

influential, groups of expert policy elites in governmental agencies, think tanks, and universities that shaped public policies.

His scholarship was imbued with the normative ideals that should shape behavior of politicians and bureaucrats in a democratic polity. He lamented the increasing number of political appointees, decline in civility, and polarization that have marked the last several decades of Washington politics.

Hecklo wrote prolifically about the presidency and how it changed over the latter part of the twentieth century. In a series of books, he decried the advent of the "permanent campaign"—the tendency to bring the simplicities and conflicts of the campaign into the process of governing. "If we end up interpreting our whole constitutional system as an extension of election-time horse-race thinking, supplemented by mass plebiscites, then something will have gone wrong," He emphasized the importance of presidents listening to competing advice about policymaking.

He argued that because of the polarized era the US has been going through, it is all the more important for presidents to listen to dissenting voices. In several books on Ronald Reagan he praised Reagan's character and political leadership, while criticizing him for constitutional lapses in the Iran Contra affair.

Throughout his scholarship, Hecklo was concerned with the normative values of good governance. In his book, *On Thinking Institutionally* (2011), he emphasized the importance of connecting the present with the past and the future and paying attention to the human relationships that create and maintain institutions. In his 2002 Gaus Lecture, "The Spirit of Public Administration," he argued that the ethos of public administration necessarily entails the careful stewardship of the institutions of democratic governance.

Later in his career, he wrote several books and articles addressing the appropriate place of religion in the public sphere of the United States, in which he argued that it was legitimate for religious values to inform public policy, but that the government should not favor one religion over another. Hugh was temperamentally a humble person; he did not seek honors, though honors came to him. He was an elected member of the National Academy of Public Administration and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He received a Guggenheim Fellowship and won the APSA John Gaus Award for lifetime achievement in public administration and political science. He chaired the Ford Foundation research advisory committee and served on the Scholars' Council advising the Librarian of Congress.

At Harvard, George Mason and other universities, he was known as a champion of his students, many of whom kept in touch with him long after their courses were over. He retired from George Mason in 2014 and spent most of his time writing and tending to his tree farm in White Post, Virginia. He grew conifers for Christmas trees, and people came from miles around to search for their perfect tree, which he would cut down for them. In the summers, he trimmed and tended to the trees and worked to return native American plants and trees to his land.

He is survived by his wife, Beverley Carole Hecklo, to whom he was married for 46 years, and their daughter, Ashley Rebecca Hecklo.

In remarks about James Q. Wilson, with whom he cotaught a course at MIT, Hecklo said, that Wilson exhibited "a combination of gentle modesty and a ferocious intellectual honesty"—an encomium that could aptly be applied to Hecklo himself.

—James P. Pfiffner, *George Mason University*
—Steven Rathgeb Smith, *APSA Executive Director*

Lee Ann Fujii

Lee Ann Fujii, associate professor of political science at the University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada, died March 2, 2018 of complications arising from the flu. She was 56. Lee Ann was a loving sister, daughter, and friend. A scholar of race, ethnicity and politics, Lee Ann pushed boundaries both in her scholarship and in her life. She was a yogi, a world traveller, a shopper, and a fan of the arts. She was funny, loyal, and a constructive critic who never avoided difficult conversations or shied away from the truth.

Lee Ann was born and raised in Seattle. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in music from Reed College and then spent several years as an actress and in the tech industry in San Francisco. Her experiences moving through the world with racial ambiguity ignited her interest in questions of identity and violence, and she ultimately decided to pursue a career in the academy. Lee Ann earned an MA in international relations from San Francisco State University in 2001, where she wrote a thesis on identity formation and the Rwandan genocide and then moved to Washington, DC to pursue a doctorate in political science at the George Washington University. She earned her PhD in 2006. Lee Ann then served as assistant professor of political science at GWU from 2007 to 2010 before moving to the University of Toronto in 2011, where she received tenure and was promoted to the rank of associate professor in 2015.

