

Herzberg, standing by with pad and pencil. "Don," he would say, "record that citizen's opinion." Soon thereafter a rally would learn that an informal, scientific pool of the citizens of River City had established "Eighty-five percent support for Benton!"

One day the routine went slightly off. Benton approached a citizen, introduced himself, and was met with apoplectic rage. "You're Benton," came the unexpected reply. "Why if Satan himself was running I wouldn't vote for you." And as the citizen stormed off Benton turned and said, "Don, put him down as doubtful."

Never to call retreat: never to abandon hope: such was Dean Herzberg's life and his lesson. The depth of his charity so disposed him: but hope went beyond disposition. It was an act of faith also, a positive rejection of despair as the deadliest of sins, political no less than spiritual. "None of the above" was never his choice. We cannot conceive him going about the campus opining that he would not be voting for any of the candidates for president this year. Given only that there was more than a single choice, one would be better than another, and he would choose the better. (Of this year—for he was careful about language—the best!)

And he would do it with a smile, for he had the playfulness of genius, and to a point the gift of prophecy, which we in the normative range of academic pursuits persist in hoping might one day prove to have been science!

His last published writing appeared on the op-ed page of *The New York Times* on April 10 of this year. (He wrote books; but posters were his preferred medium!) There was, he suggested, a new national party in the offing. Perhaps in the shell of the Republican Party: certainly with Republican leadership. Call it, he suggested, "The Party of 'Concern for America.'" Fourteen days later John Anderson announced his independent candidacy in almost precisely the terms the Dean's article had forecast. One isn't born with such skills; they are acquired only with discipline and with time.

Time, of course, ran out. This we will remember and regret so long as our own time holds. But our gratitude that he lived is so much greater than the grief of

his death. As Yeats said of another, he was "blessed and had the power to bless." We who shared that blessing live a larger life because of it, and for this we pray for him and remember him.

Daniel Patrick Moynihan
United States Senate

Daniel Lerner

Of Dan Lerner's many contributions to the social sciences in the study of communications, attitudinal research, and methodology, it was his work in the field of development that was to receive the widest acclaim. His major contribution was *The Passing of the Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*, first published by the Free Press in 1958 with paperback editions beginning in 1964. His ideas on development were subsequently amplified in several papers, including a long article he wrote for the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* called "Modernization: The Social Aspects," a chapter entitled "Toward a Communication Theory of Modernization," published in the book edited by Lucian Pye, *Communication and Political Development*, and an essay he wrote in a book he edited with his friend Wilbur Schramm in 1966 entitled *Communication and Change in Developing Countries*.

The Passing of Traditional Society was among the more influential books on development published in the late fifties. It was well received, widely read, frequently cited and had considerable influence on subsequent studies of development. It was, and continues to remain, a basic book for all graduate students in the development field. It represented a particular approach, used a particular methodology, and had a particular point of view and while some have criticized these views and methodology in recent years, they continue to remain an important contribution of American social science research to the sociology of development.

Lerner's book begins with a parable concerning a grocer and a chief in the village of Balgat, eight kilometers outside of Ankara. The village was first studied by a Turkish scholar in 1950 who described it

as a "barren" lifeless village, two hours by car on a dirt road. The village was run by a Muhtar—a chief who believed in the traditional values of obedience, courage and loyalty who wanted his sons to grow up to fight bravely "as we fought." The local grocer on the other hand was a very different kind of person, though he was also born and bred in Balgat. While the chief was content, the grocer was restless. He wanted a bigger grocery shop, a nicer house, and better clothes.

Lerner first visited Balgat in 1954. By then the village was connected to the city by a paved road and it had a bus which did the journey in only half an hour. There were now several grocers, but much to Lerner's lament, the old grocer was dead. Elections were to be held and the chief was the last Muhtar of Balgat. His sons had not gone to war—but had become shopkeepers. The old grocer was gone, but it was now the eldest son of the Muhtar who had become a grocer. One of the villagers said of the old grocer: "Ah, he was the cleverest of us all. We did not know it then, but he saw better than all of us what lay in the path ahead. We have none like this among us now. He was a prophet."

