

aided by a faculty drawn from American University and NTL Institute in a unique and still unprecedented collaboration.

Today, the AU/NTL Masters of Science in Organization Development Program continues to enroll students from around the world and has over 1,200 graduates. The program long ago had to stop designating cohorts in Roman numerals, and it most recently enrolled Cohort 57. Graduates of the program have gone on to make important contributions to the field and practice of organization development at conferences, in publications, through university teaching, and as OD practitioners and executives in business, government, and not-for-profit organizations. Importantly the program itself has served as a model and validation for the combination of content, process, and application in graduate education long advocated by Dr. Segal. There are no podiums to stand behind in the AU/NTL classroom.

Becoming a Personality Theorist and Therapist

Around this same time period, Dr. Segal became interested in Freud and psychoanalytic theories and approaches to group and organizational behavior. He then broadened his interests to include other psychological theorists and approaches such as Rogers, Jung, Horney, Skinner, Ellis, Lewin, and Perls. He began to incorporate their ideas into the classroom and then decided to write a book summarizing the essence of each of their theories and how it applied to the practice of organization development. It was a long labor of love, but was finally finished with the publication in 1997 of *Points of Influence: A Guide to Using Personality Theory at Work*. That same year Dr. Segal retired from the faculty at American University and was appointed professor emeritus. He moved back to San Francisco and completed the requirements to become a licensed marriage and family therapist and began a new career as a therapist at Pyramid Alternatives and in private practice. He was actively involved in his therapy practice and various writing projects until his untimely death.

Morley Segal the Person

In the end who was Morley Segal as a person? In some ways he was a study in contrasts. He was intellectually curious and had a keen mind combined with an amazing ability to pull disparate things together and see possibilities where others only saw obstacles. He had a healthy

ego, but actively created opportunities for others to shine. At the same time his outward demeanor often belied his inner person. He was tall and a bit ungainly and in some ways the absent-minded professor. He was also able to laugh at himself or use himself as an example, such as learning how to tap dance and then using that as a way to model his Jungian “shadow self” as a suave character from the 1930s. These qualities made him approachable and endeared him to his colleagues and students. He was definitely charismatic, but in ways hard to fully define. From political scientist and legislative intern to personality theorist and therapist. From studying political and external dynamics to working with internal and unconscious processes. From a focus on content to a focus on content and process. A remarkable journey of a remarkable man who role modeled for his students and colleagues life-long learning, risk taking, personal empowerment, vulnerability, intellectual curiosity, and an uncanny ability to accomplish what others thought impossible.

Dr. Segal is survived by his loving life partner of nearly 30 years Maurine Poppers, his brother Rodney, his three children and their spouses, his six grandchildren, and his former wife, Joyce Holly. He is also survived by the thousands of colleagues and former students whose lives he enriched and influenced for more than 40 years.

Robert J. Marshak
American University

Note

* This account was prepared by Dr. Robert J. Marshak, scholar in residence, School of Public Affairs, American University, who was a student and colleague of Morley Segal for 40 years.

Charles Tilly

Charles Tilly, a social scientist who deployed historical interpretation and quantitative analysis in the large scale study of social change, died on April 29 in New York City after a long illness. He was 78. Often focused on Europe since 1500, his work also made sweeping advances in social and political theory. He leaves behind a panoply of former students, friends, and colleagues to whom he contributed wisdom, mentoring, and friendship over a long and distinguished career.

Tilly was born on May 27, 1929, in Lombard, Illinois, and was educated at Harvard and Oxford, obtaining the Ph.D.

in sociology at Harvard in 1958. He taught at the universities of Delaware, Toronto, and Michigan, as well as at Harvard and the New School for Social Research, and ended his career at Columbia, where he was the Joseph L. Buttenwieser Professor of Social Science.

Tilly published over 50 books and more than 600 articles in the fields of social movements, revolutions, state building, democracy, and historical and urban demography. Trained as a generalist, he never identified with narrow subfields or with any single discipline. Indeed, even to characterize his influence in political science alone would distort his intent and misrepresent the consistently interdisciplinary nature of his scholarship. Before turning to his importance in our field, we should at least recognize his immense influence on sociology and history and the profoundly interdisciplinary nature of his work.

