FOR
RELEASE: 9/22/66
THURSDAY PM's

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY
200th ANNIVERSARY
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY
September 22, 1966

I am both happy and proud to be with you and to be so honored on such an important occasion for this great and growing university.

As many of you know, I am a refugee from the classroom, and every chance I have to return to a university -- not to mention the chance for an honorary degree -- helps me keep my credentials as a political science professor in order. In fact, my first experience as a Vice President was as vice president of the American Political Science Association.

The business of politics is not the most secure in the world, and it doesn't hurt to have a little insurance.

Rutgers University is today celebrating its bicentennial as a strong and free institution only a short time after that strength and freedom were directly threatened.

A year ago, in the heat of political controversy, and under threat of dire retribution, your distinguished President, faculty, and Board of Governors -- supported by an alert and dedicated student body and by the courage of the Governor of this state -- were adamant in protecting the right of dissent. (You were adamant I might add, even though most of you, as I was, were in disagreement with the dissenter.)

You and Governor Hughes were vindicated at the polls by the people of New Jersey.

You gave concrete meaning to the spirit of the Bill of Rights and gave active defense to the eloquent proposition of Henry Thoreau:

> "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

I should like on this occasion to say a word or two about the place of dissent -- of academic freedom -- in a democratic society.

Academic freedom is not just an academic matter. It is both the symptom and the cause of the other freedoms we enjoy.

As John Milton and John Stuart Mill understood in past centuries, the right of free inquiry and of responsible dissent is society's self-correcting mechanism.

In a more modern idiom, it is our self-regulating system of "feedback."

There is no party, no Chief Executive, no Cabinet, no legislature in this or any other nation, wise enough to govern without constant exposure to informed criticism.

If responsible political leaders do not always follow the advice of dissenters, it is not because such advice is ignored or summarily dismissed.

It is because in submitting the advice to the test of perceivable consequence, it may not, at a given moment, make sense.

I know from long personal experience in Washington that few responsible academic proposals are actually lost.

Some are diffused: most are modified by the dialectic of academic as well as political discourse.

But as Lord Keynes once pointed out, in terms of fundamental origins, public policy is largely the product of some "academic scribbler."

It seems to me that academic freedom permits universities at their best to perform three cardinal services for government and for the society as a whole.

First, it enables them to challenge orthodoxies.

Second, it enables them to fashion laws of nature -- including laws of human nature.

And third, it enables them to promulgate options. Let me say a word about each of these.

Twenty years ago, President Truman signed the Employment Act of 1946. This act, as you remember, established the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as a Joint Economic Committee in the Congress.

It mandated that the President submit to the Congress each year an Economic Report which would describe the economic state of the union and which would recommend policies aimed at promoting maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

The background of this Act, and the policy recommendations which have emerged from the Council since its passage, are rooted in a largely academic challenge to economic orthodoxy.

For generations, classical economics had rested on the assumptions that market mechanisms were automatic and immutable, and that government interferences in the operations of the market should be limited essentially to credit adjustments by the Federal Reserve and to cutting public expenditures in times of depression.

I need not trace for this audience the intellectual and policy battles of the past generation associated with the so-called Keynesian revolution.

I can only say that this battle -- begun by academic scribblers -- has produced a revolution in economic thought and in public policy and has immeasurably benefited our country.

If universities break ancient molds, they also create new truths.

The investments in university research of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, the Office of Education, AEC, NASA, and other federal agencies is testament to the key role that new knowledge plays in human progress -- both technical and social.

A few years ago when Nikita Khrushchev visited the United States, he was astounded by our agricultural productivity.

American agriculture is in large part a success story because, for generations, federal and state governments have supported our Land Grant colleges and their agricultural experiment stations.

Our agricultural scientists have discovered new truths. They have uncovered laws of nature which have unlocked the secrets of plant and animal productivity.

Today, as chairman of the newly created National Marine Sciences Council, I have great hope that we may develop our marine resources as we have our agricultural resources.

There is pending in the Congress legislation to create Sea Grant colleges to develop and bring new knowledge to our exploration of the ocean.

And there is no question of the roles that our universities have played, for instance, in developing new materials, processes and management techniques in our federal space and atomic energy programs.

