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Martin Diamond was born in New York City in 1919 and died in Washington, D.C., in 1977.

Before World War II, Martin Diamond attended college only briefly and did not complete undergraduate studies. Nevertheless, after wartime service, he was admitted in 1950, on the basis of his self-education, as a graduate student in the Department of Political Science, University of Chicago, earning the A.M. in 1952 and Ph.D. in 1956.

He held teaching positions at the University of Chicago, the Illinois Institute of Technology, Claremont Men's College and Claremont Graduate School, and Northern Illinois University. Had it not been for his sudden death from a heart attack in July of 1977, he would have assumed the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Chair on the Foundations of American Freedom, Georgetown University, on August 1, 1977, and would have served concurrently as adjunct scholar of the American Enterprise Institute.

Diamond was a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, 1960–61; the Rockefeller Foundation, 1963–64; the Relm Foundation, 1966–67; the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1974–75; and the National Humanities Institute in New Haven, Connecticut, 1975–76.

Martin Diamond was also called on for advice by state and local officials, by United States senators and congressmen, and by the president and the vice-president of the United States. He spent the last morning of his life testifying before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee against proposals to abolish the Electoral College.
Herbert J. Storing was born on January 29, 1928, in Ames, Iowa. He served in the United States Army from 1946 to 1948, and received his A.B. degree from Colgate University in 1950. He then attended the University of Chicago, earning his A.M. in 1951 and Ph.D. in 1956. He was a Fulbright Scholar to the United Kingdom from 1953 to 1955 and also received research grants from the Rockefeller, Ford, and Relm Foundations and from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Storing served as senior research assistant at the London School of Economics; as assistant, associate, and professor of political science at the University of Chicago (1956–77); and as director of the Telluride summer program at the Hampton Institute in 1967. He was Visiting Charles Evans Hughes Professor of Jurisprudence at Colgate University from 1968 to 1969, and part-time professor of political science at Northern Illinois University from 1969 to 1975.

At the time of his death in September 1977, Storing was Robert Kent Gooch Professor of Government and Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia, where he also served as director of the Study of the Presidency at the White Burkett Miller Center for Public Affairs. He was also a member of the President’s Commission on White House Fellows.

He is coauthor of The State and the Farmer; editor and contributor to Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics; editor of What Country Have I? Political Writings by Black Americans; editor of the seven-volume The Complete Anti-Federalist; author of What the Anti-Federalists Were For; and author of numerous essays on the American Founding, constitutional law, public administration, American political thought, and the American presidency.
Martin Diamond

Only an exceptionally strong mind and heart could possibly have sustained the range and diversity of Martin Diamond's interests, associations, and activities. The characteristic tension of his life was created by the many different and sometimes conflicting demands he allowed to be placed upon him. His friends constantly urged that he spend himself less freely (while of course taking plenty for ourselves), but he would not and could not give less than all of his remarkable talents and his good, affectionate nature.

Diamond was a superb speaker. Perhaps that is what he did best of all. On the stump, at the lectern, in academic conferences and confrontations, before public audiences, to statestems, with friends—he spoke magnificently. He had the actor's sense of and concern for the details and the style of his presentation. He took pleasure in the finely turned, thoughtful phrase. He sought always to speak, of course intelligently and lucidly, but also with some elegance. He was a master storyteller and had a vast reservoir of perfectly remembered, subtle jokes that were always funny and in point. He enjoyed, and admitted that he enjoyed, the applause of his hearers. He once asked jokingly how he could get credit for suppressing a pertinent but not quite first-rate joke. He did not pretend indifference to being on the cover of *Time* as one of the country's ten best teachers. But he knew precisely the value of all the praise he received, and he valued most the applause of a quickened understanding. If his audience, whether in a great hall or in someone's dining room, was restless or indifferent he died a little, and he made extraordinary and almost always successful efforts to reach it, to make it respond, understand, join his wonder at human nobility and human folly. These qualities helped to make Diamond the great teacher he is universally acknowledged to have been.

In addition to his own teaching in a wide variety of forums, Diamond was active in thinking and writing and teaching about teaching. He attempted to resist narrow, value-free, sub-political teaching about politics, at the lower as well as the college and graduate levels. He did all he could to arrest the decline in understanding among teachers of politics of the relevance and the nobility of the writings and doings of the American Founding Fathers. In his own teaching, in lectures and writings, in his textbook on American government, and as a member of the American Political Science Association committees on undergraduate education, he sought to reach out as widely as he could with tough-minded support for the nobility of teaching politics and for good teaching about the American tradition and American heroes.

