

Member of the American Society for Public Administration and a Charter Member of the Metropolitan Public Personnel Society.

On campus Dr. Fitzgerald had been both a graduate and an undergraduate advisor. He had been active in Freshman Orientation and recently in the S.J.U. "Open House" program for prospective undergraduate students. He also supervised the department's Public Administration Internship Programs and chaired the G.E.P.C.'s Subcommittee on Public Administration.

Dr. Fitzgerald was a popular teacher who will be remembered as an excellent instructor, valued colleague, and good friend.

His death on April 25, 1977 was followed on April 28th by a concelebrated Mass of the Christian Burial at the Holy Family Roman Catholic Church, Flushing, New York. Reverend Joseph I. Dirvin, C.M., Vice President for Community Relations and Secretary of St. John's University, New York, was principal celebrant and preached the homily. Members of his family, his colleagues, students, and friends served as honorary pall bearers and honorguard. Internment followed at the Long Island National Cemetery (Pinelawn), Farmingdale, New York.

Condolences are extended to his wife, Dr. Margaret E. Fitzgerald; his sister, Sister Mary Luke, O.P., Ph.D.; and his other relatives and friends.

Frank Paul LeVeness
St. John's University, New York

Earl B. Latham

Earl Latham, Joseph B. Eastman Professor Emeritus of Political Science, and Distinguished College Lecturer at Amherst College, died on May 6. His death was sudden. He was still intellectually vigorous, brilliantly teaching huge classes in constitutional law. His great career thus ended as he would have wished it to.

Earl Latham came to Amherst in 1948, from the University of Minnesota. He had served with the government during the war years, and decided that his truest commitment was to the academy. He kept some connection to the world of affairs, principally during the candidacy and, later, the Presidency of John Kennedy; but his real passion was the pursuit of understanding.

As a teacher, Earl Latham set a high standard in his unique blending of substance and performance, instruction and entertainment, wisdom and wit. In a seminar or in a lecture, his mastery of the moment first enthralled and then educated. Colloquy was thrust and parry, producing both delight and insight. His teaching went on in the classroom, his office, his home, and around campus. Whenever or wherever Earl encountered students, he taught.

Earl's contribution to the study of politics earned him many honors. He was elected

President of the New England Political Science Association, Vice President of the American Political Science Association, and fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He gave a number of endowed lectures at various American universities. He was a visiting professor at Harvard. His last main book, *The Communist Controversy in Washington: From the New Deal to McCarthy*, won the first David Demarest Lloyd Prize. More important than all these emblematic recognitions is the simple fact that his writings were widely read and reviewed; that they made an impact from the time of their publication; and that they are still alive. His reputation as one of the handful of major students of American political life is secure. He thus reached the highest honor to which he aspired.

His three main books, his numerous essays and reviews, and his edited collections are all unified by a defined political sensibility, which was Madisonian in its basic inspiration. Earl taught that though the individual's consciousness and purpose were irreducible, no individual end of a social kind could be reached by the solitary individual's exertions. Each had to join others and cooperate with them in group activity. The life of politics was the play of groups. You had to expect them to form, to push, to pressure. That was political nature. The play was absorbing to Earl; one might say he was addicted to the beauty of its changing patterns. He developed a worldly tolerance of almost all players, despite his general moral commitment to the interests of the weaker or less advantaged. Yet he drew the line: his worldliness never took on the professional deformity of cynical complacency as it did with some political scientists. In American political life, Joseph McCarthy was over the line. Earl's account of his rise and fall is great portraiture: great because fair, and because fair, annihilating. His detestation of McCarthy and McCarthyism was a vivid expression of the other side of his Madisonian sensibility: his passionate love of American constitutionalism. If his greatest writing was on the play of groups, his greatest teaching was on the rules of the play, on the vigorous but tormented career of the articles and amendments of our Constitution.

Besides these intellectual engagements Earl had one more we may mention. That was to understand and express the truth, as he perceived it, of individual motivation. He was a deeply introspective man and tried to trace his motives to their source. In Hobbes's phrase, he searched hearts; his own, first of all. He was unyielding in his self-descriptions. He poured them into his journal, a huge organic work, which he labored on to the end of his life, and perhaps took great pride in, than in anything else he wrote. He also turned that scrutinizing passion on public figures, and on those around him, whenever he thought there was hypocrisy, or even worse, the semi-hypocrisy of self-deception, or, worst of all, the destructive inattention of inexperience. He thought and proved that political science at its best is a

revelatory study, revelatory of the truth about human nature; but that, without self-knowledge, it would remain a muddle. Finally, political science is an instrument of the most precious truth, self-knowledge.