I predict a revolution in educational theory and practice in the next two decades as a result of public and private investments in such fields as motivation and learning.

Social psychology, modern genetics, and the new exciting sub-field of zoology known as ethology are making astounding breakthroughs which cannot help but affect the future of public policy and the fate of the human race.

President Johnson's unprecedented support of education, at all levels, attests to his belief that the truth , will make us free.

But for the responsible policy-maker in government, perhaps the university's most immediate contribution is not the challenging of ancient orthodoxies, or the discovery of new truths, but the creative construction of policy options.

In more cases than you can possibly know, we in Washington turn to the learned professions and to the universities for guidance in forming new programs.

A half-century ago, the University of Wisconsin, under the leadership of John R. Commons, was the policy center of America in such fields as social insurance and welfare economics.

Virtually everything that has happened since at the state and federal level in these critical areas of humane public policy is the legislative derivative of their pioneering work.

It was President Roosevelt who gave currency to the term "brains trust." His major advisers in developing the experimental policies of the New Deal were university professors.

And, since that time, professors have increased their influence.

There are no fewer than 7 ex-professors in the President's Cabinet of 12.

And the term "in-and-outer" has become almost as well known as "brains trust."

Today, Washington is brimming with visiting advisers, witnesses, consultants, and technical experts from our universities in every field of human knowledge.

Washington National Airport, at any point in time during the day, includes, in transit, a faculty which -- if kept together -- would create one of the world's most distinguished institutions of higher education.

These professors are valuable to Washington precisely because they are unfettered, and because they often have an opportunity to see beyond the immediate urgencies and rigidities of on-going operations. And for the same reason they are increasingly being put to work as well by progressive private corporations, financial institutions and labor unions seeking the objective, unbiased view in their decision-making process.

If these professors were controlled and cowed they would be valueless.

They can produce policy options precisely because they are once removed from the inertias and compulsions of operating assignments.

And here let me come to the immediate and specific.

In the past months and years, no problem has burdened the minds of your national political leaders more than the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Men of good will both in Washington and in academic life have differed in diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy.

It would be tragic if authoritarian governments were to mistake our discourse and dissent for weakness, for our diversity is the basis for our unity. And our intellectual pluralism is the friend rather than the enemy of responsible political decision-making.

Our goals in Southeast Asia are clear: They are to help the nations of that part of the world maintain their independence and to help them build strong and progressive societies.

But our means towards these goals are both flexible and pragmatic.

Military force, at this juncture, is necessary.

It is necessary not because it is adequate, but because it establishes minimal conditions for undertaking long-range political, economic, diplomatic and social accommodations which are only ultimate guarantors of long-range stability and independence in that part of the world.

Let me emphasize that it is in these complex areas of long-range accommodation that your government needs all the help it can get from the academic community.

We need the help of universities in breaking orthodoxies in our own thinking.

We need scholars to tell us about the orthodoxies, stresses, strains, and motivations of the Asian powers with which we are presently at odds.

Above all, we need the help of universities in thinking through viable, practical, pragmatic options aimed at securing our long-range goals in Asia.

I have said many times, since my recent missions to Asia and the Pacific, that one of the highest priorities in our country should be the expansion, both in quality and quantity, of our programs of study concerning that part of the earth. For -- no matter how much we would deny it -- the great majority of us are comparatively ignorant when it comes to any part of the world but Europe and North America.

Things are changing. But they cannot change fast enough. Our universities, and our secondary schools as well, must expand their programs of Asian and Pacific studies, as you are doing at Rutgers. They must, in fact, expand their programs of study concerning all the unfamiliar, overlooked parts of the world.

For it is in precisely these places that the small disorder -- unseen and misunderstood -- can grow to the larger conflict which might threaten the general peace.

In the nuclear age, we can no longer afford the luxury of international ignorance.

Nor can we, as a world power, afford a half-world knowledge.

Let me say two things in the way of conclusion.

First, the need for university concern and help is just as urgent in meeting our problems at home as it is in meeting those in the world.

Rutgers is in the middle of one of the greatest urban agglomerations in the world. Your Urban Center and your Eagleton Institute are already nationally recognized for their concern with the politics and administration of state and local jurisdictions.

But my guess is that Rutgers would be the first to admit that it has only scratched the surface of its responsibility to its surrounding communities.