AN EXPERT ON POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND IDENTITY

Lee Ann was a recognized expert on political violence. Growing out of her doctoral research, her first major study addressed a political violence puzzle: "How do ordinary people come to commit mass violence against their own neighbors, friends, and family?" Lee Ann spent most of 2003 and 2004 as a Fulbright Scholar in Rwanda. Knocking on doors and visiting prisons with her interpreter—research assistant, she interviewed current and former residents of two rural communities about their life experiences and memories of the period between 1990 and 1994. Consistent with her rejection of hierarchy and the cult of prestige, Lee Ann purposively selected participants whose actions during the 1994 genocide ranged from rescuers to killers, and ultimately focused her analysis on "Joiners," whom she identified as "the lowest-level participants in the genocide." *Killing Neighbors: Webs of Violence in Rwanda* (Cornell University Press, 2009) demonstrates that social ties and group dynamics had more effect on individuals' actions during the genocide than ethnic hatreds or fears. This close attention to individuals, interactions, and social context comprises a thread woven throughout all her work.

As her research progressed, Lee Ann made several poignant observations about the construction of identity. In a 2010 talk at UC Irvine, she contended, "Identity amounts to the repeated and public actions, activities, and practices—some calculated, some spontaneous, some scripted, some improvised—that make them real." She challenged simplistic understandings about identity, arguing instead that it is dynamic and constructed and defies facile interpretations.

Showtime: The Logic and Power of Violent Display is Lee Ann's newest work. Although not yet finished, it develops the idea of "violent display" using evidence from Rwanda, Bosnia, and the United States. At its core is an understanding of resistance. *Showtime* challenges the idea that violence is inevitable. Interruption is possible, and it often occurs through small, everyday acts. Lee Ann notes pointedly that bystanders are complicit. Drawing on her theatre background and extending ideas developed in her first book, Lee Ann frames

the development of violent display using concepts like performance, rehearsal, intermission, sideshow, and encore. Her passion for this work is palpable in the video of her last presentation of this work just a few short weeks before her death.

The energy with which Lee Ann approached her work is all the more notable given the difficult topics that she studied. She spent years interviewing people, sifting through archives, and visiting field sites where horrible atrocities—lynchings, genocides, and torture—took place. She did this with kindness, with grace and, when appropriate, with humour. Lee Ann firmly believed that emotion does not taint "objective scholarship." To create good research, she knew scholars need to study difficult things and confront hard truths. Lee Ann questioned almost everything, and her research is a painstaking compilation of the answers at which she eventually arrived. Often, these answers were unsettling, but she would not let us escape recognizing the horror and violence inherent in the human experience. She held humanity accountable.

Much of Lee Ann's research was conducted with the support of several prestigious awards. These included fellowships with the Fulbright Program (2003–04), Ford Foundation (2013–14), and the Institute for Advanced Study (2016–17), as well as being named a Visiting Scholar with the Russell Sage Foundation (2013–14). She held research grants from the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars, the United States Institute of Peace, and the Social Science and Humanities Research Council.

METHODOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS

Lee Ann's methodological choices were groundbreaking. A deeply creative person who applied this quality to her fieldwork, she honed what friends sometimes jokingly called the "Fujii method": to understand someone's experiences, you need to talk to them over time, usually in several lengthy interviews. Lee Ann quickly became one of the most respected interpretivists in political science as she explored a host of methodological questions in several journal articles. Her article on accidental ethnography, "Five Stories Of Accidental Ethnography," describes how researchers can use unplanned moments to understand the worlds they are studying and their position within them, for example, while "Shades of Truth and Lies" explores what scholars can learn from deceptive statements. Reflecting on that article, Dvora Yanow writes, "Her abductive puzzle (my words, not hers) was the tension between her 'training' (her word) in political science to consider a lie—something she was told in an interview which other sources later contradicted—to be inadmissible in the realm of scientific truth, and her newfound insights that what people told her could well be meaningful in its own right: signalling something of importance to them (and of significance to her research), rather than an intentional distortion of the truth, although the latter, too, could be usable knowledge."

In *Interviewing in Social Science* (Routledge 2018), Lee Ann develops what she calls a "relational approach" to research. For Lee Ann, the value of interviewing is not the answers that research participants provide to the questions that we pose, but rather in the data that emerge through our *interactions*. She urges scholars to conduct their work with reflexivity, to consider how we engage with others and how our own positions—and that of our research subjects—influence the knowledge that is developed.

Lee Ann was always conscious of relationships and of power in her scholarship and her life. Her work pushed other scholars, including nonqualitative researchers, to consider the ethics of their work and their responsibilities to their research participants.

