

## Introduction

HAROLD D. LASSWELL

*Yale University*

You may recall that we have a tradition of flippant anecdote on occasions of this kind. It is not difficult to see why this happened. The President's address came late in the annual meeting and after dinner. Everybody was stuffed with food, marinated in liquid dressing, and dazed by communication overload.

Now all this is abruptly changed. Here we are in the afternoon having starved since lunch, dried out since last night, and feeling stimulated by the recollection of our dazzling rhetorical contributions to the meetings.

I shall, however, take a measure of responsibility for a brief personal allusion. Like so many people, Heinz began as a smiling infant and joy-bringer to his environment. From then on it was, in a sense, downhill. He made the environment less comfortable as he got closer and closer to politics and political science.

He passed through the labyrinth at Berkeley, served as an indentured servant of research in Washington during the war effort, and joined the staff of that organ of perpetual advice to the nation, *The New Republic*. Then came his full commitment to a career of teaching, investigation and consultation—based in Antioch College and Stanford University.

By this time the latent potentials were fully developed. His independence and creativity were apparent. And Heinz was outspoken and tenacious of opinion close to the point of provocativeness. Combined with a lucid mind and an arresting style he was the manner of man who inspires able students, colleagues, and decision makers who can stand the heat.

It is rumoured that a gifted and disciplined

mind is a useful tool in the profession, and Heinz's career tends to confirm this proposition. As a gifted mind he had no trouble with a conceptual and philosophically differentiated map of the whole. What was particularly distinctive was the intellectual discipline that enabled him to suspend preferential commitments until a situation was scrutinized to see whether the preconditions were present that were appropriate for applying the preference.

It was not uncommon at the time of another Aristotelian revival in political science to recognize the relevance of observing the environment. What was impressive was that Heinz went far beyond a change in vocabulary to make the sacrifices necessary to acquire skill in the requisite procedures of data gathering and processing, and of theory building.

His strategy of investigation is in many ways a professional model worth emulating. He chose as an axial frame of reference one of the principal components of the decision-making and executing process—legislation—for which we have professional responsibility. He attacked the problems involved with "intensive" methods of inquiry. He went on to utilize "extensive" standpoints and procedures. And he kept relating the specific function to the context of interaction in the process of decision and in the social process as a whole.

We are indebted to our colleague for the distinguished investigations that have thus far appeared, and we look forward with keen anticipation and respect to those to come. I give you President Eulau.