Transportation, air and water pollution, slums, poverty, ill-health, racial discrimination, inadequate schools, truncated opportunity, unfulfilled lives -- these social cancers cannot be wished away.

The total resources of our universities will have to be mobilized against our urban problems if old orthodoxies are to be broken, new truths are to be found, and new policy options are to be developed.

Just as isolation in the world is something our nation cannot afford, so is isolation in the community something our universities cannot afford.

There are a few universities today in America -- but all too few -- which have committed themselves to meeting the problems of their communities.

Most of our universities are aware of the availability of federal funds for studies and activities in the urban environment. Some have made use of them.

But what is to prevent more of our universities, as a few have, from committing their <u>own</u> resources to the problems of urban and metropolitan life?

What is to prevent more of our universities from putting to work some of the lessons learned in space-age technology and management -- the lessons of interdisciplinary cooperation; the application of the systems approach -- in meeting more earthly challenges?

I believe our faculty members should not be judged by publications alone, but also by standards of teaching and <u>participation</u>.

I talked about this problem not long ago with an academic friend. His response was: "Isn't it enough for us to educate well the young men and women who will be the next generation of urban leaders?"

Yes, it is important, but it is not enough. Education is enriched as it is strengthened by experience.

Beyond this, what makes us think that these young men and women will become active participants in urban life if their education has not turned them toward that path?

I know that some of you may regard me as being too much an applied scientist. But I have never believed that knowledge should remain either in books or in the minds of the few. It should be used for the benefit of the many.

Earlier this week at Howard University I made several specific proposals, some of which I will repeat here. (I've always believed in repetition as an educator.)

I believe universities should take the lead in organizing non-profit housing corporations which, in turn, could take full advantage of special federal programs for low-income housing.

I believe universities -- working with business and labor -- should seek new ways to train unskilled and hardcore unemployed workers.

I believe universities should unite to promote actively equal employment opportunity in their own hiring of professional and administrative employees -- as well as requiring such standards from all firms with whom they do business.

I believe universities should send both faculty members and students into our urban ghettoes to help overcome generations there of educational and cultural deprivation. What better place for "laboratory" work?

I believe universities should take far more seriously their responsibilities to the quality of teaching and of research at small colleges and schools without adequate resources.

I believe, in short, our universities should see as their responsibility the problems of 20th century urban society which crowd, in many cases, right up to the edge of their well-tended campuses.

There is no question that academic freedom and academic responsibility are joined together.

You showed academic responsibility a year ago when you stood firmly in the path of those who threatened the right of dissent.

But there are other kinds of academic responsibility as well.

One of these I have just alluded to: It is the responsibility of the academic world not to draw apart from the real world. Who among us can doubt that the existence of poverty . . .of discrimination . . .of outmoded and inefficient local government are as much a threat to academic freedom as they are to the freedom of the general citizenry?

There is another responsibility too -- and I speak of this responsibility as one who has been on both the giving and receiving end of academic advice and recommendations.

This is the responsibility of those in academic life to base their pronouncements upon fearless and objective examination.

Unless recommendations stem from knowledge rather than untutored emotion . . .unless a sense of concern is matched by the capacity for hard analysis, the academic dispenser of idea or giver of advice does himself a disservice.

The world is filled with the noise and clash of opinion. It is woefully shy of dependable knowledge.

In a society which needs and values your independence -- your "league of notions" -- the greatest threat to academic freedom would be the failure of those who prize it most to live up to their own canons of responsibility.

Let me make myself clear. I do not believe that our country is passing through a period of academic irresponsibility. Quite the contrary.

But I do believe that we cannot, in this age both of danger and promise, demand anything less of ourselves than the most stringent standards.

Now, more than ever, the great work of challenging orthodoxies, discovering truths and establishing options is a necessity for human survival and progress.

May we approach that work with humility, with discipline, and with responsibility. In doing so, we shall make our freedom the more secure.

####

Dr Hess
Gov Hughes
Mr Brower
Ambassador Koorman
Sir George Pickering
Dr Holst

REMARKS

VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY

200TH ANNIVERSARY

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

NEW BRUNSWICK, NEW JERSEY

SEPTEMBER 22, 1966

William the Silent
Delegates, colleges - Universities

I am both happy and proud to be with you and to be so honored on such an important occasion for this great and growing university.