Lerner returned to the village a number of times to record its transformation. "The ancient village I had known," he wrote, "for what now seemed only four short years was passing, had passed. The Grocer was dead. The Chief—the last Muhtar of Balgat—had reincarnated the Grocer in the flesh of his sons."

Lerner used the parable to illuminate his views of the modernization process in the Middle East. The study had been begun in 1950 by the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia. Lerner subsequently analyzed the data from this survey conducted in six Middle East countries—Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iran. The central concern of the survey was to examine how modern people emerged and to understand what made them modern.

For Lerner the central dimension of a modern personality was "empathy" or "the capacity to see oneself in the other fellow's situation." Traditional men, he said, lacked this empathic quality. He illustrated the viewpoint of the tradition minded by quoting the characteristic answer of a Turkish peasant who, respond-

ing to the question as to what he would do if he were president, declared, "My God! How can you ask such a thing? How can I . . . I cannot . . . President of Turkey . . . master of the whole world?"

For Lerner the development of empathy was the indispensable skill for people moving out of traditional settings. "High empathic capacity," he wrote, "is the predominant personal style in modern society which is distinctively industrial, urban, literate and participant." It is empathic behavior that makes it possible for individuals to adapt to new roles, learn new relationships, form new opinions." More broadly, he continued, "mobility is the primary process whereby modernization is activated." He saw mobility as having three dimensions:

The first was physical or spatial mobility, the movement from the countryside to the city. The second was social mobility, the movement upwards of sons and daughters. And the third was psychological mobility or empathy. These demographic, sociological and psychological processes resulted, according to Lerner, in political participation. For Lerner, then, there was a linkage among urbanization, literacy, media participation and electoral participation.

One of Lerner's singular contributions was his attempt to show how disproportionate developments contributed to instability. He showed that though Egypt was more urbanized than Turkey it did not have an adequate base for modernization because of its low literacy. While Egypt's cities were full of homeless illiterates who provided a ready audience for political mobilization in support of extremist ideologies, in Turkey, by contrast, the various indices of modernization in 1958 had kept pace with one another—rising literacy, urbanization and voting participation. On Lerner's scale Egypt ought to be twice as literate as Turkey since it was twice as urbanized and since it was not, the imbalances accelerated social, political and economic disorganization.

Lerner was also among the earliest writers to emphasize the sequence of development and the ways in which one change made possible another. Urbanization, he argued, came first and this facilitated both the growth of literacy and the media. And the growth of the media in

turn stimulated the growth of literacy. "Out of this interaction," concluded Lerner, "develops those institutions of participation (e.g., voting) which we find in advanced modern societies."

Thus, the central thesis of Lerner's work was the functional interdependence of elements in the modernization process—and while the argument for interdependence was not proven, he opened up avenues for empirical testing. The attempt to test the theory, and in particular to see its relationship to the question of the social prerequisites of democracy, filled the *American Political Science Review* and other professional journals with articles for years—by Seymour Martin Lipset, Phillips Cutright, Donald McCrone, Charles Cnudde, Deane Neubauer, and others.

How decisive were the media? Lerner believed that the process of becoming modern was accelerated by the mass media. He called the media "mobility multipliers," for they provided pictures of the future—though now the pictures came not only from America and Europe, but from Russia, China and Cuba as well. Lerner argued that what made people modern was modern institutions—but he gave the media a particularly prominent role.

To understand Lerner's contribution and the place of his book in the social science literature of development one must see it in the context of four intellectual trends of the 1950s and 1960s.

The first was the importance given to writers on development to attitudinal change. Attitudes were understood as both consequences and determinants of modernization, as both dependent and independent variables. Modern institutions and settings—the factory, the media, the universities, the city—were seen as forces for creating modern individuals, and modern individuals were also forces for social change. This concern for the human dimensions of development was a central thrust of social science research. Dave McClelland studied achievement motivation. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba explored the attitudinal basis for democracy. Everett Hagen looked at marginality in the social structure as a determinant of entrepreneurial behavior. Wayne Cornelius studied attitudinal change among the migrant poor in an urban setting. And Alex Inkeles, following

in Lerner's path quite explicitly, a continuity recognized in the dedication of his book, explored the psychological dimensions of modernization. Inkeles subsequently confirmed but also modified many of Lerner's findings. He reported that the city does not have a modernizing effect since one can retain traditional ways of living in urban ghettos. But he found factories and educated parents to be important, and he confirmed Lerner's finding on the influence of the mass media in inculcating new attitudes, values and behavior.