At one time Diamond aspired to be an actor or perhaps a director, and he retained a keen interest in the arts, especially the movies. He took pleasure in out-"bufing" self-declared, serious movie buffs.) But Diamond could no more have been content as an actor than he could have foresworn being an actor at all. He was determined to speak his own words, his own mind, at the highest level he could reach. The words he uttered as a young socialist agitator in New York City did not seem, finally, to stand up to the tests of experience and critical examination, and this led him on a journey into academia, providing him with the germ of his interpretation of the intellectual failure of American socialism, which became his Ph.D. dissertation. Entering the University of Chicago, without a B.A., for graduate studies in 1950, Diamond enthusiastically shared and contributed to the vitality of Chicago's Department of Political Science in the early 1950s, where a solid social science orthodoxy was under courteous, relentless attack by Leo Strauss, a remarkable professor from the New School for Social Research who proposed to restore, and who did in fact restore, political philosophy to a place in contemporary political science. Some of Diamond's writing and much of his teaching was concerned with elaborating or trying to explain or simply trying to understand Strauss' criticism of social science and the complex and difficult alternative he presented. Of special note here are his attempts to clarify, in ways guided by Aristotle but pertinent to contemporary political science, the notion of "opinion" and the relation of fact and value. A sketch of this ambitious project was presented in a series of lectures at Loyola University in 1970; portions were published in an essay on "The Dependence of Fact Upon Value" in *Interpretation* (1972) and his William Benet Munro Memorial Lecture at Stanford University in 1975 on "Opinion, Passion, and Interest in Political Life."

But while the context of Diamond's intellectual concern was the tradition of political philosophy that Strauss opened, the focus was on the American regime. To understand the basic principles of the American regime, Diamond turned to the intentions of its makers. Establishing for this generation of Americans (including political scientists), the relevance of the Founders to contemporary questions was Diamond's first major object, and it is his major scholarly achievement. The American Constitution and the writings surrounding it, especially the great Federalist Papers, were not, Diamond showed, a reactionary turning away from the principles of the Declaration of Independence. In Diamond's view profoundly democratic, these documents were rather a response to the

In a textbook which he conceived and of which he was the senior author, The Democratic Republic (with H. Garfinkel and W. Fisk, 2nd ed., 1970), Diamond combined his understanding of the American Founding and his conviction that the intention of the Founders is the best beginning point for understanding the American regime, with his concern to provide the teaching of American government with the solid foundation, the civic relevance, and the dignity that it deserves. In a time and a profession that tends to cynicism, Diamond boldly praised what is praiseworthy in the American Tradition.

During and following his graduate studies, Diamond taught at the Illinois Institute of Technology (1952-1955) and at the University of Chicago (1952-1958), where he was also a major figure in the “Social Science I” course of the “Hutchins College” program at the University of Chicago. Moving to Claremont Men’s College and Claremont Graduate School in 1958, Diamond was quickly recognized as a natural academic leader as well as an extraordinary teacher and scholar, and he established a program on political philosophy and American political thought and institutions that continues in those institutions. He was named Burnet C. Wohlford Professor of American Political Institutions in 1963. In 1971 Diamond accepted a Professorship at Northern Illinois University where he was again the central figure in a graduate program emphasizing political philosophy and American political thought and institutions. On the day before his death Diamond had moved to Washington where he was to have assumed the Thomas and Dorothy Leavey Chair on the Foundations of American Freedom at Georgetown University, and a position as Adjunct Scholar of the American Enterprise Institute.

As a political scientist, Diamond was a dissenter, a man of strongly held opinion that were controversial in his profession. Yet he was enjoyed, listened to, and respected throughout the discipline. To disembowel an opponent with a quick rhetorical thrust was child’s play for Diamond, but the better, more interesting, more demanding task was to reason, inquire, and persuade. He carried extraordinary interest and enthusiasm not only into his teaching and writing and his very wide friendships among political scientists, but also into his many activities in the American Political Science Association. Diamond’s contributions to the organized profession were many. He served on the Council of the American Political Science Association from 1973 to 1976, and on the Steering Committee for Undergraduate Education out of which came the Division of Educational Affairs. (A forthcoming issue of DEA News will be devoted to the contributions of Professor Diamond.) He was the principle architect of the APSA’s Ethical Issues Seminars and the Strauss Memorial Award. At the time of his death he had agreed to serve on the newly established Task Force on the Future of the Association.

Diamond’s other activities were almost endless. He was a Fellow of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (a very special recognition for a man of his persuasion in 1960-1961); he was a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in 1974-75 and at the National Humanities Institute in New Haven the following year. He received recognition and support for his scholarly activities by the Earhart Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. He was a very frequent advisor of foundations, publishers, and academic leaders. He lectured for the State Department, the United States Information Agency and other government agencies. He frequently appeared on public television. He was a member of the National Advisory Council of the American Revolution Bicentennial Administration. He was constantly in demand for consultation by public figures, at the very highest levels. He died on July 22, 1977, at the age of 57, just after testifying before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee, testimony based upon his recent pamphlet written for the AEI, The Electoral College and the American Idea of Democracy.