As many of you know, I am a refugee from the classroom, and every chance I have to return to a university -- not to mention the chance for an honorary degree -- helps me keep my credentials in order as a political science professor. ~~in order~~. In fact, my first experience as a Vice President was as vice president of the American Political Science Association.

The business of politics is not the most secure in the world, and it doesn't hurt to have a little insurance.

But, my real reason for happiness and pride is that Rutgers University is today celebrating its bicentennial as a

strong and free institution only a short time after that strength and freedom were directly threatened.

A year ago, in the heat of political controversy, and under threat of dire retribution, your distinguished President, faculty, and Board of Governors -- supported by an alert and dedicated student body and by the courage of the Governor of this state -- were adamant in protecting the right of dissent. (You were adamant I might add, even though most of you, as I was, ~~were in disagreement~~ disagreed with the dissenter.)

You and Governor Hughes were vindicated at the polls by the people of New Jersey. (X) - see yellow sheet

You gave concrete meaning to the spirit of the Bill of Rights and gave active defense to the eloquent proposition of Henry Thoreau:

> "If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer.

Meikeljohn

The Ninth Alexander Meikeljohn Award in recognition of a conspicuous service to the cause of academic freedom was given by the AAUP this year to President Gross & the Rutgers' Board of Governors

Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away."

I should like on this occasion to say a word or two about the place of dissent -- of academic freedom and academic responsibility in a democratic society.

First of all, Academic freedom is not just an academic matter. It is both the symptom and the cause of the other freedoms we enjoy.

As John Milton and John Stuart Mill understood in past centuries, the right of free inquiry and of responsible dissent is society's self-correcting mechanism.

In a more modern idiom, it is our self-regulating system of "feedback."

There is no party, no Chief Executive, no Cabinet, no legislature in this or any other nation, wise enough to govern without constant exposure to informed criticism.

If responsible political leaders do not always follow the advice of dissenters, it is not because such advice is ignored or summarily dismissed.

Rather it is because in submitting the advice to the test of perceivable consequence, it may not, at a given moment, make sense.

I know from long personal experience in Washington that few responsible academic proposals are actually lost.

Some are diffused; most are modified by the dialectic of academic as well as political discourse.

But as Lord Keynes once pointed out, in terms of fundamental origins, public policy is largely the product of some "academic scribbler."

It seems to me that academic freedom permits universities at their best to perform three cardinal services for government and for the society as a whole.

First, it enables them to challenge orthodoxies.

Second, it enables them to fashion laws of nature -- including laws of human nature.

And third, it enables them to promulgate options.

Let me say a word about each of these.

Twenty years ago, President Truman signed the Employment Act of 1946. This act, as you remember, established the Council of Economic Advisers, as well as a Joint Economic Committee in the Congress.

It mandated that the President submit to the Congress each year an Economic Report which would describe the economic state of the union and which would recommend policies aimed at promoting maximum production, employment, and purchasing power.

The background of this Act, and the policy recommendations which have emerged from the Council since its passage, are rooted in a largely academic challenge to economic orthodoxy.

For generations, classical economics had rested on the assumptions that market mechanisms were automatic and immutable, and that government interferences in the operations of the market should be limited essentially to credit adjustments by the Federal Reserve and to cutting public expenditures in times of depression.

I need not trace for this audience the intellectual and policy battles of the past generation associated with the so-called Keynesian revolution.

I can only say that this battle -- begun by academic scribblers -- has produced a revolution in economic thought and in public policy and has immeasurably benefited our country.

If universities break ancient molds, they also create new truths.

The investments in university research of the National Science Foundation, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, the Office of Education, AEC, NASA,

and other federal agencies is testament to the key role that new knowledge plays in human progress -- both technical and social.

A few years ago when Nikita Khrushchev visited the United States, he was astounded by our agricultural productivity.

American agriculture is in large part a success story because, for generations, federal and state governments have supported our Land Grant colleges and their agricultural experiment stations, and county extension services.

Our agricultural scientists have discovered new truths. They have uncovered laws of nature which have unlocked the secrets of plant and animal productivity.

Today, as chairman of the newly created National Marine Sciences Council, I have great hope that we may develop our marine resources as we have our agricultural resources.

