President Burkhardt
Dr Luminasky
In a Regent
Dillon Ripley
Smithsonian Institution
Dean
Dr Munro
NYC
Rees
Dr Peter
Elder
Harvard Graduate School

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

WASHINGTON, D.C.

JANUARY 20, 1966

It is good to be with you tonight and to join with you in celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

I have long valued and admired the work of your Council and of its constituent organizations.

To one of them, I owe a special obligation.

Some years ago, I received a thorough in-service training in the art of being a vice president -- vice president of the American Political Science Association, -- that is.

My good friend Evron Kirkpatrick and his associates took me in charge, and shepherded me through my tenure in office. In fact, they even pronounced me fit for further service. How could I say no when the next offer of a Vice Presidency came my way?

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and humanities -- and their profound regret that they could do nothing tanglible to help them.

But, thanks in large part to your staunch friends in the Congress, things have changed.

I know that Senator Pell, Senator Javits, Senator Clark, Senator Gruening, Senator Yarborough, Congressmen Thompson, Fogarty, Moorehead and Widnall and many others

share my pride tonight that the Congress has provided financial support for the arts and humanities.

In 1964 we did achieve a significant first step — the creation of the National Council on the Arts. But the establishment of a foundation, endowed with real money, still seemed remote then. (we tried) 1952-60-64

We had enthusiasm. But we didn't have the votes.

Then came the first session of the 89th Congress. Thanks to determined leadership by President Johnson and skilled floor work by your friends in Congress, we did break through.

As you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focused largely on the arts rather than the humanities.

There were a variety of reasons for this. Nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts -- in the sense that, like Mr. Khurshchev, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character and pre-suppose the existence of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures, and possess that quality we call "glamour."

But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

Few laymen profess with confidence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics -- and fewer still to say so. Editorial writers, columnists, and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders

and advising you what to do and what not to do, what to say and what to leave unsaid -- unless, of course, you write history about the living as well as the dead.

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reasonable degree of public understanding and recognition.

And, to look for a moment at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public -- and to your representatives here in Washington -- some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

The eloquent report of your "Commission on the Humanities" was a welcome step in this direction.

And, it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. But, the process of communication with the public and the Congress must be a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Perhaps I, as an amateur humanist and a professional public servant, can be of some help here by telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

(1) First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens, in the individual, the quality of choice.

Choice is a vital part of all our lives, and nowhere is it more important than in government; indeed, a wise Frenchman has observed that "to govern is to choose."

Each choice taken -- indeed, even each choice deferred or avoided -- has consequences reaching far into the future.

There is an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions -- the "what," the "where," the "when," and the "how."

But when they have laid their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the "why."

No narrow specialty or expertise can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present, and future that the humanities do.

Let me make it clear -- I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical consequences. In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and preservers of what we call civilization.

The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past . . . the critic who casts new light on a work of literature or painting or music . . . the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions -- all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. Together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

One of the most important facts about the establishment of the new Humanities Endowment is that it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake. Humanist scholars, as you are well aware, have long recieved support from the federal government. But in the past this support was always justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense and so forth.

NDEA
NSF

Now the President and Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The national government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your Commission on the Humanities: "Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

Ultimately, the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars who pursue their researches wherever they may lead -- guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself.

These individuals, in their singleminded dedication to their calling, may often be deaf to the cries of the marketplace and the forum -- to the seductive voices of fashion and of expediency.

Certainly the "American Council of Learned Societies" may be proud of its long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what those scholars proposed to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous intellectual standards, often in defiance of fashion and of popular "trends," the ACLS has served the humanities and the nation well.

But the history of the ACLS illustrates another principle I think is well worth mentioning on this occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences as well as the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance. I stress "may" because I do not think that the case for basic research and scholarship in the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

In this connection I think, for example, of your Council's continuing interest in the study and understanding of languages. For many years, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed "exotic" languages.

Languages

Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these languages.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the armed forces.

The same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies, in which your Council has also played a leading role.

Our possession of substantial numbers of highly trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and Africa has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

Natural Asset.

Mumford
Library of Congress

In both these cases, and others I could cite, the so-called impractical scholars turned out to be more far-sighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor distressing. It is, in fact, as it should be.

