

sion 'great' is not the right word."

Harold's reverence for language involved more than just the pride of the master craftsman; it was sustained by his frequently expressed belief that all serious writing is to some degree autobiographical, embodying an element of the identity of the author. Whatever truth his theory might have for others, it certainly was manifest in his last, and very moving book, *Re-Encounters in China*, in which a mature and very wise Harold Isaacs, with considerable bemusement, reflected on not only the pathetic fates of his one-time Chinese friends but also on his own youthful audacity in believing that Marxism-Leninism could be reconciled with honesty and justice.

Right alongside his fury at the state of the times was Harold's other contending passion, an outpouring of compassion and love for all those he embraced as his family. "Family" for him started with his immediate loved ones but quickly reached out to include that extraordinary network he called his "extended family." Isaacs invested tremendous amounts of energy and care in maintaining a wide range of friendships from every phase of his career.

The contrast between the youthful Harold Isaacs who was ready to change the world and the mature Harold Isaacs who attached supreme importance to the most private matters of personal identity and the bonds of friendship might suggest a person who had retreated from the world in disillusionment. Particularly since he also became a person given to moments of cantankerous derision of the vanities of public figures. This, however, would not be a correct reading of Isaacs's transformations, for in a very fundamental way he remained an idealist; it was only that his focus of concern had shifted from abstractions to concrete individuals. Isaacs continued to be a romantic; no longer in political terms but by clinging to an idealized vision of what direct human relationships can be.

As a result of this transformation, Isaacs became increasingly impatient with the thought that political considerations should rule personal relationships. He was thus both bemused and exasperated

that his Shanghai days friends would have nothing to do with him until the Beijing authorities declared him no longer pollution, and then when they finally met in his re-encounters it was as in a time capsule, for the Chinese sought to blank out all that had happened between those Shanghai days and Deng's reforms.

Although Harold Isaacs clung to his self-identity as a journalist, his enduring contributions will be in the realm of scholarship. First, for the meticulous historical reconstruction of devious and sordid events in the Chinese revolution, and second for his sensitive analysis of how people in a changing world have struggled to develop and maintain acceptable feelings of group identity. As an analyst of modern nationalism, especially among the emerging nations of Asia and Africa, he took as his domain the dynamic essence of world affairs. By focusing on the impact of passions on reason, and more particularly the profound human craving for asserting group identities, Harold Isaacs, a one-time master journalist, became a master authority of a central subject of political science.

Lucian W. Pye
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Richard W. Krouse

Richard William Krouse was born on September 23, 1946 and died in a tragic automobile accident on September 5, 1986. He had been at Williams College since 1975, having done his undergraduate work at Franklin and Marshall College (*magna cum laude*) and his graduate work at the University of Chicago and Princeton University from which he received his Ph.D. in 1978. His teaching and research were in the field of political philosophy with a specialization in democratic theory. He was also a very effective teacher of American politics.

At the time of his death Dick had published 13 scholarly articles and seven reviews. All of them appeared in distinguished professional journals and edited collections. They reveal a lot about their author—his substantive concerns, intellectual style, and even his personal

qualities. One can read them and learn much about political things, and now especially one can read them to remind oneself of some salient characteristics of a colleague and friend. The qualities of his prose mirror the qualities of the man. There is intellectual detachment conjoined with intense commitment, a scrupulous sense of fairness in asserting claims and disputing the claims of others, an elegance never tinctured with pomposity or pretense. And of course there is clarity, a quality that seemed to come naturally to Dick, but which, as the ever present furrow on his brow more accurately indicated, he struggled to perfect. Those who saw him work knew that a sentence was not simply written; it evolved. This was not just a matter of style; rather it spoke to the deepest qualities of the man, for clarity and definition are not unrelated to rectitude, and to give some intimation of the person that was Dick Krouse is to recall what was perhaps his most evident characteristic, an almost truculent integrity.

All of Krouse's scholarship, from his dissertation through his fruitful collaboration with the Williams economist Michael McPherson, explored the internal logic, tensions, and implications of democratic liberalism. In a series of significant articles on Madison, de Tocqueville, James and John Stuart Mill, and Robert Dahl, Dick delineated with great precision the tension-laden relationship between the core political values of liberty and equality. These essays were followed by two pieces on the concepts of marriage, divorce, and the family in liberal and Marxian political discourse. Here Krouse explored the failures of both traditions in bridging the theoretical gulf between their constitutive philosophical presuppositions and the political and socio-economic institutions and practices associated with those traditions. Liberalism had been unable to reconcile its commitment to formal equality of civil and political rights for the individual and a continuing acceptance of severe inequalities in the material distribution of income, wealth and power. And Marxism was torn between the autonomous individual prized in the more reflective versions of that vision and a hostility to the

institutional forms of privacy arguably essential to the full development of this individuality. In the last two years of his life, Krouse and McPherson worked together to construct a political economic theory that might resolve some of these vexing tensions. In the end their collaboration produced three much discussed articles on the property relations necessary for conditions of justice, equality and liberty in a market economy. Dick was particularly proud of this work and the favorable and important attention it had received; he looked forward to its evolution into book form.