As distinct from political science, contemporary sociology is made up of a large number of specialized subfields. Most card-carrying sociologists would be lucky to achieve distinction in as much as a single subfield; Tilly made important contributions to no less than seven sociological subfields. These are: political sociology, social movements, economic sociology, comparative/historical sociology, urban sociology, stratification and inequality, and theory. In one area, comparative/historical sociology, Chuck's work virtually defined the field into existence. In another, social movements, his scholarship helped set in motion a paradigm shift that redefined the study of movements and collective action as the proper province of political and organizational sociologists rather than social psychologists and scholars in the collective behavior tradition. The broad contours of political sociology everywhere bear his imprint.

Tilly's contributions to history are more difficult to pinpoint, since—in implicit polemic with the specializing tendency of much modern historiography—he contributed in equal measure to French, British, European, and world history. And as European historians were moving determinedly away from the study of large-scale social change and towards a “cultural turn” that sometimes left political change in the shadows, Tilly's relentless pursuit of the connections between capitalism, statebuilding, and contention marked him, for some, as a vestige of the out-of-date 1960s. He was hardly that, but younger historians, anxious to set themselves off from their elders, sometimes failed to notice that his methodological innovations were both fundamentally historical and were deeply

impregnated with culture. For example, his concept of the “repertoire” of contention is both profoundly cultural and provides a key to the understanding of large-scale social and political change.

In our field, Tilly is best known for his signal contributions to the field of historical state building, which he compared to a protection racket. “Consider the definition of a racketeer as someone who creates a threat and then charges for its reduction,” he wrote in his epochal chapter of *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge, 1985), edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. This insight broadened into his most ambitious work, *Coercion, Capital and European States* (Blackwell, 1990), in which he demonstrated how war and war-making capacity lay at the origin of the modern state. Students of state building outside his chosen territory of Europe have sometimes found these insights culture bound, but all who study state building have had to come to terms with his theory.

Tilly is likely to be best remembered in the interdisciplinary field of what he called “contentious politics,” an area of research that he virtually created. He argued that by limiting their ken to western reformist movements, most scholars of social movements were not only cutting themselves off from the rich fields of comparative revolution, strike waves, civil wars, and the like, but were also doomed to ignore the findings of historians working in periods when the social movement had not yet been invented. In his latest book, *Contentious Performances* (Cambridge, 2008), he demonstrates both the historical specificity of the social movement and how it emerged from the eighteenth-century repertoire through the nationalization and parliamentarization of politics.

The central core around which Tilly’s work revolved was the relationship between large-scale social change and contentious politics. His first book, *The Vendée* (Harvard, 1964), was an archive-based study of the counter-revolution in France, in which he used paired comparison of two areas of eastern France to demonstrate the relationship between social change and mobilization. With Louise and Richard Tilly, he then turned to the comparative and historical study of contention, in *The Rebellious Century* (Harvard, 1975), and, with Edward Shorter, to a detailed statistical analysis of industrial conflict in *Strikes in France* (Cambridge, 1974). The methodological and conceptual departures he produced in these books would define the boundaries of the study of contentious politics for the next three decades. Based on these

empirical studies, at the end of the 1970s, Tilly wrote what remained for years the definitive text on contentious politics, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (Addison-Wesley, 1978).

But he was far from done. In the 1980s, Tilly returned to the archives, constructing *The Contentious French* (Harvard, 1986), the most exhaustive study of historical contention in that conflict-ridden country. More significant for social scientists who do not specialize on France, in that decade he began to experiment with computer-assisted ways of studying contentious events, first at the University of Michigan and then at the New School for Social Research. In this work, Tilly shied away from pre-coding computerized records of social conflict—a method that he felt privileged quantity over quality—preferring instead to record long verbal accounts from original sources that specified the sources, objects, and forms of action involved in what he was then calling “contentious gatherings.” These verbal accounts were then reduced into broader categories and combined into composite events that he could examine both internally and in relation to each other. The method had the advantage of pointing to interactive pairs of contenders—labor and capital, farm workers and farm owners, and, increasingly, states and social movements—rather than focusing on “protest” alone, as many students (including the present author) tended to do.