There was an appropriateness—a still painful appropriateness—in the circumstances of Martin Diamond’s death. He died, as Irving Kristol said, “in the bosom of his beloved republic—in a Senate hearing room”—better, for Diamond, the Senate than the White House or the Supreme Court building. “And he died,” wrote Diamond, in a pamphlet, “and he died testifying brilliantly on behalf of a traditional American institution, the electoral college, which he believed indispensable to the well-being of that republic.” He died also, I hope I
may be permitted to add, in the presence of close friends and his beloved step-daughter, Diane.

Diamond was, as Senator Daniel P. Moynihan said in the Senate shortly after his death, “a man often called upon by our country’s highest political figures for instruction and counsel, and that instruction and counsel will be sorely missed in legislative halls and executive offices as well as in the academic world.” Diamond had keenly looked forward to his new positions in Washington to bring him into more sustained contact with American public life so that he could bring his special talents and point of view to bear upon it. He had hoped for a decade or two; he had plans, projects, insights, and wisdom enough for many times that.

Herbert J. Storing
Robert K. Gooch Professor of Government
University of Virginia

A bibliography of Martin Diamond’s writings, together with a Eulogy by Irving Kristol and other material may be found in a Memorial published by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research (Washington, 1977). A limited number of copies are available by writing to AEI, 1150 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

This memorial was completed just before Professor Storing’s sudden death on September 9, 1977. A memorial for Professor Storing will appear in the Winter issue of PS.
Herbert J. Storing died suddenly on September 9, 1977. He had just assumed his new responsibilities at the University of Virginia as Robert Kent Gooch professor of government and as director of the Study of the Presidency at the White Burkett Miller Center of Public Affairs. He was 49 years old.

As a political scientist, Storing left a double legacy: a body of writings, and a body of students in whose training at the University of Chicago he had figured large. In each case the legacy bears witness to his genuine distinction.

Storing's writings are much like the man himself: powerful, lucid, direct. Much of the peculiar rhetorical power of his unadorned prose is drawn less from his art than from the integrity and independence of his mind. He had developed to a high degree the ability to enter into another's position—to see it whole, to respect its reasons, and to judge it fearlessly. He left behind a string of essays (almost every one a pearl of its kind) that testify to these moral and intellectual virtues. This is especially evident in those essays where Storing dealt with positions that he considered seriously deficient or flawed. Storing's examination was patient, tenacious, and tough, but the severity of his scrutiny bespoke the seriousness with which he took another man's reasons. It was the mark of this generous and honorable scholar that he made the best possible case for a position before finding fault with it, indeed at times making a more coherent case than its proponents had managed on their own. In their quiet, understated way, these essays provide an education in civility.

Storing was a member of the department of political science at the University of Chicago for 21 years. No one there, it may safely be said, surpassed him in liberality. He had many takers. He gave of himself without stint—in the classroom, in his comments on papers and dissertations, in the extracurricular public law seminar he conducted at home, in his critiques of classes taught by student teachers, in the large correspondence he maintained with and on behalf of graduates. He thought of himself as a "faculty friend"—neither a buddy nor a remote presence, a senior man who would guide, support, prod, correct, and encourage younger men and women to find their own way and to achieve mastery. A student has spoken of his classroom as "a special place. There was fellowship and energy, a formality infused with warmth, lessons of thoughtfulness and character." It could not be put any better. Out of such classes has come a generation of teachers, suffused with Storing's own "rational and manly passion" and with his understanding love for the principles of the American regime.

That, I venture to suggest, may be the more enduring legacy. His essays, to be sure, will continue to be read and admired for what they are: models of clarity, integrity, and judgment. And his magnum opus, The Complete Antifederalist, must take its place as a monument of American historical scholarship and political interpretation. Yet our regard for these fine productions is diminished somewhat by the cruel awareness that Storing was struck down at the peak of his powers, when even greater things were in the offing. He had finished his work on the American Founding and was about to devote his capacious thought and energy to a study of the Presidency. It was an especially congenial subject for him; the profession and the nation are so much more the losers.

Storing was a large and complex man—full of spirit and vitality, fiercely competitive in sports, yet generous, utterly unpretentious, finding simple delight in friendship and family. There was much about him that called to mind that "seriously cheerful" country Cato whom Franklin immortalized: "It was not an exquisite Form of Person, or Grandeur of Dress that struck us with Admiration. I believe long Habits of Virtue have a sensible Effect on the Coun-
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tenance: There was something in the Air of his Face that manifested the true Greatness of his Mind. . . . His Aspect is sweetened with Humanity and Benevolence, and at the same Time emboldened with Resolution, equally free from a diffident Bashfulness and an unbecoming Assurance. The Consciousness of his own innate Worth and unshaken Integrity renders him calm and undaunted in the Presence of the most Great and Powerful, and upon the most extraordinary Occasions. . . . He always speaks the Thing he means, which he is never afraid or ashamed to do, because he knows he always means well; and therefore is never oblig'd to blush and feel the Confusion of finding himself detected in the Meaness of a Falsehood." The language of DuBois that Storing once adapted to characterize some noteworthy black political thinkers fits him no less: he was a teacher of all who aspire to wed with Truth and dwell above the Veil.