A second feature of the social science literature of the time was the importance given to political democracy as the preferred outcome. Like his close friend and associate, Harold Lasswell, Lerner was interested in a policy science of democratic development. He equated modernization with mobility and to political participation which he saw leading to political democracy, as the highest, truest expression of modern men. But he argued that this process had to accompany the production of modern goods and services, and that a society that mobilized its population prematurely would be a society not simply of rising expectations, but in a phrase he made popular, a society of "rising frustrations," an unbalanced, as he put it, "want: get ratio" with demand growing more rapidly than the system's capacity to meet it. With this simple turn of phrase, Lerner anticipated much of the later argument about the institutionalization of political participation and the importance of system performance.

A third feature of social science research at the time was the spread of a particularly American social science methodology—survey research. Rooted in the American tradition that peoples' views counted, and that hence it was worth counting peoples' views, American social scientists began conducting surveys abroad and became increasingly concerned with the conceptual and methodological problems of cross cultural surveys. The Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia was among the first centers for such research, and Lerner was among its earliest pioneers; in that path were to tread Hadley Cantril, Gabriel Almond, Sidney Verba, Herbert Hyman, Alex Inkeles, and at M.I.T. Fred Frey,

Frank Bonilla, and among Lerner's students, Karl Jackson and Marvin Zonis.

A fourth feature of the literature of the time was a search for common processes, for uniform evolutionary sequences of change, and even for unilinearity. Hence Lerner's notion of uniform determinants of change—urbanization, literacy, the media. Lerner was particularly found of quoting a section of *Das Capital* where Marx wrote that "the more developed society presents to the less developed society a picture of its own future." And with the hubris that Lerner used to provoke people, he wrote in the introduction to *The Passing of Traditional Society* that "The data in this book show that the same basic model reappears in virtually all modernizing societies on all continents of the world, regardless of variations in race, color or creed." The West, wrote Lerner, provided the stimuli to undermine traditional society in the Middle East. "What America is," he wrote, "the modernizing Middle East seeks to become." "Underlying the varying ideological forms," he went on to say, "which modernization took in Europe, America, Russia and Japan there have been certain behavioral and institutional compulsions common to all."

To some extent Lerner's focus on common processes was dictated by his methodology. Those who used cross national surveys sought common attitudinal states of mind and personality types that could be determinants of change across cultures. The American social scientist, committed to change—looked for what Dave McClelland almost whimsically called, a "virus" for change; the search produced such concepts as achievement motivation, the marginal man—and Lerner's empathic personality. Survey methodology was used to search for this elixir, this virus for modernity and democracy that cut across cultures.

Among social scientists there has always been a tension between those who sought general propositions and uniform patterns of development and those who theory of social change emphasized the critical role of internal, autochthonous patterns and propensities for change within the modernizing societies. Lerner's own account of Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iran belie the notion of unilinearity; Lerner was too

good an empiricist to force his findings to fit his theories. But he was more concerned with the forces of modernization—urbanization, literacy and especially the media—on social change, and not on the indigenous propensities to change. Lerner was thus looking for *common forces of transformation*; other social scientists have been looking for *different rules of transformation*.

It is not, as some would see it, that some scholars look at what is general and others at the particular, that some look at the forest and others at the trees. The tension is between two kinds of theories of change. One turns to studying the varying forms of internal social structures, cultural beliefs, economic relationships, and the forms and institutions of political authority to discover how internal forces for transformation interact with new stimuli, while Lerner, like many in his time and since, focused on theories which gave primacy to exogenous stimuli. For Lerner it was the impact of the mass media and its picture of the world outside and hence of the world ahead that constituted a larger overriding force for change. And behind this theory of what caused change was his own strong normative belief that a participant democratic society was the preferred outcome.

