REMARKS HONORING

Marshall D. Shulman

DINNER
DECEMBER 9, 1986

Speakers

Dean Alfred Stepan

The Honorable Cyrus R. Vance

Professor Seweryn Bialer

Professor Robert Legvold

Mrs. Pamela C. Harriman

President Michael Sovern

Professor Emeritus Marshall D. Shulman

The W. Averell Harriman Institute
for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Dean Alfred Stepan

Good evening. My name is Alfred Stepan, Dean of the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University. I want to welcome you to this grand event. Its grandness derives directly from the person we are here to honor. He has been a wise counselor to leading statesmen; he has been a compassionate and inspiring mentor to generations of students. He has developed, and indeed defined, a field of scholarly inquiry; he has been a builder of the most distinguished institution in the world dedicated to the study of the other superpower.

Each dimension of the man could be the centerpiece of the evening. What unites all these dimensions, and has brought all of us here to honor and celebrate his life, is his extraordinary wisdom and humanness. What unites all of us is our deep esteem and love for you, Marshall. We are all honored to be with you this evening. I give you the first speaker, the Honorable Cyrus Vance.

The Honorable
Cyrus R. Vance

My friendship with Marshall goes back many years, and I am filled with pride and pleasure to be a part of this evening's ceremonies recognizing his matchless service to the Harriman Institute, to Columbia, and to our country. He is, as we all know, a unique person, combining a wealth of talents with great warmth and charm.

Not only is Marshall one of our outstanding Soviet scholars, but one who has, time and again, given unstintingly of himself through selfless public service, a fact to which I can testify personally. Most recently, I witnessed at first hand his memorable contributions when he served with me as Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Soviet Affairs, a post previously held in past administrations by such other luminaries as George Kennan, Chip Bohlen, and Tommy Thompson. Among Marshall's important, but less known, achievements has been his leadership in motivating specialization in Soviet affairs within the Foreign Service, thus providing a much-needed steady flow of Soviet experts in the career ranks.

It is difficult for me to find words which express adequately what it has meant to me to have Marshall's counsel and help when keen analysis, sound judgment, and imaginative solutions to hard problems were needed. There is no one, literally no one, I would rather have standing with me at such times.

Above all, I treasure our friendship. Marshall's advice, encouragement, and support have lifted my spirits when the going was difficult, and guided me when wise judgment was needed. I shall be everlastingly grateful.

And now it is my great pleasure to introduce the next speaker, a most distinguished scholar, a most able evaluator of the problems of U.S.–Soviet relationships, and a dear friend, Seweryn Bialer.

Professor
Seweryn Bialer

It is a privilege to be Marshall's colleague and friend in the Department of Political Science at Columbia, the Russian Institute, and now in the Harriman Institute. It is a pleasure to say a few words about Marshall as a fellow scholar, as a professional colleague, as a teacher, and as a personal friend. Marshall is a leader in the field of Slavic studies, and particularly in the study of the Soviet Union and Soviet foreign policy.

For a number of decades he has made enormous contributions of thought, of support, of innovative thinking, of time, of concern, and of commitment that are now recognized by everyone. I would like to stress especially two of his major contributions to the field of Soviet studies. First, he brought to the study of Soviet foreign policy, more than anyone else, a key ingredient, an ingredient that Max Weber considered necessary in the study of distant or alien societies, namely, empathy—an ability to understand the way of thinking of people of different cultures, even when one does not sympathize with their thinking. Marshall's contribution to our understanding of how the Soviets think, and how their thinking changes, is immense. Secondly, Marshall is probably the first, or one of the first, who brought to the field of arms control a many-sided knowledge of the Soviet Union. This is still very rare today, though many do follow in Marshall's footsteps.

As a colleague and a teacher, Marshall is an enemy of orthodoxy, and always encourages diversity of views. He is a catalyst in bringing together formally and informally disparate elements of the study of the Soviet Union and diverse people toward the common goal of greater knowledge and greater understanding. As a colleague and a friend, Marshall is loyal. He is a man of great personal integrity, and a man of kindness, of understanding, and of compassion.

You may have noticed that I used in my brief remarks the present and not the past tense. And in the key sense of the word, Marshall has not retired; he is, and he will remain, very active in our community. Paying him tribute today, I am at the same time looking forward to many years of common work and common achievement.

It is my great pleasure to introduce the next speaker, the present Director of the Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union, my close friend, and a man whom I admire very deeply for his many-sided talents, Bob Legvold.