Lee Ann argued that ethics in research is not simply a "box to check" on your IRB application. She reminds us that power relationships are asymmetrical, even if you have obtained a person's consent, and that protecting research participants involves more than simply informing them of their risks and having them sign a form. Lee Ann writes, "When conducting research with human beings, we must remind ourselves that to enter another's world as a researcher is a privilege, not a right. Wrestling with ethical dilemmas is the price we pay for the privileges we enjoy." Lee Ann demanded that researchers be accountable in their relationships with research participants.

PUSHING INSTITUTIONAL AND DISCIPLINARY BOUNDARIES

Lee Ann also challenged disciplinary norms and practices in her department and in public. Her gently phrased 2012 article, "Research Ethics 101," calls for a broader consideration of research ethics. It was followed in 2016 by a thorough critique of the dishonest nature of DA-RT (Data Access and Research Transparency) discussions. "Who can say that transparency is a more pressing problem than the entrenched forms of structural and agentic power that shape who and what gets published, who gets hired and promoted, and which methods and methodologies become anointed as the new 'gold' standard?" she asks in "The dark side of DA-RT."

Lee Ann was deeply—and rightly—critical of the lack of diversity in political science, both demographically and methodologically, and she enumerated concrete actions that could be taken to address these shortcomings. Her willingness to challenge disciplinary practices was obvious in her 2016 International Studies Association Northeast keynote, "Changing Disciplines," later published in revised form on *Duck of Minerva*. "The discipline tolerates *white* mediocrity very well," she observed, "but does not similarly hire and celebrate non-white mediocrity." Lee Ann was particularly proud of this intervention, which portrayed the exclusion and inequity many still do not wish to confront.

As Lahoma Thomas, one of Lee Ann's doctoral students, observes, "When you do not see your experiences and those of your community represented in the literature, when the manner in which you make sense of the social world is in opposition to the foundational texts in your discipline, and when you disagree with some of the theoretical premises that guide your discipline because your positionality in the world has shown you something else, it can be a very alienating experience that conjures feelings of frustration, alienation, and self-doubt. Lee Ann experientially understood that. She spoke to those feelings in an authentic way. Equally as important, Lee Ann understood that seeing the world differently was a strength, not a deficit."

A MENTOR AND TEACHER

Lee Ann taught classes in comparative politics, qualitative methods, and political violence. She was a gifted teacher who often said that working with students was her favorite part of her job. Lee Ann did not profess woodenly from a podium; she asked questions, she challenged, and she inspired. In her graduate seminars, she pushed doctoral students to move beyond critique. She wanted them to engage with the arguments they were reading. Lee Ann cared deeply about writing—her own was lucid, approachable, and evocative—and she helped students to develop clear communication as a weapon in their arsenals. One of her mentors, Dvora Yanow, has described it as "a writing whose voice was as approachable as she was, speaking passionately with the authority of experience coupled with the humility that acknowledges the possibility of other interpretations."

Lee Ann was laser focused on the persistence of race and gender bias in the academy, and she worked strategically to disrupt this by offering support to marginalized scholars. Lee Ann showed up for graduate students and junior faculty of color, for those without degrees or jobs at top ten graduate programs, for those engaged in particularly difficult field research, for those whose "pathway to academia was roundabout, nontraditional, and unexpected" like her own, and for a host of others. Lee Ann did so much of the typically invisible, underappreciated labor that fuels institutions and helps others to flourish. She provided career counseling and connections, read multiple drafts of their/our work, and cheered on the discouraged even as she dealt with her own losses and disappointments. "While Lee Ann was an academic she was an activist at heart," Lahoma Thomas points out. "The academy was just the forum in which her activism took place. Her revolution was located in the academy. She was committed to transforming the discipline of political science from within." Aarie Glas, who worked with Lee Ann for a number of years as a research assistant and teaching assistant says, "Lee Ann taught me and many others to be both critical and reflexive as scholars and as human beings. Most uniquely, however, she taught through her example what it is to be a mentor in the truest sense—to be emphatic, generous, and engaged in ways that I can only aspire to myself."