There is pending in the Congress legislation to create Sea Grant colleges to develop and bring new knowledge to our exploration of the ocean.

And there is no question of the roles that our universities have played, for instance, in developing new materials, processes and management techniques in our federal space and atomic energy programs.

I predict a revolution in educational theory and practice in the next two decades as a result of public and private investments in such fields as motivation and learning.

Social psychology, modern genetics, and the new exciting sub-field of zoology known as ethology are making astounding breakthroughs which cannot help but affect the future of public policy and the fate of the human race.

President Johnson's unprecedented support of education, at all levels, attests to his belief ~~that the truth will make us free.~~ That both the Quantity and Quality of Education must be increased and improved. if the frontiers of Knowledge are to be extended.

But for the responsible policy-maker in government, perhaps the university's most immediate contribution is not the challenging of ancient orthodoxies, or the discovery of new truths, but the creative construction of policy options.

In more cases than you can possibly know, we in Washington turn to the learned professions and to the universities for guidance in forming new programs.

A half-century ago, the University of Wisconsin, under the leadership of John R. Commons, was the policy center of America in such fields as social insurance and welfare economics.

Virtually everything that has happened since at the state and federal level in these critical areas of humane public policy is the legislative derivative of their pioneering work.

It was President Roosevelt who gave currency to the term "brain trust." His major advisers in developing the experimental policies of the New Deal were university professors.

And, since that time, professors have steadily increased their influence on Public Policy.

There are no fewer than 7 ex-professors in the President's Cabinet of 12.

And the term "in-and-outer" has become almost as well known as "brain trust".

Today, Washington is brimming with visiting advisers, witnesses, consultants, and technical experts from our universities in every field of human knowledge.

Washington National Airport, at any point in time during the day, includes, in transit, a faculty which -- if kept together -- would create one of the world's most distinguished institutions of higher education.

These professors are valuable to Washington precisely because they are unfettered, and because they often have an opportunity to see beyond the immediate urgencies and rigidities of on-going operations. And for the same reason they are increasingly being put to work as well by progressive private

corporations, financial institutions and labor unions seeking the objective, unbiased view in their decision-making process.

If these professors were controlled and cowed they would be valueless.

They can produce policy options precisely because they are once removed from the inertias and compulsions of operating assignments.

And here let me come to the immediate and specific.

In the past months and years, no problem has burdened the minds of your national political leaders more than the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Men of good will both in Washington and in academic life have differed in diagnosis, prognosis, and therapy.

It would be tragic if authoritarian governments were to mistake our discourse and dissent for weakness, for our diversity is the basis for our unity. And our intellectual pluralism is the friend rather than the enemy of responsible political decision-making.

Our goals in Southeast Asia are clear: They are to help the nations of that part of the world maintain their independence and to help them build strong and progressive societies.

But our means towards these goals are both flexible and pragmatic.

Military force, at this juncture, is necessary.

It is necessary not because it alone is adequate, but because it establishes minimal conditions for undertaking long-range political, economic, diplomatic and social accommodations which are the only ultimate guarantors of long-range stability and independence in that part of the world.

~~Let me emphasize that~~ It is in these complex areas of long-range accommodation ~~that~~ your government needs all the help it can get from the academic community.

We need the help of universities in breaking orthodoxies in our own thinking.

We need scholars to tell us about the orthodoxies, stresses, strains and motivations of the Asian powers with which we are presently at odds.

Above all, we need the help of universities in thinking through viable, practical, pragmatic options aimed at securing our long-range goals in Asia.

I have said many times, since my recent mission to Asia and the Pacific, that one of the highest priorities in our country should be the expansion, both in quality and quantity, of our programs of study concerning the Pacific and Asian areas, For -- no matter how much we would deny it -- the great majority of us are comparatively ignorant when it comes to any part of the world but Europe and North America.

Things are changing. But they cannot change fast enough. Our universities, and our secondary schools as well, must expand their programs of Asian and Pacific studies, as you are doing at Rutgers. They must, in fact, expand their programs of study concerning all the unfamiliar, overlooked parts of the world.

For it is in precisely these places that the small disorder -- unseen and misunderstood -- can grow to the larger conflict which might threaten the general peace.

In the nuclear age, we can no longer afford the luxury of international ignorance.