As a teacher Dick Krouse represented what for many of us was the model for liberal arts instruction. From his students he compelled reflection, but he did not hold it to be a teacher's task to implant his views in those he taught. He attracted students, but not a following; his enrollments, in fact, were quite modest despite his students' invariable assessment that he was one of the best instructors at Williams College. As he was no friend of theatrical displays in the classroom Professor Krouse's impact on students was not that of a great "performer": Rather, his students reacted with unstinting admiration to the fundamental seriousness, intensity and clarity of his mind as well as to the rare combination of intellect and character that provided them the role model of the true intellectual. For Krouse's intellectuality could never be mistaken for the dry misanthropy of the "academic." His profound respect for all people, importantly including his students, never permitted him to separate theory from practice. For Dick the life of ideas was arid unless it could be put in the service of improving the lives of people: he quite unselfconsciously and naturally lived that conviction in his approach to academic matters, in his personal relations with the students, in his approach to the abiding problems of social justice, equality and freedom. For Krouse the liberally educated person was not a cluster of attitudes or a set of postures but rather was one who had managed to integrate the life of the mind with the life of the public *persona*, the citizen. His students instinctively recognized and admired in him the very em-

bodiment of the committed intellectual who takes seriously the obligations and responsibilities of higher learning.

Dick's service to the College carried well beyond his successes in the classroom. Of the many things he did, his chairmanship of the Faculty Steering Committee in 1981-82 was the most noteworthy, and for him the most satisfying. He was the driving force behind the College's adoption of new procedures for written communication with nontenured faculty, a change that represents a signal advance in the fairness of its reappointment and tenure processes. And it was largely a result of his initiative, hard work, and skillful leadership that the College expanded the range of fringe benefits to such important areas as dental insurance.

Finally, a word should be said about Dick's role in the Political Science Department. In a department not widely known for its calm and conciliatory approach to collective decisionmaking, he was more often than not the key player in the usually productive deliberations of that highly contentious group of strong-willed people. He had the skills necessary for inducing compromise, but he was not a compromiser. What he possessed most of all was the ability to listen, to comprehend what was sensible in alternative positions, to discern the inconsistencies as well as the possibilities in what others said. We often thought that the reason our meetings were so painfully long was that Dick had the strange habit of not speaking unless recognized by the Chair, while the rest of us exercised our interruptive privileges to meander our way to unsatisfactory conclusions.

Blessed with a wonderful and growing family, steadily cementing his position within the network of nationally prominent political theorists, producing work of ever broadening reach and significance, Richard Krouse was not destined to live to see the ripened fruits of his love, his thoughts, intellectual energy and power. One cannot make sense of the cruel wastefulness of his death and it is ultimately unproductive to attempt it. Yet the manner of his life ought to become part of the lives of those who knew him, no less than becoming part of the fabric and tradition of Williams College.

A memorial fund in his name has been established at Williams College, and contributions may be sent to The Richard W. Krouse Memorial Fund, Williams College, Williamstown, MA 01267.

Gary J. Jacobsohn
Kurt P. Tauber
Williams College

Benjamin A. Most

Benjamin A. Most, associate professor of political science at the University of Iowa, died in Iowa City on November 10, 1986, of heart failure. His sudden and untimely death is a tragedy, not only for his family, friends and colleagues, but for the discipline as a whole. At the age of 38, Ben Most was only beginning to make his mark on the study of international relations, policy and methodology.

Ben was born May 19, 1948, in Canton Pennsylvania. He grew up in Pennsylvania, and attended Franklin and Marshall College, where he received his A.B. in 1971. He received his Ph.D. in political science from Indiana University in 1979. From 1977-81 he taught at Brown University before moving to the University of Iowa. The product of this intellectual journey was a scholar of immense ability and a man of great character. Ben was a recognized expert in the study of war and international conflict, especially in the application of geo-political models and approaches to war, the study of borders and the analysis of the diffusion of violent conflict. But Ben's interests and expertise also ranged across the study of public policy and the policy process, comparative politics and methodology. At the time of his death he was in the process of revising two pieces which had been accepted for publication—monographs on the foreign policy process, and on the analysis of changing authoritarian political systems in Argentina (he had field experience in Mexico, Bolivia, and Argentina). He was also preparing a co-authored book on the logic of inquiry and theory in international relations. Having recently joined the Executive Council of the newly formed Midwest Consortium for International Security Studies, he was