The scholar -- by disposition, by training, and by situation -- is peculiarly fitted to take the long, detached view of men and of societies. To do so is both his privilege and his responsibility. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be -- and I assure you there are many -- the opportunity for contemplation is seldom among them.

I am a man in public life and a man of Public affairs. As such, I envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all the ramifications of human knowledge and experience.

And I do hope that the program of the Humanities Endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more directly and regularly their unique perspective and insights to those of us engaged in the business of governing and decision-making.

The establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities marks the beginning of a new era for the humanities in America. If I might presume to give you a few words of advice as you enter it, I would simply say: "Be true to yourselves." I hope you will continue to do what seems important to you -- guided by the internal logic of your work and your own high standards of scholarship.

I hope you will never succumb to the temptation to sacrifice that work and those standards to any transitory notions of expediency or popularity. And, in your corporate capacity as the representatives and the servants of our nation's tens of thousands of humanist scholars, I hope you will always remember your responsibility to speak and to act for your constituency.

If your voice has been heard in the councils of government -- and it has -- it is because it has been the authentic voice of dedicated scholars -- Exponents of Excellence.

This must continue to be the case.

By being true to themselves, scholars best serve not only their nations and their times, but all mankind as well.

# # # # #

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
BEFORE THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES
WASHINGTON, D.C., JANUARY 20, 1966

It is good to be with you tonight and to join with you in celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities.

I have long valued and admired the work of your Council and of its constituent organizations.

To one of them, I owe a special obligation.

Some years ago, I received a thorough in-service training in the art of being a vice president -- vice president of the American Political Science Association, that is.

My good friend Evron Kirkpatrick and his associates took me in charge, and shepherded me through my tenure in office. In fact, they even pronounced me fit for further service. How could I say no when the next offer of a Vice Presidency came my way?

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and humanities -- and their profound regret that they could do nothing tanglible to help them.

But, thanks in large part to your staunch friends in the Congress, things have changed.

I know that Senator Pell, Senator Javits, Senator Clark, Senator Gruening, Congressmen Thompson, Fogarty, Moorehead and Widnall and many others share my pride tonight that the Congress has provided financial support for the arts and humanities.

In 1964 we did achieve a significant first step: the creation of the National Council of the Arts. But the establishment of a foundation, endowed with real money, still seemed remote then.

We had enthusiasm. But we didn't have the votes.

Then came the first session of the 89th Congress. Thanks to determined leadership by President Johnson and skillled floor work by friends in Congress, we did break through.

As you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focused largely on the arts rather than the humanities.

There were a variety of reasons for this. Nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts -- in the sense that, like Mr. Khurshchev, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character and pre-suppose the existence of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures, and possess that quality we call "glamour."

But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

Few laymen profess with confidence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics -- and fewer still to say so. Editorial writers, columnists, and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders and advising you what to do and what not to do, what to say and what to leave unsaid -- unless, of course, you write history about the living as well as the dead.

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reasonable

degree of public understanding and recognition.

And, to look for a moment at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public -- and to your representatives here in Washington -- some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

The eloquent report of your Commission on the Humanities was a welcome step in this direction. And it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. But the process of communication with the public and the Congress must be a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Perhaps I, as an amateur humanist and a professional public servant, can be of some help here by telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens, in the individual, the quality of choice.

Choice is a vital part of all our lives, and nowhere is it more important than in government; indeed, a wise Frenchman has observed that "to govern is to choose." Each choice taken -- indeed, even each choice deferred or avoided -- has consequences reaching far into the future.

There is an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions -- the "what," the "where," the "when," and the "how."

But when they have laid their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the "why."

No narrow specialty or expertise can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present, and future that the humanities do.

Let me make it clear: I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate and practical consequences. In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and preservers of what we call civilization.

The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past . . . the critic who casts new light on a work of literature or painting or music . . . the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions -- all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. Together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

One of the most important facts about the establishment of the new Humanities Endowment is that it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake. Humanist scholars, as you are well aware, have long received support from the federal government. But in the past this support was always justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense and so forth.

Now the President and Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The national government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your Commission on the Humanities: "Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

Ultimately, the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars who pursue their researches wherever they may lead -- guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself.

These individuals, in their singleminded dedication to their calling, may often be deaf to the cries of the marketplace and the forum -- to the seductive voices of fashion and of expediency.