Ralph Lerner
The College
The University of Chicago
In Memory of Martin Diamond by Irving Kristol, 1977. 
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Irving Kristol

In Memory of Martin Diamond

On July 22, Martin Diamond, newly-appointed professor of political science at Georgetown University, died in Washington, D.C. He was 57 years old.

Martin Diamond was one of America’s leading political philosophers, and a member of the editorial advisory board of The Alternative: An American Spectator. In tribute, we publish here the eulogy delivered at his funeral by his long-time friend, Irving Kristol.

I have the sense, as I stand here delivering a eulogy for Martin Diamond, that he is looking down on me with a tolerant but challenging smile which says: “Okay, you won the toss, now let’s see you cope with the real thing.”

You see, Martin and I had always assumed that, whichever of us went first—we are almost exactly the same age—the other might well be called upon to say or write something in memoriam. And about a year or so ago, we had a long and wonderfully funny dialogue in which we helped one another compose the other’s obituary. We began by aggressively detailing our own virtues and accomplishments, to which the other promptly added qualifications and amendments having so much force and truth in them that, at the end, we had in effect composed highly critical reviews of each other’s life and work, with only an occasional and grudging admission of merit. We laughed uproariously as we put each other down, searching for the perfect locution which did the job most subtly and effectively.

Now, however, it is the real thing—no more banter, no more exercise of wit at one another’s expense, and no more of the deep love, for which friendship is so inadequate a term, that made such conversations possible. Only an acute and overwhelming sense of loss for a man who has been an integral part of my own life for over 35 years.

But even as I say this, I know that—since this is the real thing—my own sense of loss cannot be compared with the grief now experienced by his wife Ann—his wife and, it is fair to say, his intellectual collaborator—and his children, Kate and Ayton, and his stepdaughter, Diane.

Each man’s death leaves a little void in the universe—but some voids are larger than others. There are some persons who simply enter more lives, and are a more active presence in those lives, by
reason of their personal qualities, or their intellectual qualities, or both. With Martin, it was both—both as a person and as a mind, he added so much to our lives—how much, we shall only now become acutely and painfully aware.

As a person, Martin had one of those rarest human talents: He was always interesting to be with, he was simply incapable of ever being boring. In part, this was the natural and infectious overflow of his high-spiritedness—his love of life, his immense curiosity about life, his keen and steady attention to life in all its oddities and paradoxes. It was not possible for him to read the morning newspaper without finding something of significant human interest or philosophic interest—on the news pages, the sports pages, or in the comic strips.

In large measure, as I have said, this was simply a natural disposition on his part. But it was also, to some degree, a cultivated disposition: He actually felt—what so few of us do feel—a human responsibility never to be tedious or boring. I suppose this may have derived from his original ambition, which was to be an actor, and, failing that, a film director. That histrionic impulse he converted into a kind of social energy and brought it to bear on his relations with people. He enjoyed the company of other people precisely because he brought so much to his relations with them—and, of course, they particularly enjoyed his company because they were always to some degree invigorated by his presence, made to feel more alive, discovering in themselves a quickness of spirit they never knew they had.

It was these personal traits which helped make Martin Diamond such a very great teacher—certainly one of the greatest of his generation. He was never satisfied merely to impart information, or even insights. He wanted his students to leave every single session "walking on air," as he once put it to me, and he was distressed when he occasionally fell short of that incredibly ambitious goal. He—and we—paid a dear price for this extravagant commitment on his part. He did not write or publish as much as he should have, and he taught his students much that we, alas, shall now never have the opportunity to learn with them. On the other hand, no other teacher of his generation elevated and helped perfect the souls of his students—theirs, and not merely their minds—as he did. For the next half century or so, this nation will have in it men and women for whom the existence of Martin Diamond was an un Moffat grace of life, a blessing they had no right to and never anticipated, and for which they will be grateful until the day that they, too, die. In part of them persists the memory and the genius for teaching in their own professional lives, just as Martin perpetuated the pedagogic genius of his teacher, Leo Strauss. If so, his influence will radiate and ripple through many generations to come.

But Martin was not simply a remarkable human being, with human qualities in so many ways superior to—of a different order from—those that the rest of us have. He was also a political philosopher, a thinker of the first order. Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who had come to know Martin during these last years, issued a public statement on learning of his death, in which he said that Martin "almost single-handedly established the relevance of the thought and doings of the Founding Fathers for this generation." This was no mere pious expression of friendship. It was truly meant. I well recall that, when the bicentennial issue of The Public Interest appeared in the autumn of 1975, containing Martin's essay on the Declaration of Independence in relation to the Constitution, Pat Moynihan rang me up to say this was the most important article the magazine had ever published. I had no trouble agreeing with that judgment.

