sored. As one who always gave more than full measure in fulfilling his responsibilities, Frank Grace was a gentleman, a patriot, and a scholar who served his country, his good wife and family of six fine children, his department and his university well. His colleagues will remember and miss him. His students will recall his care and devotion.

George Grassmuck
University of Michigan-Ann Arbor

Charles S. Hyneman

Charles S. Hyneman, the fifty-seventh president of the American Political Science Association, died in Bloomington, Indiana, on January 20, 1985, at the age of 84. He had retired from his full-time appointment as Distinguished Professor at Indiana University in 1971, after having taught at his *alma mater* since 1956.

Charles Hyneman seldom related to those around him in a single role. We are not alone in having found him to be—sequentially and sometimes simultaneously—a distinguished scholar, a teacher, a lifelong stimulator of thought, a professional colleague, the father or grandfather we never had, a fellow gardener and basketball enthusiast, and, above all, a generous and reliable friend. A person of Charles Hyneman's stature passes through one's life but rarely. Few individuals manage to combine the qualities of intellect, integrity, and humanity to such an extraordinary degree, and yet succeed in imparting their gifts to others in such a disarmingly "homespun" fashion.

Sidney Hook, in his provocative book *The Hero in History,* made a distinction between the merely eventful man and the event-making man—the latter being one who by thought and deed made things occur that substantially altered the course of events for those about him. Charles Hyneman was too much of an iconoclast and a democrat with a small "d" to have accepted the title of "hero," and yet he had the ability to do the small thing as well as commit the great act that did make a significant difference in the lives, careers, and the perspectives on issues and events assumed by those around him.

There is a moment in Plato's *Apology* in which Socrates explains his mission in life to the jurors who are trying him. He says:

> I am a sort of gadfly given to the state by God and the state is a great and noble steed who is tardy in his motions owing to his very size and required to be stirred into life. I am that gadfly which God has attached to the state and all day long and in all places am always fastening upon you arousing and persuading and reproaching you.

Charles Hyneman was our gadfly. He aroused us. He persuaded us. And implicitly he reproached us as we recognized how much harder he pushed his own mind than we were inclined to push ours.

It was those self-imposed demands that made Charles the scholar of international repute, whose five decades of writing produced a significant contribution to the literature of political science. Charles had an unquenchable passion for scholarship and displayed an unending pursuit of the truth which remained with him till the end. Literally, in his last days, he was putting the finishing touches on *The Founding: A Prelude to a More Perfect Union,* which the editor, Howard Penniman, considers to be Charles' finest work. The corpus of his writings is wide ranging, starting with *The First American Neutrality* (1935), which evidenced his earlier interest in international relations and foreign policy. Among his later writings, many scholars still regard Hyneman's *Bureaucracy in a Democracy* (1950) as one of the more refreshing and seminal contributions to the fields of both public administration and democratic theory. Over an extended period Charles' concern about reconciling our origins as a national society with contemporary political practices and values is reflected in *The Supreme Court on Trial* (1963), *Popular Government in America* (1968), and his posthumous *The Founding,* as well as in the co-edited volumes, *A Second Federalist* (1967) and *American Political Writing During the Founding Era* (1983). Indeed, many of us long suspected that Charles purposely kept one

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900624323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

or two of his writing projects short of completion so that his scholarly agenda was always open.

Like all great scholars, however, Charles was never entirely happy with the methods he and his colleagues used for gaining that knowledge. He was well trained in the historical and legal approaches that dominated political science before World War II, and he gained invaluable practical experience in several governmental agencies during WWII. His appointments included the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of the Provost Marshall, General in the War Department, and the Federal Communications Commission. This governmental experience convinced him that the discipline's knowledge was not good enough to be very useful. Its factual basis was too anecdotal and unreliable, and its theories were too simplistic and unverified. After the war he became one of the leaders of what came to be known as "the behavioral revolution" in political science. He organized a series of conferences at Northwestern University on the possibilities of making the discipline's empirical base more reliable and its theoretical superstructure more meaningful. Charles published his own ideas in his seminal book *The Study of Politics* in 1959, and a year later he was elected president of the American Political Science Association. The Northwestern conferences and his book profoundly changed the way most political scientists since that day have gone about their business. Many, of course, have challenged Hyneman's wisdom and guidance in that area: but that, too, Charles always welcomed. His own personal commitment to the need for a quantitative base to political science is evidenced in his monumental *Voting in Indiana* (1979), which was a labor of love.