Cretainly the American Council of Learned Societies may be proud of its long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what those scholars proposed to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous intellectual standards, often in defiance of fashion and of popular "trends," the ACLS has served the humanities and the nation well.

But the history of the ACLS illustrates another principle I think is well worth mentioning on this occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences as well as the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance. I stress "may" because I do not think that the case for basic research and scholarship in the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

In this connection I think, for example, of your Council's continuing interest in the study and understanding of languages. For many years, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed "exotic" languages.

Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these languages.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the armed forces.

The same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies, in which your Council has also played a leading role.

Our possession of substantial numbers of highly trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latin America and Africa has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

In both these cases, and others I could cite, the so-called impractical scholars turned out to be more far-sighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor distressing. It is, in fact, as it should be.

The scholar -- by disposition, by training, and by situation -- is peculiarly fitted to take the long, deteched view of men and of societies. To do so is both his privilege and his responsibility. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be -- and I assure you there are many -- the opportunity for contemplation is seldom among them.

I am a man in public life and a man of affairs. As such, I envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all the ramifications of human knowledge and experience. And I do hope that the program of the Humanities Endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more directly and regularly their unique perspective and insights to those of us engaged in the business of governing and decision-making.

The establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities marks the beginning of a new era for the humanities in America. If I might presume to give you a few words of advice as you enter it, I would simply say: "Be true to yourselves." I hope you will continue to do what seems important to you -- guided by the internal logic of your work and your own high standards of scholarship.

I hope you will never succumb to the temptation to sacrifice that work and those standards to any transitory notions of expediency or popularity. And, in your corporate capacity as the representatives and the servants of our nation's tens of thousands of humanist scholars, I hope you will always remember your responsibility to speak and to act for your constituency.

If your voice has been heard in the councils of government -- and it has -- it is because it has been the authentic voice of dedicated scholars.

This must continue to be the case.

By being true to themselves, scholars best serve not only their nations and their times, but all mankind as well.

In the matter of:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES
AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE AMERICAN
COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

Place: Washington, D.C.

Date: January 20, 1966

OFFICIAL REPORTERS

Jo Ann Withers Reporting Service

1906 M STREET, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

338-7060

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES,
AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE AMERICAN
COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES, HELD AT
THE MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.
JANUARY 20, 1966

- - - - - - - - - -

Thank you very much, Dr. Lumiansky.

President Burkhardt and members of the American Council of Learned Societies, and friends. And I want to include in that generalization of friends, my associates in the Congress of the United States.

(Laughter.)

It's early in the session, you see. And all of my fellow workers in the vineyards of public service that are here tonight from the different offices of our Government:

I suppose each table should be called upon this evening to have its own spokesman tell us what has been going on in your precinct, because I can tell you that I can give you a good report of what's been going on in our precinct.

If this is the Council of Learned Societies, I want more of it, because we have had a most delightful and scintillating, exciting experience at our table, for I have

been serving as umpire and referee, sort of applying the rules of the Senate, while our good friend, Dean Elder, has been filibustering.

(Applause.)

And Dean Mina Rees has been keeping all of us very happy and just on our toes giving us all these new systems in mathematics. And I'm happy to say that we've discussed the Smithsonian Institution and we have given S. Dillon Ripley a good deal of practical and professional advice, which he intends to ignore on occasions like this.

But I don't know of any time that I have had more fun and enjoyed such a good dinner under such favorable circumstances and surroundings as on the occasion of this evening.

I say all of this because I am rather terrified and I thought I'd just take a few moments to fortify myself for the experience that I'm about to go through.

Harry Truman once said that whenever he addressed an audience of young people at a great univeristy or college campus, he often wondered why he ever left Washington to do so. And I'm beginning to feel now that whenever you address an audience of the delegates and the members of the Council of Learned Societies, you wonder why you even left your

office.

I have been listening to the roll call of the great names in the academic community and in the many great professions of our country, and it sort of leaves the Vice President with an extra degree of humility. You should start out that way, you know, being Vice President.

But I'm here, and I've already partaken of your hospitality, and I suppose I should just proceed and go right ahead and hope that what I may have to say will test your tolerance and your spirit of understanding, and you are supposed to have that, you know. And I trust that tonight that I may put you to the test.