All of us here were moved by Martin Diamond toward an understanding of the Founding Fathers, and of the American idea of democracy as expounded by the Founders, that was not otherwise—and never would have been otherwise—available to us. Speaking for myself, I can say in all candor that Martin's reflections on this matter were a decisive intellectual influence on my whole way of thinking about democracy in general and the American democracy in particular. And not only an intellectual influence, but a moral influence as well. For Martin taught us—taught us, I dare to say—not only how to understand the American democracy, but how to appreciate it as well. No; that's not strong enough. I should say: how to reverence the institutions of our democratic republic, and the wisdom incarnate in them.

Such reverence, as we know, is not very common these days, and where it exists it tends to be a mindless affair, based on a sentiment which, however sincere, is also shallow and uninformed. True reverence goes far beyond sentimentality, just as true love goes far beyond romance. It involves an open-eyed perception of why the revered object is what it is, of how its virtues and its defects are so often necessary to one another, and why—given the inherent limitations of the human condition—we should humbly and gratefully accept it for what it is. There wasn't an ounce of utopianism in Martin's political philosophy; indeed, he considered utopianism to be the most insidious intellectual and moral poison of our age. And it was this very absence of utopianism which permitted him to understand the Founders as they understood themselves—an understanding which, almost from the beginning of American history, was clouded and distorted by political romanticism and political utopianism, and remains so clouded today.

Like all students of his teacher—his revered teacher—Leo Strauss, Martin had learned to keep a certain philosophic distance from modernity, to understand it sub specie alterius, as few modern thinkers could bring themselves to do. But Martin was not content with this philosophic achievement. He took seriously the idea that the philosopher was also a citizen with special responsibilities, and when it came to the American polity, he was very much a philosopher engagé. Nothing irritated him more than the bright student who, having learned from classical political thought how inherently problematic a democratic regime is, would then disdainfully contrast the American democracy with the Athenian polis or the Roman Republic. Shortly before his death he told me of his intention to write an article, directed toward his students and fellow political philosophers, explaining that, while the ideals of classical political philosophy may have been more elevated than the ideals of modern political theory, the political practice of the ancients was more barbarous, more brutal—and that this is something worthy of note, even by philosophers.

Martin believed, and argued in his writings, that there had been a steady deterioration of democratic political thought ever since the age of the Founders, that the American theory of democracy had gradually become vulgarized and debased by that spirit of populism which democracy itself engenders. His life's work, as he saw it, was to restore democratic thought to its original complexity, its high-self-consciousness, its nobility even, because, as he saw the task of this American democracy, it was to encourage the common man to become somewhat more uncommon. One of the reasons he so looked forward to living and working in Washington was because he felt his life's mission might be more effectively pursued there.

As we know, Martin died just when he was opening a new phase in his career. He had, on the very day of his death, moved to Washington where he was to be given the time and resources—by Georgetown University and the American Enterprise Institute—to edit his scattered writings into a comprehensive book, and where he also anticipated being more directly involved, and more directly influential, in the political life of this republic. This is not to be.

But, shocking and sudden as his death was, there were appropriate aspects to it which I know he would wish me to call attention to. To begin with, it was an instant and painless death, such as any wise man would choose. Moreover, he died in the bosom of his beloved republic—in a Senate hearing room. And he died after testifying brilliantly on behalf of a traditional American institution, the Electoral College, which he believed indispensable to the well-being of that republic.

So the circumstances were, in ways he would surely have appreciated, most appropriate. But—and may the Good Lord forgive me for saying it—the timing was wrong.
Herbert Storing  
*January 29, 1928 - September 9, 1977*

There is a marvelous harmony between the way of Herb Storing's living and the manner of his leaving the world behind. In life, he stood like a towering oak, great of stature and intrepid in mind; when his time came, it was a shattering bolt that took him away, a blow worthy of the victim. Herb did not tempt fate, but he would not give it an inch. He looked at his future with the same steady eye that he turned toward everyone and everything that came his way. He chose the way of his living, and because he elected to stand like a giant, it was granted to him to fall like one. So doing, he bequeathed to his family intact the inheritance he had from his father, the example of a brave spirit that valued life so dearly as to refuse to relinquish even a fragment of it while breath remained. Herb's death is our grief, but his courage is our respite now, and will be the lifting up of our hearts in good time.

