. I moved away from his substance as I passed through Yale and took on my own version—for example, from administrative law to public policy, from delegation of power to pluralism and "the end of liberalism," from legislative and administrative processes to "policies cause politics." And as a consequence, it was years before I recognized how much of a debt I owed Glen. Very late in his life, as it turns out, I was able to tell him, that my tardiness was a permanent source of regret.

We saw little of each other during my six years in and out of Yale, a six-year stint at Cornell, thence to Chicago, and then back to Cornell. We never got together for an extended conversation. Our encounters were at APSA meetings, usually in the hall of exhibits and limited to handshakes and his pat on my back expressing pride in one of his students. His work and mine had grown too far apart.

The intellectual distance between us was largely a function of Glen's intellectual voyage, not mine. I have stayed very much within his constitutional realm—or

as they say these days, the institutional level. Meanwhile, Schubert was moving still further away from his base in a manner that I judge to be an essential part of his character, which was to go as far into a problem as was humanly possible. He moved from court cases to judges. Then to the decisions of justices and from that to judicial decision-making. Herman Pritchett, during our time together at Chicago, insisted to his colleagues that, although he had been the first to quantify the Justices, "It was Glen Schubert, not Herman Pritchett, who invented judicial behavior." This was not an excess of modesty on Herman's part. It was his accurate attribution. And it is a just validation of Pritchett's tribute to Glen that the font of judicial behavior became and remains at MSU.¹

That is one of the Schubert legacies, the one that he would not rest with. He had gone on to another, and still another leap further back along the causal chain, toward more and more microscopic units of action—from Constitution and courts, to judges and their decisions, to their behavior, and then to the psychology of their behavior and then to the biology of their conduct. If death had not stopped him, it is likely that he would have plunged into the chemistry of choice.

Students of politics will be decoding Glen Schubert for a long time to come. He was one of the earliest to delve into the question of "the public interest," a critical response to pluralism as it was just beginning to bloom. Schubert was first, or no later than second after Pritchett, to turn judges into ordinary human behavioral forces; and he took this as far as it could go. And his biology and politics rubric was an early contribution not only to political behavior but to the emerging discourse on the environment, environment policy, and sustainable development.

I dare to compare Glen Schubert with Arthur F. Bentley, whose one work in political science (*The Process of Government*, 1908) lay virtually unrecognized until David Truman rediscovered (or unearthed) Bentley in his *The Governmental Process* (1951). In this spirit I raise my glass to an extraordinary individual, an energetic competitor and a time-bomb for a political science that will eventually give him his due.

Theodore J. Lowi
Cornell University

Note

1. Shortly after I was ensconced at Yale, hardly a year, one of the MSU graduate students, Roger Marz, sent me a letter with all the local

news, including the most memorable report that Schubert had either postponed or abandoned his

book on Justice Robert Jackson "to do some kind of quantitative work on all the Justices."