Well, it could be said with almost not even needing to say it that it's a special privilege and a very high honor and a joy to be with you tonight, and to join you in a celebration, and I'm the sort of a person that likes celebrations, celebrating the establishment of the National Foundation of the Arts and Humanities.

I have long valued and admired the work of this Council and of its many constituent organizations. And I might add, to one of them I owe a special obligation and a debt of gratitude.

Some years ago I received a thorough in-service

training in the art of being a vice president -- that is, vice president of the American Political Science Association.

(Applause.)

I want you to know they stopped right there.

(Laughter.)

My good friend, Dr. Evan Kirkpatrick, and his associates todkme in charge, and they shepherded me through my tenure in office. It didn't last long, but they did well with what they had to do with. In fact, they even pronounced me fit at the end of that tenure for further service, which I readily told many people about.

So how could I say no when the next offer of a vice presidency came my way.

(Applause.)

I have had a good deal of experience in being number two, at home and elsewhere.

(Laughter.)

For many years, men in public life have professed their love of the arts and the humanities. And they have also professed their profound regret that they could do nothing tangible to help them.

Now, that day is over, thank goodness. And it's over thanks in large part to your staunch friends in the

Congress, friends that you have noted here tonight. And because of these friends, things have changed.

I know, for example, that my friend, Senator Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island --

(Applause.)

This is an election year, Dr. Lumiansky. You can't expect anything better out of a Tulane man. I graduated from LSU.

I know that Senator Pell and Senator Javits, Senator Clark and Senator Green and Senator Yarborough, just to mention a few in the Senate, and Congressman Moorhead and Congressman Thompson and Congressman Fogarty and Congressman (inaudible) and many others would and do share with me tonight the pride that Congress has provided at long last financial support and legislative support, a commitment of the American people for the arts and the humanities.

I can recall our visits about the arts and humanities bill before the Congress opened in the First Session of the 89th Cnngress. I can recall my visit with Claiborne Pell and with Senator Clark and with others that came outside of the halls of Congress to discuss with me whether or not we should add the humanities part to this bill. I said: "Indeed we should; go for the whole program."

Well, in 1964, we achieved a rather significant first step which was the creation of the National Council on the Arts. I can recall the passage of the bill on the National Council of the Arts. I look over here and see Senator Pell. He may recall that we wondered whether or not we could get it up before the end of the Congress.

Those were the days when I was Majority Whip. And while you don't have a great deal of respectability, you have a little authority in that job. And we were able with the work of Senators Pell and Clark and Javits and others to get that bill out of the committee, get it on the calendar and then get it over to the House where our friends in the House went to work. And I want to say, Congressman, you did a bank-up job.

And we took step number one, the creation of the National Council on the Arts. But the establishment of a Foundation endowed with real money still seemed remote. We had to make a choice then, should we take step number one or should we wait and take the full journey.

Somewhere along the line I heard somebody make a speech quoting somebody who said that the longest journey is the first step. So we took the first step.

We tried, by the way, to make this first step in

other years. I can recall many efforts. In fact, if I were to review my life in Congress, it is the life of initiating unpopular proposals --

(Applause.)

-- which ultimately became popular. But it's certainly nice to see the babies born and to see them grow into full maturity.

We had great enthusiasm in these years as we worked for the National Council on the Arts and then subsequently the Council on the Humanities. But the trouble is, in those earlier days we didn't have all the votes.

And as I have indicated, then came the First Session of that 89th Congress. And thanks to the determined leadership by President Johnson -- and he stood with us all the way -- and the skilled field work of your friends in the Congress -- and it took a good deal of open field running -- we did break through. We scored a touchdown.

And as you undoubtedly recall, the debates in Congress focussed largely on the arts rather than on the humanities. No matter how shrewd and wise you think you may be in the field of politics, people are always aiming at the wrong target.

(Laughter.)

I can recall that everybody thought that that humanities section was the one that would really draw the fire, that they would level the powerful guns of the opposition upon the humanities section.

I was just saying here a moment ago, just to digress, I decided that I should just as well enjoy this speech -- you may not enjoy it.

(Laughter.)