Tilly’s experimentation with computer-readable studies of historical episodes of contention came to fruition in his magisterial *Contentious Politics in Great Britain, 1758–1834* (Harvard, 1995). In this book, he demonstrated how the repertoire of contention evolved from the parochial, local, and often violent events of the eighteenth century into the national, associational, and non-violent events of the nineteenth. This epochal shift in contentious performances he associated with the rise of Parliament and the shift in scale from the local to the national level of British politics and with the rise of the social movement. The latter was marked by properties he stubbornly summarized as WUNC (worthy, unified, numerous, and committed) and by the development of modular performances—like the demonstration—that could be adapted to a broad spectrum of causes and contenders. His major insight was that new performances do not appear Venus-like, fully formed, but emerge out of constant, interactive innovation from the existing repertoire.

Tilly’s increasingly preoccupation with contention did not still his contributions to other areas of the social sciences. In

the same decade, Tilly co-authored (with Chris Tilly) *Work under Capitalism* (Westview Press, 1998), and also produced a theoretical and historical study of inequalities, *Durable Inequality* (University of California, 1998), which completed his epistemological shift from the structural approach of his early work to the emphasis on mechanisms and processes that marked the last decade of his thinking. For example, the mechanism of “opportunity hoarding” that he examined in *Durable Inequality* might look from a distance no different than exploitation, but it applied equally to large-scale industry protecting its inventions and to Italian gardeners in Westchester passing their businesses on to their sons. To critics who complained that the microscopic examination of how mechanisms and processes emerge gave short shrift to causation and outcomes, he would parry: “But *how* is why!”

Tilly’s growing preoccupation with mechanisms and processes was the inspiration for Doug McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly’s 2001 Cambridge book, *Dynamics of Contention*. McAdam and I had thought we would help ease Chuck into retirement by taking him to breakfast at a conference called to honor him by former students Michael Hanagan, Leslie Page Moch, and Wayne te Brake. As he fondly cracked in his last book: “That plot failed.” To our delight, he proposed that we not only write a book together but develop a group project, one that would be supported by the Mellon Foundation at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences. With the other members of the “contentious gang,” Ron Aminzade, Jack Goldstone, Elizabeth Perry, and William Sewell, Jr., that project resulted in a book (*Silence and Voice in the Study of Contentious Politics*, Cambridge 2001), helped to train 14 Ph.D. students from around the country in the study of contentious politics, and formed the background for the series *Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics*, which is currently coordinated by Elisabeth Wood of Yale.

Even as his health began to fail, the new century saw, if anything, an acceleration in Tilly’s productivity. His most recently published books are *Contention and Democracy in Europe, 1650–2000* (Cambridge, 2004), *Social Movements, 1768–2004* (Paradigm Publishers, 2004), *Economic and Political Contention in Comparative Perspective* (Paradigm Publishers, co-authored and co-edited with Maria Kousis, 2005), *Trust and Rule* (Cambridge University Press, 2005), *Popular Contention in Great Britain, 1758–1834* (Paradigm Publishers, 2005, revised paperback edition of

the 1995 book), *Identities, Boundaries, and Social Ties* (Paradigm, 2005), *Why?* (Princeton University Press, 2006), the *Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (co-edited and co-authored with Robert Goodin, Oxford University Press, 2006), *Contentious Politics* (co-authored with Sidney Tarrow, Paradigm, 2006), *Regimes and Repertoires* (University of Chicago Press, 2006), *Democracy* (Cambridge 2007), and *Credit and Blame* (Princeton 2008). Several of these books were written while he was receiving chemotherapy for non-Hodgkins lymphoma. The latest, *Contentious Performances*, which Cambridge will bring out in late 2008, he was robbed of the satisfaction of seeing in print.

Tilly was recognized by honorary degrees from numerous universities and was a fellow of the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Philosophical Society. He was recently awarded the Albert Hirschman Prize for significant lifetime contributions to the social sciences by the Social Science Research Council, which will be awarded posthumously in October 2008.

But recounting these honors and titles does little to communicate the character of Chuck Tilly the person. His sense of humor, his quick ear for cant, and his impatience with pretense were combined with unfailing generosity, broadness of spirit, and his open and his egalitarian relationship to all who knew him. I remember his review of a book on empires that enjoyed a brief moment of fame a few years ago. Chuck took that book apart chapter by chapter, exposing the hollowness at its core and highlighting its errors of fact and logic. But his abiding characteristic was his generosity. From our first encounter in Ann Arbor through his years at the New School and Columbia, I never sent him a text that he failed to comment on (usually overnight), or a student he failed to help. The only time this intensely private person allowed his emotions to show was when I presented him with a book I dedicated to: "Chuck Tilly; a teacher!"