Among contemporary students of development there continues to remain a division between those who start with a concern with the internal rules of transformation and those who start with a concern with external stimuli, and while each concedes the importance of the other, the models of change with which they work are often quite different. Lerner's contribution was that while he focused on these common forces for change, he never overlooked the importance of context, of history, and of what was local.

Lerner helped to create what was to subsequently become a mainstream in the study of development. When the book appeared it was heralded as an important new way of looking at development. Moreover, Lerner wrote in a prose style that was the envy of his professional colleagues. He moved back and forth from his parables to his paradigms, from his deft phrases to his technical tables. But he also expressed his ideas in a form that could be tested, corrected, even refuted

Lerner had no illusion about the permanence of his ideas for he recognized the short half life of social science concepts, but he was confident that a social science approach—one that emphasized theory formation, empirical data collection, the rigorous analysis of data, in short the testing of theory against reality—would last. In the last two sentences in the 1964 preface to his book, Lerner wrote an epitaph for his own work:

“The Best service a model can render, however, is to hasten its own obsolescence by leading to a better one. I look forward to this outcome in due course.”

Myron Weiner
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Edward Lee Pinney

Edward Lee Pinney, professor of politics, died suddenly on May 14, 1980. He was 49 years old and had served on the Washington and Lee University faculty for 17 years.

A native of Jacksonville, Florida, raised in Alabama, “Mike” received the B.A. degree in history from Auburn University in 1952 and then went on active duty with the U.S. Army, serving as a lieutenant in Korea. On his return he studied political science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he received the Master’s degree in 1956 and the Ph.D. degree in 1960. From 1959 to 1963 he was a member of the political science faculty at Louisiana State University. In 1963 he joined the faculty at Washington and Lee. He was the author of journal articles on German, Mexican and American government, and he edited *Comparative Politics and Political Theory*, published in 1966.

Mike was a man of varied interests and many talents. He was active in the American and Southern Political Science Associations and served as Recording Secretary of the SPSA. He was a strong competitor on the tennis court and an avid gardener with a prodigiously green thumb. One of Mike’s distinctive traits was an unparalleled wit, which was based on a vast vocabulary and a jet-speed ability to pick out flaws of logic or philosophy in any discussion, no matter

how exotic the topic—and to see and play upon the implausible, the improbable and the absurd whenever they occurred. From his students, he demanded performances that met his own high scholarly standards, and he rewarded them with scintillating lectures and with warmth, concern and affection.

In Mike Pinney we have lost a valued colleague, a stimulating companion, and a dear friend.

William Buchanan
Milton Colvin
Delos D. Hughes
Lewis G. John
John R. Handelman
Washington and Lee University

Robert S. Runo

Robert S. Runo, associate professor of political science, Roosevelt University, died June 12, 1980, of a heart attack at age 72. After retirement in 1972, he was living at his home in Mt. Prospect, Illinois, a suburb of Chicago. He is survived by his wife, Margaret, two children, Karen Crotty and Robert H., and five grandchildren.

Robert Runo, born at Calumet, Michigan, graduated from Williams College, and did graduate work at the University of Michigan, receiving the degree of M.A. in 1934, and at the University of Chicago, 1938-40. Teaching first at De Paul University and then Indiana State Teachers College, he was briefly with the Office of Price Administration. From 1943-46, he was in the U.S.N.R. and the U.S.N., with the rank of lieutenant. In 1946, he joined the Roosevelt University faculty where he served for the rest of his teaching career. For several years, he taught one course at Northwestern University. His courses were in Political parties, Public Opinion, and Constitutional Law.

At Roosevelt University, Robert Runo came to typify the close relationship between teaching and faculty self-government by being not only acting department chairman on two occasions, and for one three-year term, department chairman, but also for nine years a faculty-elected member of the Board of Trustees. For most of the years while teaching, he was on the faculty senate, and was a valued contributor to many faculty commit-