I give so many of them I have decided to enjoy this one even if the audience doesn't. But I was saying a moment ago, when I was in India, many of our political specialists were trying to prognosticate who would be the new Prime Minister. And as you would expect, most of them didn't select the right person.

I'm happy to say that this is one of the reasons that I have great faith in Divine Providence. As I was leaving for the airport, I decided that I was going to stop off and see Mrs. Indira Gandhi. And I was told, well, that you ought to really get to the airport, that we have you scheduled to leave at a certain time. There are always these people with schedules, they are the bane of my life.

I said: "Well now, what difference does the schedule make? You can't leave until I go; I'm in charge of

that airplane."

(Applause.)

The reply was: Well, we have told a number of people you would leave at that time." But since I didn't have to be too concerned about the voters at that moment, I decided to let them wait.

So I stopped off to see the very charming and brilliant lady that is today the Prime Minister of one of the truly great democracies of the world -- intuition, I say, or good luck.

But getting back to my theme, sometimes you just don't level on the right target. And in the debates in the Congress, the argument was all over the arts section. And I can still see Roger Stevens sitting up there in the gallery just ducking each one of those blows.

Now, there were a variety of reasons for this, Roger, because nearly everyone considers himself a qualified critic of the arts -- in the sense that Mr. Khruschev, for example, he knows what he likes and doesn't hesitate to say so.

It is sort of like everybody is qualified to be Secretary of State. Everybody knows how to handle the foreign policy of the country.

Moreover, by their very nature, the performing arts are public in character, and they presuppose the existance of an audience. Their practitioners are public figures and possess the quality that we call glamour.

But the practitioners of the humanities are, for the most part, at least, with the exception of the table where I've been sitting, free of the more dubious blessings of public attention.

(Laughter.)

Very few laymen profess the competence to know what they like in philosophy or linguistics, and fewer still even say so. You don't really argue too much about how you like Chaucer, do you, for example.

Editorial writers and columnists and commentators of all sorts are not constantly looking over your shoulders and advising you what to do and what not to do, and what to say and what to leave unsaid -- unless, of course, you write history, about the living, as well as the dead.

I put that in for my friend, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.

(Laughter.)

But even privacy can be pushed too far. As men and women who have dedicated your lives to the service and the honor of knowledge, you have every right to expect a reason-

able degree of public understanding and recognition.

To look for a moment now at the other side of the coin, now that the humanities have formally entered the competition for public funds, and the arena is crowded, I want you to know, you have a certain responsibility to make clear to the public and to your representatives here in Washington some appreciation of what you do and why it is important.

I would suggest to you as one who has been around Washington now for 17 years that you ought not to presume or assume that people really know how important you are, or how important is your work.

The eloquent report of your Commission on the Humanities was a welcome step in this direction, and it is no exaggeration to say that this report won for the humanities an equal place in the new National Foundation. This was really the stepping stone or the stepping stones to effective legislative enactment.

But the process of communication with the public and the Congress must not be a matter of history but rather a continuing one. You can never assume that the case has been made once and for all.

Alben Barkley used to tell that old story, you know,

about the man down there in Kentucky that had done so much for his constituency. And he ran into one of his old friends on the corner by the post office one day. And he said: "Well, Fred," he said, "I gather you are going to vote for me in the election." And old Fred said: "Well," he said, "I don't know." He said: "I just haven't made up my mind."

And the congressman said: "You haven't made up your mind?" "Why" he said, "how can you be that way?" He said: "Don't you recall when your brother needed a job, I made him postmaster; that when your son needed to go to college, I got him an appointment at an academy; that when your mother needed some help, I was able to get her a loan at the bank and signed the note? Don't you recall how I helped your nephew and your uncle?"

He went through a whole list of things, and old Fred said: "Yes," he said, "I recall all of that." "But," he said, "what have you done for me lately?"

(Laughter.)

It's the oldest story in politics, but it's very appropriate.

So never assume that the case has really been made or won. Perhaps I as an amateur humanist and more or less now a professional public servant can be of some help here by

telling you what I consider the vital contribution of the humanities to our national life.

First of all, a thorough grounding in the humanities sharpens in the individual the quality of choice. And in a free society, the quality of choice, the sharpening of the quality of choice is absolutely essential. Choice is a vital part of all of our lives. And no where is it more important than in free government or a government of a free society.