GONE TOO SOON

Lee Ann was at once critical, compassionate, and kind. A cheerleader who never missed an opportunity to celebrate her friends and students, she would say "you are fucking brilliant!" with so much conviction you actually believed it. Nearly all of Lee Ann's emails were signed, "LAF," both her initials and a nod to her uproarious personality. She had a full-bodied laugh that took over the room, and when she really got going, she would add enthusiastic table-thumping. Lee Ann didn't just listen to you talk, she engaged, excitedly exclaiming "Yeah, yeah, yeah!" to let you know she was with you. There was almost nothing traditional about the way that Lee Ann went about her life or her work.

Those of us who knew Lee Ann well know just how much she loved her cats, who were like her children. Because of her dedication to animals, her family has suggested that if anyone wants to honor her memory with a donation, please consider doing so at your local animal shelter.

Lee Ann is survived by her two brothers, Carey and Jeff, and her sister-in-law Josephine. She is also fondly remembered by a large circle of friends, who span continents, generations, and backgrounds. These friendships were built on tea, talks, and plates of food. With Lee Ann's death, our tables are all a bit too quiet.

—Stephanie McNulty, *Franklin and Marshall College*

—Erin Tolley, *University of Toronto*

—Robin Turner, *Butler University*

Ted G. Jelen

"I really love doing this."

—Ted G. Jelen

Thaddeus (Ted) Gerard Jelen, professor of political science at the University of Las Vegas, Nevada, passed away on November 21, 2017 due to a long illness linked to a professorship abroad. He was 65.

Ted received his PhD in political science from Ohio State in 1979, taught for a year at the University of Kentucky, and then went to Illinois Benedictine College, later renamed as Benedictine University, where he served for many years as department chair. Limited computer resources at Benedictine forced Ted to buy the General Social Survey every year, and then pay a data company to subset the variables to a file size that the school's computers could handle. From 1990 to 1991 he was a visiting professor at Georgetown University, and the availability of more powerful computers and ICPSR datasets led to an explosion of research. He was hired as chair at UNLV and served in that role from 1997 to 2003, and then remained a faculty member there until his death. Ted was a ubiquitous presence at conferences in the US and abroad for many years, always found in the hotel lobby with a big smile, a funny story, and genuine interest in your latest project, which he always proclaimed to be "really interesting."

Ted was a prodigious scholar, with 15 authored or edited books, 81 peer reviewed articles, and 64 book chapters. His published work has been cited thousands of times in political science, sociology, anthropology, psychology, history, gender studies, and religious studies journals in the US and internationally. His graduate work centered on political theory, and his work frequently connected careful empirical analysis to broader theoretical themes. Ted had a research agenda that reflected his upbringing as a Polish kid in Chicago: the Catholic Church, religion and the state, sex, abortion, gender, and guns. He published several articles comparing attitudes on gender and abortion between the US and Poland. To that end, he was proud to be named to the Roll of Honor of Polish Science by the Polish Ministry of Science in 2001. His knowledge of Chicago politics also left him with a seemingly inexhaustible stream of colorful stories.

Ted wrote on a wide variety of subjects but his major contributions were in the field of religion and politics, gender politics, and the politics of abortion, in each case focusing mainly on the US, but also with a number of papers in comparative politics. He focused on two broad themes in religion and politics—the political mobilization of religion and church/state relations. In the former, he published two books on congregations and clergy in Greencastle Indiana, a variety of papers on how religious context affects the way that religion influences individuals, and several important papers on measurement issues. His edited book *Religion and Politics in Comparative Perspective* was translated into Spanish and chapters that Ted wrote were translated into Bosnian and Hebrew and frequently cited. His most important work on church-state relations was a fine book *To Serve God and Mammon*, Second Edition by Georgetown University Press. He also wrote on public attitudes on church state issues. He published papers laying out research agendas in the field in 1988 and again in 1998. Just as important to the subfield, Ted laid out a publishing roadmap, showing that it was possible to pursue a career exploring religion and politics. He published in a wide range of outlets across the social sciences, but also demonstrated that it was possible to appear in the top political science journals including *Journal of Politics* and *American Journal of Political Science*.

His work on gender attitudes involved carefully dissecting different attitudinal objects, and showed how religion was one of many sources of these attitudes. His book *Between Two Absolutes: Public Opinion and the Politics of Abortion* has been a major resource on this topic, with chapters frequently reprinted in undergraduate methods readers. He published papers laying out a research agenda on abortion politics, and several papers comparing US attitudes with those in Poland, Germany, and a number of other countries.