Earl was a uniquely powerful man; he is not replaceable.

Members of the
Department of Political Science,
Amherst College

Charles Emanuel Martin

The death of Charles E. Martin on January 12, 1977, at the age of eighty-five, brought to an end more than a half-century of association with the University of Washington. Martin came to the University in 1925 from what was the Southern Branch of the University of California at Los Angeles. He was appointed by President Suzzallo to succeed J. Allen Smith as head of the political science department, and remained in that position throughout a full quarter-century of significant, if unspectacular, growth.

When Martin came to Seattle, department heads were, in effect, absolute rulers, each in his own domain. They were unchallengeable from below, and subject to very little effective supervision from above—a then normal pattern of relationships in most of the land-grant colleges of the west and mid-west. When, on the other hand, he laid down his administrative responsibilities in 1952, the old pattern had almost completely disappeared. By that time the typical department chairman had become little more than the presiding officer for a group of colleagues whose recorded agreement was required in all matters of consequence—decidedly not an arrangement conducive to virtuoso exercises in statesmanship on the part of the chairman.

Charles Martin deserves to be remembered fondly as the last of a vanished breed who was certainly one of the most tirelessly energetic and colorful representatives of the type. No sooner arrived on the scene than he began to exploit all the resources available to him in the interest of a more visible department of political science. Adoption of new courses of study, lectureships, institutes, and conferences testified to the emergence of a restless organizing talent with enormous “drive.” Martin was the first and last dean of a short-lived college of social sciences, the creation of which he had vigorously promoted; he brought outstanding speakers to the campus—among them H. J. Laski, whose Walker-Ames lectures filled the venerable Meany Hall as it had never been filled before. The Quarterly Symposium of World Affairs, at which Martin regularly presided, deserves separate mention for although the format was borrowed from Southern California’s Rufus von KleinSmid—it was entirely dependent on the personality and drive of its Seattle impresario. Moreover, it enlisted the support of a large and influential clientele which was as much town as gown in composition.

Given such a background, it was all but inevitable that Martin would make enemies on roughly the same generous scale as he made friends. For only an extraordinary endowment of tact could have enabled a man to avoid generating numerous resentments in the course of a career as politically active as Martin’s. And he was emphatically not an outstanding diplomatic operator—despite a profound knowledge of the history of diplomacy. His forte was the frontal assault on an entrenched position, and he “pulled no punches” when pursuing a cherished objective. Such direct methods earned him widespread respect among the faculty at large as a man not easily intimidated by the “Brass” of the University establishment. The long-term legacy of Martin’s administrative experience was not, however, nearly as ambiguous in terms of personal relationships as the foregoing might suggest. For it is relatively easy to forgive an antagonist who fights in the open—no matter how abrasive his behavior may have seemed at the time of encounter. Just so, Martin’s evident lack of guile in waging his hard-fought battles more or less guaranteed that his detractors would “melt away” with the passing years while his uncomplicated loyalty to his friends meant that he would keep their friendship indefinitely.

Once retired from the chairmanship, the pace of his activities notably slackened. But there was no relaxation in his teaching effort nor in the extent of the travel he undertook—primarily in support of his teaching. International Law was his favorite academic subject, and the range of his acquaintance in that field was singularly impressive—beginning with his revered teacher at Columbia, John Bassett Moore, and including enough members of younger generations of scholars to account for his election to the Presidency of the American Society of International Law in 1960-61.

In addition to several books on American government and constitutional law, his publications in his principal field included *The Policy of the United States as Regards Intervention*, *The Politics of Peace*, and *Universalism and Regionalism in International Law and Organization*.

His next most cherished teaching subject was United States Foreign Policy, and here the effectiveness of his teaching was clearly enhanced by his first hand familiarity with those who executed that policy; he kept in touch with members of the foreign service all over the world. Among the more important of his experiences abroad were: his service as Carnegie Foundation Professor to Asia and the Antipodes (1929-30), the chairmanship of the U.S. Cultural and Scientific Mission to Japan (1948-49), and the directorship of the American Studies Program at the University of the Philippines (1962-64).

Charles Martin’s lecturing style was both memorable in its own right, and singularly reliable as an index to his public personality. What his auditors *saw*, once our speaker got underway,