It is fitting to close this memoir by highlighting Tilly's commitment to training students and mentoring them and younger colleagues. In his more than four decades of training graduate students, he directed over 200 Ph.D. dissertations and served on the committees of numerous others. His service to the social sciences went well beyond his own institutions. He created a listserv, AMSOC, which serves as an interactive forum for discussions and sharing of information in many areas of the social sciences. And his Columbia Workshop on

Contentious Politics was a magnet for young and less young students of contentious politics across the broad New York metropolitan area.

Tilly's abiding virtue was the intellectual excitement he generated, which will be remembered by all those who had the privilege of working with him. As Roy Licklider writes of the time he spent as a participant in Tilly's seminar on social change at the New School:

His ability to treat all students, not just the chosen few disciples, as intellectual equals was equaled only by his eagerness to put his staggering knowledge and time at their service and his concern about their lives as well as their work which lasted long after they had departed.¹

Sidney Tarrow
Cornell University

Notes

* This obituary draws on the kind collaboration of Doug McAdam.

1. In a personal reflection on the listserv, AMSOC, founded by Tilly, which served as a major source of communication for scholars of social change and contentious politics around the world. Quoted with permission.

John C. Wahlke

A life of distinguished scholarship and teaching ended in Tucson, Arizona, on April 10, 2008, with the death of John C. Wahlke, who served successively on the political science faculties of Amherst College, Vanderbilt University, the State University of New York at Buffalo, the University of Iowa, Stony Brook University, and the University of Arizona. Born in Cincinnati, Ohio, John lived more than five months beyond 90 years of age. His professional career stretched over more than half a century, and his teaching, research, and leadership deeply influenced at least two important subdivisions of political science: legislative and biopolitical research.

He was born in Cincinnati, Ohio, on October 29, 1917, where he grew up and attended elementary and high school. He graduated from high school in 1935, and then enrolled in Harvard College, where he earned an AB degree magna cum laude, with election to Phi Beta Kappa, in 1939. He briefly worked at jobs for Seagram and Sons and the Crosley Corporation, and attended the University of Cincinnati, but his obvious promise as a student was interrupted by the vicissitudes of World War II. John entered the U.S. Army as a private in 1942, and left

as a captain. He received training as an air observation pilot flying small airplanes and spotting enemy targets for the field artillery. While he was attending flight school in Kansas he met Virginia Joan Higgins of Pittsburg, Kansas, and they were married in December 1943. They had two children, Janet (Parmely) and Dale.

John served for two years in the European Theater, among other assignments, flying over the Ardennes during the Battle of the Bulge in the winter months of 1944–45. He won five battle stars, and was awarded the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters. For John, these were exciting and rewarding times; he thought of his European military service as a high point of his life. He loved to tell the story about flying over the American-German lines when his plane's engine failed and he had to land in the midst of a hotly contested battle zone. He was able to hide his small airplane in a nearby barn and, after dark, join a small convoy of Americans searching for friendly forces. Suddenly a German tank lumbered out of the woods and, unaware that the convoy was American, not German, the tank proceeded to fall into line. John was close enough to hear the Germans talking. Luckily, after a short time the tank headed off in a completely different direction, and the Americans, including John, were greatly relieved.

John Wahlke became a distinguished teacher and research scholar. His undergraduate teaching interests were varied and longstanding. While still at Harvard, he served on the board of freshman advisers; for a number of years he was an examiner for honors studies at the University of Rochester; and he worked tirelessly as part of the "syllabus project" of the APSA. But his teaching career really began with his first academic affiliation—a four-year stint teaching undergraduates at Amherst College. In 1961–62 he worked with undergraduates in the Vanderbilt-in-France program at Nice and Aix-en-Provence. Active in programs for undergraduates undertaken by the APSA, in the mid-1970s, he chaired an association committee on educational policy and programs. Then from 1988–90 he chaired an APSA task force on the political science major that worked in collaboration with the American Association of Colleges and Universities. This influential educational policy committee made a number of recommendations for greater structure in the political science major (see Wahlke's March 1991 report, "Liberal Learning and the Political Science Major: A Report to the Profession" in *PS: Political Science and Politics*).