Professor
Robert Legvold

What a pleasure it is to be part of this evening! What a happiness to honor this man!

So many of you in this room have been Marshall's friend for so many years. My own acquaintance with him is now nearly twenty-five years old, and goes back to a time when he was the teacher and I was the student. He has remained my teacher and mentor ever since, something a great many of us in this room would happily claim. This evening is a chance for us, Marshall, to say, "Thank you."

Years ago—in fact, not so long after I finished studying with Marshall—someone who is at the other end of the political spectrum from him said of me and another of Marshall's students: "Legvold and X are not such bad folks, but the problem is they have been Shulmanized." Apart from the odd rather automotive image this evokes for me, the criticism is not wrong. I suspect many of us have been Shulmanized. Not because that was his purpose, but because that was his effect. Partly it was his effect precisely because it was not his purpose. On the contrary. Marshall affected us so because he came closest to what Bronson Alcott once said about good teaching: "The true teacher defends his pupils against his own personal influence. He inspires self-distrust. He guides their eyes from himself to the spirit that quickens him. He will have no disciple."

And the spirit that quickened him, the spirit that he shared with us—no, that he imposed on us—was a deep dissatisfaction with simple, settled, self-satisfied approaches to the Soviet question. It was never so much what we thought, as much as it was how casually and thoughtlessly we got there—and then, almost as bad, how gracelessly and incompetently we committed our thoughts to paper or print. He has cared. He has cared about our level of understanding and what we were prepared to do about it, as he has cared about the level of understanding within this country.

Jean Monnet liked to quote a diplomat who said: "The world is divided into those who want to become someone, and those who want to accomplish something." Monnet preferred to belong to the second category, because, he mused, "There is less competition." So it is with Marshall. A lot of you know that, but I think it is his students who know it best, because we are the beneficiaries, particularly those who now come after us at the Institute that he built. But we also know so well because we have felt most palpably his standards and his hopes.

And it is in that spirit that we, using the Harriman Institute as our instrument, now want to honor him by

establishing a prize in his name. Tonight I am happy to announce the creation of the Marshall D. Shulman Prize to be awarded annually by our professional association, the AAASS, for the best book written in the field of Soviet foreign policy studies. We think that is the way to keep this teacher, this influence around for a very long time to come.

And now, I want to introduce Marshall's partner and close friend, the person who with her husband made so much of this possible, Pamela Harriman.

Mrs. Pamela C. Harriman

Thank you, Bob. Let me say in response to Bob Legvold that the best testimony to Marshall Shulman's success is his successor. Bob Legvold is shouldering a heavy responsibility. I know he has the strength to carry it and the wisdom to lead the Harriman Institute to new distinction. Fellow Shulmanites, we are here to celebrate a stewardship that is ending and a career that is resuming. The Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union, as we all know, is Marshall Shulman's creation—and now that it is strong enough to fly, he is the one jumping out of the nest. Instead of writing budgets, he will write books. Instead of raising funds, he will raise the level of civil discourse about the life-and-death issues of our times. Marshall is stepping down only so that he can step out again to lead the scholars he has recruited, trained, supported, and inspired. And while the Institute will be the poorer for his departure, the University and the nation will be richer for his return to full-time scholarship. Sovietology has long needed a motorcycle-riding elder statesman. Marshall, welcome back to the open road.

Tonight we have to amend Emerson's aphorism about an institution being the length and shadow of one man; the Harriman Institute is a monument to two men with a single vision: Averell and Marshall. Both taught the three R's of East-West diplomacy—Realism, Rationality,

and Restraint. And both saw that American policy toward the Soviet Union needs not only a steadiness of purpose, but a steady supply of expert analysts and analysis. Thanks to their commitment and to the tradition already established by Columbia's Russian Institute, those resources of scholarship, once shrinking, are multiplying again. And now, Soviet specialists are no longer an endangered species. We should be thinking of ways to expand their preserve from Morningside Heights to Foggy Bottom and beyond. Marshall Shulman has made that migration often enough to know its rewards and its perils. When he came to Washington at the beginning of the Carter Administration, he lived with us for a time. I thought of him as a sort of nocturnal waterfowl. He went to work, it seemed to me, at sunup, and I only knew he was home long after dark by the sound of gentle splashing in the swimming pool. Marshall said it was his one chance at relaxation, and I suspect that swimming was essential water therapy for the academic soul ensnared by bureaucrats. I am also convinced that Marshall would urge his colleagues and students to apply themselves as he has to bridging the gap between expertise and policy-making. For Marshall is the best of Sovietologists, the scholar *engagé*. He does not simply seek knowledge, he seeks it to share it, to spread it, and to apply it. He works not just to study events, but to shape them. Marshall's view has always been a steady one. It has not bent to storms of anger or cloudbursts of illusion; he has seen our adversaries clearly and insisted forcefully on exploring the real interest we and they hold in common. It has been a frustrating course to hold, but not the least of Marshall's virtues is his determination. Underneath that sweet and patient demeanor is the temperament of a bulldog—and might I be permitted to say, a British bulldog.