In old Scripture, it is written that the memory of the righteous shall be for a blessing. I take this to mean that there is not only edification but also solace in evoking the good who have gone before. Of no one is this more true than of Herb. There are many ways to quicken the recollection of him, but I want now to hold up his memory before you through writings that he left behind. As I looked at these again in recent days, a spectacle of his noble soul took shape that I greeted with admiration and affection and, I must confess it, with a measure of relief from the despondency that suffocates the mind. I read in his essay on “Slavery and the Moral Foundations of the American Republic”, and was reminded, as so often before, of the perfect clarity of his intelligence, the purity of his expression, and thus of the immovable integrity of his character.

Clarity is the rhetoric of honesty, and it came to Herb out of the deepest wells of his nature. He contributed an essay to his own volume, *Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics*, which will stand as a model of serious, scrupulous and tirelessly tenacious criticism, a mirror of the virtues that ennobled him. His introduction to *What Country Have I?* is a deeply moving witness to the compassion of a shy but vibrant spirit suffused with an absolutely incorruptible love of justice.

While thinking about Herb the word “incorruptible” stood out like a sudden illumination, and a tranquility descended on me that I pray may relieve you too. For it came to me that what we mean when we speak of immortality is precisely the incorruptibility of the soul of
a man; and Herb’s work, the showing forth of his soul, betokens that imperviousness to the false, the mean, and the unjust that tells us plainly that his life goes on, and will go on; for death has no power over the companions of nobility.

There are many things that deserve to be remembered: the playful side of his being, his gift as a mimic, his swift and compact wit, his delight in entertainment; the inexhaustible energy that he lavished on his duties, or to speak more concretely, on his students, for whom he spent himself with a freedom that drew from them a rare love and respect. He taught them fearlessly, plowing a relentless, unswerving furrow through the tangle of their predilections, opening their minds as a good husbandman lovingly prepares his field. And when the time came for the young to begin their careers, they found in him a friend and protector who toiled for them with incredible devotion, and always with the utter impartiality that was the principle of his incorruptible spirit. And of course, high among the things always to be remembered is his scholarly work itself, an intelligent, capacious and varied structure to be crowned by the monumental Anti-Federalist which will earn him the gratitude of generations not yet on the horizon.

There are indeed many things to remember about Herb, and it is a measure of the man that remembering him is a comfort in anguish. It is good to recall the keen precision, the depth and the scope of his mind; but in the time of sorrow, it is the recollection of his character that will help to see his family and his friends through the worst of their grief. Herb walked through life clad in a rugged purity that adorned him like the toga of a Roman in the age of high virtue. The only direction he knew was forward; he made no concessions out of an intimidated spirit. His great heart split at last, but it never faltered and in everything that mattered it never let him down.

Now the time has come for us to benefit from the legacy of his character, to remember that he refused to be beaten by death, or by life, or by anything. Now it is for us not to be beaten by grief. And so we take our leave of him, and wish him a good journey. If the crossing is a little rough, he’ll like it all the better.

Joseph Cropsey
At the Chapel, the University of Virginia
Charlottesville, September 12, 1977
“I appreciate your comparisons, especially with Martin Diamond who, in [the] 4 years we were together at the U[niversity] of Chicago campus, was my teacher in in many more ways than one – he was the best provoker of deep discussion I have ever known!”

Pictured Right to Left: Herbert Storing, his wife Kathryn, their children, Susan, Sarah, Eric and Megan; Colgate University, c1965.
Photo courtesy of Ann Perkins Colmo
Remembering Herbert Storing


Almost thirty years have passed since Robert Goldwin called from Washington and said that Herbert Storing had died. I must have uttered a cry, because my wife, who was across the room, rose up startled; I then broke into tears. How else does one hear the news of the death—a sudden and unexpected death—of a child, for example, or, in this case, a dear friend?

Storing and I first met in 1950 as beginning graduate students in the political science department at the University of Chicago. He came from Colgate University, where his father was a professor and, for a while, had been acting president, and I from Reed College in Portland, Oregon, byway (for one year) of the London School of Economics and Political Science, where I learned little, other than to love London. We lived indifferent units of graduate student housing (converted Quonset huts) on the Midway across from the main campus. Because our wives, by chance, were away on the same night each week, one at work, the other at school, Storing and I would eat our evening meal together, one week at his place, the next at mine, but always discussing what we had learned that day or week. We studied constitutional law with Professor Herman Pritchett and political philosophy with Professor Leo Strauss, so there was much to discuss. These weekly suppers were, I believe, the real beginning of our friendship.

The Storings owned a property on Hatch Lake, a few miles from Colgate in Hamilton, New York. There were several houses on it. Nothing fancy about them, but they were capable of accommodating visiting friends, particularly, on several occasions, those of us from Chicago and our families. (They also had a bad-tempered cat named—for some reason—Walter.) Down by the dock, there was a very small structure—built, I suppose, to store life jackets and other boating paraphernalia—which Storing used as a summer office, exclusively for the reading of PhD dissertations. It seemed to me that he must have served on at least half of the department’s dissertation committees, a disproportionate number as chairman. At any rate, I have a memory of manuscripts piled on his desk awaiting his attention. Unlike some professors I have known, Storing read them all with great care. His students will attest to this.