Nor can we, as a world power, afford a half-world knowledge.

Let me say two things in the way of conclusion.

First, the need for university concern and help is just as urgent in meeting our problems at home as it is in meeting those in the world.

Rutgers is in the middle of one of the greatest urban agglomerations in the world. Your Urban Center and your Eagleton Institute are already nationally recognized for their concern with the politics and administration of state and local jurisdictions.

But my guess is that Rutgers would be the first to admit that it has only scratched the surface of its responsibility to its surrounding communities.

Transportation, air and water pollution, slums, poverty, ill-health, racial discrimination, inadequate schools, truncated opportunity, unfulfilled lives -- these social cancers cannot be wished away.

The total resources of our universities will have to be mobilized against our urban problems if old orthodoxies are to be broken, new truths are to be found, and new policy options are to be developed.

Just as isolation in the world is something our nation cannot afford, so is isolation in the community something our universities cannot afford.

There are a few universities today in America -- but all too few -- which have committed themselves to meeting the problems of their communities.

Most of our universities are aware of the availability of federal funds for studies and activities in the urban environment. Some have made use of them.

But more should be

But what is to prevent more of our universities, as a

But few have; from committing their own resources to the problems of urban and metropolitan life?

What is to prevent more of our universities from should be putting to work some of the lessons learned in space-age technology and management -- the lessons of interdisciplinary cooperation; the application of the systems approach -- in meeting the more earthly challenges of urban life.

in their own communities and that we should demand no less of them.

Some of you may regard me as being too much an applied scientist. But I have never believed that knowledge should remain hidden in books or in the minds of the few. It should be used for the benefit of the many.

Earlier this week at Howard University I made several specific proposals, some of which I will repeat here. (I've always believed in repetition as an educator.)

I believe universities should take the lead in organizing non-profit housing corporations which, in turn, could take full advantage of special federal programs for low-income housing.

I believe universities -- working with business and labor -- should seek new ways to train unskilled and hard-core unemployed workers.

I believe universities should unite to promote actively equal employment opportunity in their own hiring of professional and administrative employees -- as well as requiring such standards from all firms with whom they do business.

For example

I believe universities should send both faculty members and students into our urban ghettoes to help overcome generations there of educational and cultural deprivation. What better place for "laboratory" work?

I believe universities should take far more seriously their responsibilities to the quality of teaching and of research at small colleges and schools without adequate resources.

I believe, in short, our universities should see as their responsibility, the problems of 20th century urban society which crowd, in many cases, right up to the edge of their well-tended campuses.

I believe that universities can profit from being active participants in the community -- Be where the action is!

the combination of theory and reality is a ~~good~~ architect - appropriate formula for Modern Education

There is no question that academic freedom and academic responsibility are joined together.

You showed academic responsibility a year ago when you stood firmly in the path of those who threatened the right of dissent.

But there are other kinds of academic responsibility, as well.

One of these I have just alluded to: It is the responsibility of the academic world not to draw apart from the real world. Who among us can doubt that the existence of poverty...of discrimination...of outmoded and inefficient local government are as much a threat to academic freedom as they are to the freedom of the general citizenry?

There is another responsibility too -- and I speak of this responsibility as one who has been on both the giving and receiving end of academic advice and recommendations.

There is above all

This is the responsibility of those in academic life to base their pronouncements upon fearless and objective examination.

Unless recommendations stem from knowledge rather than untutored emotion...unless a sense of concern is matched by the capacity for hard analysis, the academic dispenser of ideas or giver of advice does himself a disservice.

The world is filled with the noise and clash of opinion. It is woefully shy of dependable knowledge.

In a society which needs and values your independence -- your "league of notions" -- the greatest threat to academic freedom would be the failure of those who prize it most to live up to their own canons of responsibility.

Let me make myself clear. I do not believe that our country is passing through a period of academic irresponsibility. Quite the contrary.

But I do believe that we cannot, in this age both of danger and promise, demand anything less of ourselves than the most stringent standards.

Now, more than ever, the great work of challenging orthodoxies, discovering truths and establishing options is a necessity for human survival and progress.

May we approach that work with humility, with discipline, and with responsibility. In doing so, we shall make our freedom the more secure.

# # #

Minnesota
Historical Society