Finally, then, it is Marshall's character, his fierce persistence and scholarly discipline, that made him and Averell such fast friends, that built the Harriman Institute, and that will carry him now to new distinction and even wider influence. We are here because we honor Marshall's fortitude, because we are stronger for his accomplishments, and because we anticipate great things to come of his future endeavors. What the Harriman Institute has lost, Colette and Columbia have regained. Thank you for lending us Marshall Shulman's companionship and leadership. Thank you, Marshall, for your friendship. I treasure it now, and I count on it for years to come.

It is now my pleasure to introduce a president. Washingtonians revel in such moments, but I won't prolong my pleasure or delay yours. Michael Sovern is a leader of international vision. He has lifted his sights and the

University's voice to address the world and its gravest problems. He has put a human face on scholarship, and put scholarship to work for human dignity. And someday, I am sure, all his work will bring Columbia its just reward—a winning football team.

President Sovern has been a steady guide for the Harriman Institute, a source of support and inspiration. We have benefited from his help and counsel in the past, and we will benefit from his words now. My friend, our friend, Michael Sovern, President of Columbia University.

President
Michael Sovern

Thank you, Pamela. Marshall is a man for all seasons and a man of many hats. Like you, I have been sitting here listening with delight to Pamela Harriman's description of Marshall wearing a hat that truly becomes him, that of family friend and adviser; our good friend Cy Vance has told us of Marshall in another hat that fits well, that of public servant; Seweryn Bialer has admired Marshall in his faculty colleague hat; and Bob Legvold has viewed Marshall in his hat of teacher and role model. As the last celebrant, I have the pleasure of dealing with one of Marshall's most imposing pieces of haberdashery, yet one with which some of you may not be familiar: I now summon up the vision of Marshall in his motorcycle helmet.

If you have not had the treat of seeing Marshall with his motorcycle helmet under his arm—or better yet, wearing it as he rides on the wind—you have missed one of the truly exhilarating experiences of twentieth-century diplomacy.

Colette tells me that he is a safe driver. Nonetheless, I have always considered Marshall—whether on his motorcycle or at the podium—much like the cross-eyed javelin thrower at a track meet: to be watched with respectful attention.

Joan and I are longtime Marshall Shulman afficionados. We are delighted to be here to celebrate this latest milestone in his continuing service to Columbia and to the world.

And we obviously have splendid company in the Marshall Shulman fan club. Indeed, thanks to Marshall's many generous friends and admirers who have contributed to its endowment, I am recommending to the University Trustees the creation of the Marshall D. Shulman Professorship in Soviet Foreign Policy at Columbia. The Shulman Chair, like Marshall himself, will always occupy a very special place at Columbia, and I am delighted to be able to share the good news with you.

And that is not all the good news. Marshall's friend Don Kendall, who is with us tonight, has authorized me to announce that, in honor of Marshall's lifetime of accomplishment, PepsiCo has committed $1 million to Columbia to create the PepsiCo Fellowships in Soviet Studies.

Truly, Marshall, these are wonderful expressions of the affection and esteem we all feel for you.

As Marshall enters a new phase in a brilliant career extolled by our distinguished speakers this evening, we count ourselves lucky that his wisdom, his humility, his decency, his intellectual integrity will continue to help shape the future of international studies at Columbia and of international diplomacy on our troubled planet.

When I speak of Marshall's humility, as you well know, I do not paint a picture of a shrinking violet, hiding from public view. Heaven forefend. I mean, rather, that Marshall is a practitioner of Disraeli's wise maxim that "To be conscious of one's own ignorance is the first step to understanding."

Marshall himself wrote at the time of Leonid Brezhnev's death four years ago: "Of course, it's heady fun, even flattering, being summoned from the library basement where I was hunched over dusty copies of *Pravda,* having makeup cover my bald spot and being thrust before the bright lights of television to tell the world not only all I know—but more besides."