In July 1976, he organized a Bicentennial symposium at Colgate where we Chicago friends each gave a paper on some aspect of the Declaration of Independence. (Goldwin has a photograph of us sitting in a line on the platform.) That meeting was especially memorable because of the symposium, and also because of the Israeli raid and rescue at Entebbe, news
of which reached us early in the morning of July 4. It was also the last time we were all together: Storing, Goldwin, Martin Diamond, Robert Horwitz, Robert Scigliano, and I, all professors, except Goldwin, who at the time was in the White House as special assistant to the president; and all, except Storing, who was younger than the rest of us, World War II veterans. (His Army service began in 1946. As he told it, he was a sort of itinerant bugler, blowing “taps” at veterans’ burials, or reburials.) His death the following year (September 9, 1977) put an end to these summer gatherings and, of course, to much else of greater consequence: his teaching and scholarship.

Storing was one member of our Chicago group whose scholarship made a difference and, for that reason, will be remembered. This is especially true of his seven-volume study, *The Complete Anti-Federalist*, which was described by the *New York Times* reviewer as “a work of magnificent scholarship” and its publication a “civic event of enduring importance.”

Except for a couple of years in London as a Fulbright Scholar, and an occasional visiting professorship, almost all his academic time was spent at the University of Chicago, first as graduate student, then, from 1956 to 1977, as assistant, associate, and professor of political science. He had no interest in going elsewhere; that changed when the University of Virginia contacted him respecting a position as professor and head of a new program on the American presidency. I learned about this when the chairman of the Virginia department asked me to assess his qualifications. This is the substance of what I wrote:

Dear ____:

*I know of no one who is better qualified to occupy the position you describe than Herbert Storing; in fact, I cannot imagine any-one who would be better qualified for it. Having begun in this immoderate fashion, I owe it to you to admit that Storing and I are close friends, and have been ever since 1950 when we first met as beginning graduate students at the University of Chicago, and that, therefore, I may not be an impartial judge. On the other hand, I would have to insist that the closeness of our relationship allows me to speak with unusual authority; I know him, I know his work, I know his students, I know his capacities—and, knowing all this, I know him to be the model of a university professor.*

You know, or will quickly come to know, that the position you describe and seek to fill is exactly suited to his interests. The American constitutional system is his field; he has taught it and almost every aspect of it, and he has written about its Founding, and now proposes, in fact, to turn his attention to the institution of the presidency. It is also exactly suited to his talents. You want a scholar; Storing is one of the very few true scholars I know: he is thorough, comprehensive, unbiased, uncompromising in his search for all the evidence that research can uncover. You also want a profound man; Storing is the most profound man I have encountered in the field of American studies: He is a serious thinker, not an intellectual, he understands the deepest questions and problems involved in our politics, and he elucidates them with a clarity that is unsurpassed. You also want a teacher; Storing is an incomparable teacher. That, quite simply, is the unanimous judgment of all the students I have sent to him over the years. He tries to teach, and, therefore, never propagandizes; he listens to students, but never panders to them—he is too dignified, too much the man ever to do that or ever even to wish for popularity—and he has less of what we recognize as vanity than anyone I know. And he has an amazing capacity to gain the respect of an audience and even, when what he is discussing is contentious, to disarm the potentially most hostile of critics. I recall an astonishing performance at Cornell about ten years ago
when a student group, which had been attracted to him through his essays on Booker T. Washington and Frederick Douglass, invited him to address a university audience on the subject of black power. There was a huge turnout, including, as one could have expected, many who denied on principle that any white man had a right to discuss the topic. Well, he made it an educational event by teaching everyone who was educable, gaining the respect of almost everyone, and angering no one. In the circumstances of that time and place it was a remarkable achievement, but altogether characteristic of him. In his quiet and careful way, he demonstrated that he knew more and had thought more deeply about the racial problem in the United States than anyone present, including, of course, all those who professed it either academically or politically.

One more word, this on his scholarship: The Chicago Press is publishing his seven-volume edition of the Anti-Federalist Papers, one of the seven being his essay on the ratification debates. I read—in fact, studied—this two years ago, and I can confidently say that with its publication he will be recognized as a preeminent authority on the Founding period. You should not expect a volume a year from him on the presidency—that is not his way—but you can expect work that will gain him the same sort of recognition in this area.

I close by repeating what I said at the beginning: I know of no one who is better qualified for the position than Storing. He’s the best.