Indeed, a wise old Frenchman once observed that to govern is to choose. Each choice taken, indeed, each choice deferred or avoided, has consequences reaching far into the future.

Now, there's an abundance of specialists who can provide us with the facts relevant to decisions: the what and the where and the when and thehow. But when they have laid their facts, all of their facts upon the table, an essential factor is still missing: the why.

And that's where we come to choice. No narrow specialty can provide the full and essential grasp of the continuity of past, present and future that the humanities do.

Let me make it clear: I do not believe that the humanities must be justified on the grounds of any immediate

and practical consequences.

(Applause.)

In the most fundamental sense, they are good in themselves simply because they are the bearers and the preservers of what we call civilization. The historian who brings order out of the tangled record of the past; the critic who casts new light on the works of literature, painting or music; the philosopher who questions and clarifies our most basic assumptions -- all of these serve to enrich our lives and to expand our vision. And together they constitute one of our most precious national resources.

Now, one of the most important facts about the establishment of the new humanities endowment is that it does, and I repeat, it does at last constitute a recognition of the humanities for their own sake.

Humanists, scholars, as you are all well aware, have long received support from the Federal Government. But in the past this support has always been justified in terms of something else: international cooperation, the improvement of the school curriculum, national defense, and so forth.

I can recall many hearings that I conducted in the Congress when I would urge the Department of Defense, for example, to give out grants in the field of research, just

basic research, because I would say to the admirals and the generals, if you do it, no one will question it, but if somebody else does it, it will stir up a storm. So while you are defending the country, in the immediate sense, defend it in terms of the long-term interests of the nation.

It was sort of a disguised effort at maintaining a high degree of intellectual attainment in the nation.

And now we have come to face the issue head-on, and the Congress, which represents the people, has made its own declaration that the humanities are a rich and meaningful national resource in their own right and need to be encouraged.

The President and the Congress have gone on record as believing that the strengthening of the humanities as such is in the public interest. The national government has, in effect, endorsed the words of your own Commission on the Humanities, and I quote those words:

"Through the humanities we may seek intellectual humility, sensitivity to beauty, and emotional discipline. By them we may come to know the excitement of ideas, the power of imagination, and the unsuspected energies of the creative spirit."

I think those are marvelous, powerful words. And I am so pleased that these words found their way into the

records of the Congress of the United States, because make no mistake about it, once the Congress has put its seal of approval, and not only its seal of approval but its seal of promulgating and of projecting this philosophy -- then it takes on additional meaning in terms of our nation or our society.

Now, ultimately the fate of the humanities must rest in the hands of devoted individuals: scholars. Scholars as I see in this room tonight who pursue their researches wherever they may lead, guided by their own intelligence and by the canons of scholarship itself. These individuals, these scholars, in their single minded dedication to their calling may often be deaf to the cries of the market place and the forum, and to the seductive voices of fashion and expediency.

Certainly, the American Council of Learned Societies may be proud of its own long record of supporting worthy scholars despite the apparent lack of popular interest in what these scholars propose to do. By maintaining and applying the most rigorous standards, often in definance of fashion and popular trends, the American Council of Learned Societies has served the humanities and the nation well.

But the history of the ACLS illustrates another

principle that I think is well worth mentioning on this important and, I believe, historic occasion.

In every field of intellectual endeavor, in the sciences, as well as in the humanities, what today appears to be the most esoteric, far out and impractical research may tomorrow prove to be of the utmost practical usefulness and importance.

(Applause.)

I stress the word "may," because I do not think the case for basic research in scholarship and the humanities should be made to rest on claims of practical utility.

(Applause.)

To be sure, you can fortify your case by the examples of practical utility. But to rest your case on that premise alone, I think, is to really subvert the very meaning of the dedication to the humanities.

(Applause.)

In this connection, I can give an example or so. For example, of your Council's continuing interest in the study and the understanding of languages. Now, for many years in the past, yours was the only organization in this country to offer encouragement and support for scholarly work in what were then rather patronizingly termed the exotic

languages. Suddenly, with our involvement in World War II and with our manpower spread across the entire globe, we found ourselves in urgent need of communication with peoples who spoke some of these strange, exotic languages. And the practical hardheaded men were searching out through the community of scholars to find the people that could communicate, because only through communication could we have a knowledge of the enemy or an association with the ally.