While most political scientists, however, would say that Charles Hyneman was one of the great scholars of his time, just about everyone who knew him says he was the most gifted and dedicated teacher they have ever known. To understand just what that means you have to remember what he did and did not leave behind. There is no "Hyneman school" of political science that one must either join or oppose. Charles left no disciples, only students. There are plenty of Straussians and Parsonians and even a few Eastonians, but no Hynemanians. That is not because Charles had no talented pupils; after all, his former students from Indiana, Louisiana State University, Northwestern, and the University of Illinois included a late U.S. vice president, several senators and congressmen, Pulitzer prize winners, nationally recognized newsmen and women, as well as faculty members at most of the major public and private universities in this country. The list of self-proclaimed students—that is, his colleagues and others who "audited Hyneman for life"—is equally long and impressive.

Charles was never a teacher in the didactic sense; indeed, he disliked pomposity in others in the profession. Consequently, his approach to teaching was often disarming and occasionally even misunderstood until students gradually came to the full appreciation of his unorthodox style and his frequently irreverent examples to illustrate a point. The students of Charles Hyneman have practiced many different kinds of political science, adhered to many different political philosophies, and participated in many different political movements. They are a diverse collection in all respects except three: they all believe that human truth is to be found in the journey more than the arrival; they reserve the right to be dissatisfied with any conclusion, especially their own; and they know that for them this way of looking at their profession is the greatest legacy of Charles Hyneman.

In an age when we attempt to peg persons ideologically, Charles Hyneman defied neat categorization. Charles often could see great problems and issues arising on the national agenda long before others of his generation thought there was anything amiss in race relations, the increase in federal power, or the role of women in society. In that sense, Charles Hyneman was a liberal. Charles, however, had long since thought through many of the complications, nuances, and pitfalls of those issues by the time they had reached the level of national awareness. Consequently, Charles was able to provide a broader perspective and to

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0030826900624323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

counsel caution about the destruction of other values in the pursuit of single-minded reform. In that sense, Charles Hyneman was a conservative.

And in that context, we think of Charlie Hyneman in his role as a citizen. Hyneman may himself have placed the status of citizen at the top of the list of roles one can play in life. He believed in the virtues of good citizenship and tried to live that good citizenship in his daily contacts with colleagues and friends. That is undoubtedly why he often talked about Gibson County. He personified the rural heartland of this country in which he believed you could find what was still real, true, and valuable about the great American experience.

His frequent reference to Gibson County notwithstanding, Charles' interests extended far beyond rural Indiana and far beyond the boundaries of political science. All his life he sought out other places and other people—philosophers, sociologists, lawyers, practicing journalists, and practitioners in the political sphere. That is why he cherished his stint in the early 1950s with the Chicago Sanitary Board. He was fascinated with the remarkable functioning of the Daley machine in Chicago. He had a particular kind of respect for the people who were engaged in the daily work of politics. He had the same regard for the working journalist, just as he found wisdom in the ongoing life of the people who were like those among whom he had grown up in Gibson County. He always used to tell us that life was complex enough in Gibson County that we did not need to look at other more exotic areas. Almost every kind of thing could ocur in Gibson County —every kind of political thing and every kind of social thing. There was always with Charles a greater trust in rural people than in urban people. The last years of his life, which he spent working on American thought in the formative years of the Republic, reinforced his convictions about the virtues of an earlier, less complicated way of life. That characteristic undoubtedly made it difficult for him to accept some features of modern life.

Charles' scope of concern went far beyond his students, friends, and family. But it was the latter, and particularly his wife Frances, who remained central to his concerns until the very last moments. He knew it was Frances' love and attention that kept him alive despite his sometimes fragile health. He used to grumble about her scolding him on his diet, for not wearing a hat when working in the sun, or for not pacing himself. He always ended up, however, taking her advice despite his protestations. His grousing never fooled anyone about the marvelous love they had for each other over the decades. Men who are strongly independent-minded and courageous in the moral sense invariably have wives who match them in those qualities and provide them with both an anchor and a rudder. And thus it was with Charles Hyneman.

J. Gus Liebenow and
Byrum E. Carter
Indiana University

Austin Ranney
American Enterprise Institute

Robert L. Morlan

Robert L. Morlan, age 64, professor of political science at the University of Redlands, died suddenly on April 12, 1985, just two weeks before a scheduled retirement party that scores of his former students had planned to attend. During his 36 years at Redlands, Morlan, an influential teacher, launched the careers of many political scientists and public administrators.

Morlan received the B.A. degree from Denison University and the M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Minnesota. While at Redlands, he served as chairman of the political science department and dean of social sciences. Though a specialist in American government, he travelled frequently to the Netherlands, where he was at various times a visiting professor at the University of Leiden, the University of Amsterdam, and the College of Europe at Bruges and a research fellow at the Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study.

He served as president of the Western Political Science Association (1967-68) and the Southern California Political Science Association (1955-56, 1961-63)