He was appointed, of course, and moved with his family to Charlottesville, but died (on the handball court) before he had begun to teach. He was forty-nine years old.
Statement by Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan on the Death of Professor Martin Diamond.
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STATEMENT BY SENATOR DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN (D.-N.Y.) ON THE DEATH OF PROFESSOR MARTIN DIAMOND

Martin Diamond, one of the country's most distinguished political scientists, died this morning just after testifying before the Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Senate Judiciary Committee. His testimony was lucid and penetrating; his exchanges with Senator Bayh were good-natured, witty and pointed. He had been doing one of the things he did best -- bringing his enormous knowledge of the founding and basic principles of American government to bear on the current political issues of vital importance. He was a man also called upon by our country's highest political figures for instruction and counsel, and that instruction and counsel will be sorely missed in legislative halls and executive offices as well as in the academic world.

Martin Diamond began his political career as an active socialist in his native New York City, and he took pride and pleasure in his long and close association with Norman Thomas. Coming to the University of Chicago for graduate
study in 1949, he was profoundly influenced by the teaching and writing in political philosophy of Leo Strauss. He set himself the task thereafter of combining Strauss' philosophical teaching and his own political experience and insight in his study and teaching of American government.

Diamond turned early to the American founding, and almost single-handedly, he established the relevance of the thought and doings of the American founders for this generation of the students of American government. His studies of the Federalist Papers are the best account of these great founding essays that have ever been written.

Professor Diamond taught and wrote at the University of Chicago, Claremont College, and Northern Illinois University. He had just come to Washington to take the Thomas and Dorothy Leavy Chair on the Foundation of American
Freedom at Georgetown University, where he intended to continue his scholarly work, and his political activity as counselor through the auspices of the American Enterprise Institute.

Professor Diamond was one of the country's great teachers. He was a distinguished scholar. He was extraordinary in his capacity to carry the learning of the Academy usefully into practical political life.

This fine son served his country well.
2 Senators Fail in Attempt To Revive Dying Witness

By Jack Eisen
Washington Post Staff Writer

Two U.S. senators attempted unsuccessfully yesterday to revive a 57-year-old university professor who collapsed after apparently suffering a heart attack after he testified at a hearing on Capitol Hill.

Martin Diamond, 57, who left the Northern Illinois University faculty this week to become a professor of government at Georgetown University, was pronounced dead at the Capitol Hill Hospital where he was taken by a D.C. Fire Department ambulance.

Diamond had testified at a hearing of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution against a proposed constitutional amendment providing for direct election of the President, instead of indirectly through the Electoral College. Diamond was invited to testify by Sen. William L. Scott (R-Va.).

After testifying, Diamond returned to a seat in the audience, where he collapsed. About 30 people were in the hearing room in the Russell Senate Office Building when the incident occurred.

Sen. Birch Bayh (D-Ind.), the subcommittee chairman, rushed to Diamond’s side and attempted mouth-to-mouth resuscitation for about 10 minutes. Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), the only other lawmaker present, applied rhythmic pressure to Diamond’s chest.

Bayh and Nels Ackerson, the subcommittee’s chief counsel, both contended there was an excessive delay in the arrival of medical personnel.

“It really shakes you up to think you’re trying to breathe for someone and then find out later he’s dead,” Bayh said.

Ackerson said the first of several telephone calls was made to the Office of the Attending Physician in the Capitol at 10:30 a.m., and the first technicians arrived about 20 minutes later, at about the same time as an ambulance crew. Diamond was admitted to the hospital about eight blocks away at 11:20.

“That kind of delay should not have happened,” Ackerson said.

Robert Moran, administrator of the Capitol physician’s office, blamed the delay on confusion over where the collapse occurred. He said the first call summoned assistance to Room S-203, which would be in the Senate wing of the Capitol building itself, while the incident actually occurred in Room 323 of the Russell Building about a block away. Going to the wrong location cost valuable time, Moran said.
H. J. Storing, Professor at U. of Virginia

CHARLOTTESVILLE, Va. (UPI) — Dr. Herbert J. Storing, a professor of government and foreign affairs at the University of Virginia, has died at the age of 49.

Mr. Storing collapsed after playing handball at a campus gymnasium on Friday, University officials said.

They said Mr. Storing, who came to the university from the University of Chicago last winter, was a leading authority on the American presidency and the U.S. constitutional system of government.

The author of three books and numerous articles in his field, he was currently directing a major study of the presidency for the university's White, Burkitt, Muller Center.

Mr. Storing was born in Ames, Iowa, received his bachelor's degree in 1950 and his master's in 1951 from Colgate and his doctorate in 1956 from the University of Chicago. He became a Fulbright scholar and instructed at the London School of Economics.

Mr. Storing is survived by his wife, three daughters, a son, his mother and a sister and brother.
Compiled by the James Madison Program in American Ideals and Institutions, Princeton University, on the occasion of the September 25, 2017 conference on The Rebirth of American Constitutionalism: The Political Thought of Martin Diamond and Herbert Storing.
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