Besides linguists, we also needed scholars whose knowledge of the basic structure of language enabled them to develop new and more effective techniques of language instruction for the armed forces.

And I must say to the scholars that it took a war to teach us how to teach languages. We learned more about new techniques of language instruction in four years of war than we learned in 400 years of scholarship. And we ought to remember that that kind of research can be applied in peacetime as well as in wartime.

Now, the same story can be told of the development in this country of area studies. And I have a particular interest in this field, in which your Council has also played a leading role.

Our possession of substantial numbers of highly

trained and skilled experts on the peoples and cultures of Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, Latim America, and Africa, has turned out to be an invaluable national asset. The United States would simply not be able to discharge its worldwide responsibility adequately without them.

And I am pleased to note that the Library of Congress, so ably represented here by its own Librarian, has made an invaluable contribution to the national security of this nation simply because of the competence of many of its people in these area studies.

And we are beginning now to learn even in the economic community, much less in the fields of diplomacy and national security, that a knowledge of the peoples, a knowledge of the cultures of these different areas of the world is absolutely fundamental to our survival as a nation or an economy.

So what once was something that just these professors lent themselves to is today at the very heart and the core of the survival of the nation and the continuity of the economy.

I only wish that a little more emphasis was given to this. I met this morning -- I had a very interesting day. You ought to see what kind of a day we go through.

I started out with the Commissioner of Baseball. No. As a matter of fact, I really started out talking about the field of civil rights. Then I saw a tailor for a few moments. Then I came down to meet with the Commissioner of Baseball. Then I met with some of the top leaders of the civil rights movement. Then I met with the Council on Latin America. Then I went over to do some practical work with the freshmen members of Congress for the Democratic National Committee. I thought I would just inject that for a moment for my Republican friends.

A little later, we met with the President's Cabinet task force on travel.

And one thing to another; it's in and out all day long. And you get a feeling of the variety of this nation and the importance of having some understanding of what goes on in this great country.

But when I was meeting with the, I would say, top 50 businessmen in America, who are vitally concerned about political and economic developments in Latin America, I couldn't help but think how little we know. And I must say how poor the universities have been for years in offering any courses of instruction that were worthy of the name instruction in the field of the politics, the social struc-

ture, cultural patterns, the mores, the ethnic groups in this hemisphere.

And then take a look at the Far East. Take a little look at the Soviet Union. I recall my visit to the Soviet Union in 1958, and I want to just visit with you for a moment. I feel that I am a reasonably average member of Congress. When I served in the Senate, I tried to do my job and do my homework. I am a graduate of at least two universities. And I thought I did fairly well. I see the Phi Beta Kappa group is here. They must have had low standards at one time. I got into that.

But I went to the Soviet Union to meet with Mr. Khrushchev, and I want to confess something to you: I knew so little about Russia. I knew a great deal about communist ideology, about the communist apparatus. I had studied that and I had come in contact with it.

But I knew so little about Russian history that I was very poorly equipped intellectually or by experience or by aptitude or attitude to deal with the top man of the Soviet Union, because I not only talked to a man that was the product of Lenin and Stalin; I talked to one that was also the product of Mother Russia, because it isn't just communism. It's also centuries of Russian civilization and

all that goes into that.

And so few of our people in public life have any knowledge at all of these areas of the world, so few of us. We deal so superficially. It's really almost frightening how superficial we are. And is it any wonder that we have such misleading headlines? When I think of the people that frequently write the stories about world politics and how little they know, they can't even keep up with the politics of the 32nd precinct, much less the Far East or the Middle East or some place else in the world.

And yet we Americans, highly educated Americans, are reading and listening and absorbing the writings of people less informed than those of us that read all too often. And some of us that do the speaking on these subjects are educating and training and informing people without really a basic fundamental knowledge of the subject matter to which we direct our words and our attention.

I have often thought that I owed a debt of apology to all of my young students that I used to instruct in the field of American Government. I really never knew what American Government was like it was until I got down here.

I just feel like I ought to write all of them a letter and tell them to get their tuition back for my course.

(Laughter.)

Well, I'm only making a confession here tonight. That's part of my religion, you see. I just have to come up on that every so often.

But I wanted once again to cite what I stated here: that the so-called impractical scholars, at least so termed by what are called the practical men, whose names are never remembered in history, turned out to be more far sighted than many of our public officials.

But this is neither surprising nor, I suppose, should it be too distressing even though it is to me. It is, in fact, as it should be. The scholar by disposition, by training, and by environment and situation, is peculiarly fitted to take the long and the detached view of men and of societies. And to do so is both his privilege and his responsibility.

This is why I feel so strongly about this right of dissent in our society. Even though I must say the times that it tears at your heart, it makes you feel when you are in public life sometimes so angry with those that disagree, when you think you have given so much and you feel that you have so much information.

But I can never forget what was the general thrust

of John Stuart Mills' thesis that you should protect the right to dissent because you never can tell, the dissenter may be right.

But it's a hard assignment. The scholar should always have that right of dissent. Whatever the pleasures of public life may be -- and I can assure you that there are many -- the opportunity for quiet contemplation is seldom among those pleasures. And it surely is sadly the truth these days. When I journey, as we have, to the home of Thomas Jefferson, I know how much time he gave to reading and contemplation. I sometimes wonder how we do as well these days as we seem to do.

There may be one reason for it. Somebody asked me -- well, I have had a lot of people ask me, did you read this book, or did you read that book. And I said: "No; I have been out of the university for years; I really haven't had much time to read books." But I do talk to the authors; and that does help, it really does.

(Applause.)

And I'm going to say quite candidly to you, when I find many public officials telling me all the books they've read, I know one of two things. Either they are not doing their public duty or they are cheating, one or the other.

(Laughter.)

And I'm looking at all of my friends in Congress out here tonight.

Yes, I am a man of public life and a man of public affairs. And as such, I frankly envy your opportunity to ponder in depth and at length all of the ramifications of human knowledge and experience. I suppose some of you at times envy the what you consider to be the rather exciting and spirited tempo of life which some of us have in public life.

It is always so. We always think the other person has it a little better.

And I do hope that the program of the humanities endowment will include some opportunity for scholars to impart more directly and regularly their unique perspective and insights to those of us engaged in the business of governing and decision making.

I have tried this year as a sort of a new year's resolution, which started a couple of months before the y year, to set aside an evening every so often just to sit down with scholars. I'm going to do that tomorrow night.

Not long ago, about a month and a half or two months ago, I had a full evening of about six hours with people in the field, that have studied sociology, that are

the scholars in that area, urban affairs, the structure of our urban centers, not trying to deal with the day-to-day problems, but getting at the whole social base of our urbanization.

And it's a refreshing experience for one that lives by current events.

The establishment of the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities marks the beginning of a very important new era for the humanities in America.

And if I might presume to give you now just a few words of advice as you enter it, I would simply say this: Be true to yourselves. I hope you will continue to do what seems important to you.

That's why this endowment, this National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities was established. Not to be true to what I say you should do, or even the President or anyone else. But to be true to yourselves, to the high standards of your own discipline, guided by the eternal logic of your work and your own high standards of scholarship.

This is what we expect of you in a free society. And I hope that you will never succumb to the temptation to sacrifice that work and those standards to any transitory notions of expediency or popularity, because let me tell you

something: You can never keep up to the changes that some of us will demand of you. If you're going to try to satisfy the temporary emotional output of public life, you just forget scholarship.

You're supposed to be the balance wheel in a very real sense. You're supposed to be the anchor that can hold us at least in some semblance of balance and of a direct course. Don't try to play to the winds. You'll never get your sails up fast enough to avoid disaster.

(Applause.)

And in your corporate capacity as the representatives and the servants of our nation's tens of thousands of humanist scholars, I hope that you will always remember your responsibility as leaders to speak and to act for your constituency: the scholars. If your voice has been heard in the councils of Government -- and it has -- it's not because you're adept at politics, or that you even have great political influence. It is because it has been the authentic voice of dedicated scholars, exponents of excellence in mind and intellect, and it's because of this standard that you command respect. Not because you can outthink a man who has been in political life all of his life.

We respect you for your high standards of

integrity, not your capacity for maneuverability.

And by being true to themselves, scholars best serve not only their nations and their times, but more significantly, scholars serve all of mankind. And it's mankind that is your constituency.

Thank you.

(Rising applause.)

Minnesota
Historical Society