"The problem is," Marshall wrote, "that prophecy isn't really our strong suit . . . The media want to know what's going to happen . . . It sounds lame to say, 'We don't know,' but that's the truth . . . In the wake of the flood of Brezhnev coverage, it is timely to remember the old commonsense axiom: 'It ain't the things you don't know that hurt you; it's the things you do know that ain't so'."

I am not sure who said that before Marshall did—it was either Will Rogers or Dostoevsky.

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight I am forcefully reminded of an important day a little more than four years ago. Pamela Harriman was with us then, too. Cy Vance was our guest lecturer. In the group that gathered to hear him were many of you. And I assigned myself a number of pleasant tasks, including the introduction of the first director of the W. Averell Harriman Institute for Advanced Study of the Soviet Union, Marshall Shulman.

You can see why I have an eerie feeling of *déjà vu.* Looking around at the familiar faces tonight, I think of the

puzzled little girl, the daughter of a host whose cocktail party was in full swing, who tugged at her father's sleeve and asked, "Daddy, haven't we had this party before?"

But of course we have not. There is an absence tonight of one who stood at the heart of that ceremony four years ago—and indeed at the heart of much of America's diplomacy in our century—the founder of the Harriman Institute. When death took Governor Harriman last summer, Columbia lost a dear friend; America lost its wisest son.

Averell and Pamela, with characteristic insight and wisdom, recognized that there is no greater threat to our future than the failure to study and understand the Soviet Union. And with characteristic generosity and resolve, they determined to do something about it.

You have heard, in Pamela's remarks tonight, what we at Columbia have presumed to be so: that a crucial ingredient in the founding of the Harriman Institute four years ago was Averell's and Pamela's strong belief in the quality of Marshall Shulman's leadership. Without Averell, without Pamela, and without Marshall, there would be no Harriman Institute at Columbia today. We are deeply grateful to all three.

And now the time has come to present to you a young man who entered the first class of Columbia's Russian Institute following service in the Air Force during World War II. He was born in Jersey City, raised in Detroit, and educated—presumably—at the University of Michigan, and definitely at Columbia. He is a man whose life has been constant motion between Morningside Heights and Washington, with important stops around the globe and an inexplicable detour to Cambridge, Massachusetts.

For all that, he remains a wonderful man with a great sense of fun. As Victor Borge said of Beethoven: "He was such a nice fellow, it's a wonder he amounted to anything at all."

Ladies and gentlemen, in these dark days of improvisational diplomacy, his commitment to the training of experts to bring competence and sanity to international affairs gives us hope for our future. I present to you now, Marshall Shulman.

Professor Emeritus

Marshall D. Shulman

Wow! I am truly overwhelmed by these panegyrics. We all know that if only half of them were true, they would still be an exaggeration. I have decided that since I am so well regarded, I am not going to retire after all.

Perhaps I will disappoint some of you if I say that I am almost speechless, but not quite. Mike's comments about humility reminded me of the man who was being celebrated on an occasion like this and in the midst of one speech tugged at the coattails of the speaker and said: "Don't forget about my modesty!" Well, the secret of becoming an elder statesman is clearly through sheer longevity, just living longer than other people who are more worthy of what has been said tonight. I looked up "emeritus" in the dictionary, and it says: "Retired from office by age, infirmity, or length of service." I asked Mike which it was. He said that the University had a problem in that no one really knew how they could discern when I would become senile. Many overly kind and generous things have been said tonight, and I pray that the good Lord will protect the souls of those who have spoken. Until this evening, I had regarded Cy as a man of impeccable probity. But had his encomiums tonight been expressed under oath, he would have been liable for benign perjury. And Pamela—it should be said that really the vision of the Institute owed so much to Pamela. She could visualize the possibility that an institute that was conceived in this way could be a perpetual monument to Averell, that it would do the things that he believed in so deeply, and that it would carry those ideals forward, and that people would forever have reason to think back with gratitude for his life and for what he stood for. It was Pamela who saw that very clearly at the beginning and who made this institute possible. The only thing that troubled me tonight was that when we were planning the Institute, Pamela was considering writing a clause into the contract that I should give up my motorcycle. I thought that I had persuaded her that it was really just a motorized rocking chair. But tonight, it seems that she wasn't deceived at all.

Al Stepan has given us inspiring leadership at the School of International and Public Affairs. It is an irony that after a brilliant record in international relations, we brought him to Columbia so that he could face the problems of a building like this, which has too many wonderful activities to have enough space for them, and too few elevators. I thought of Al not very kindly this afternoon when I was stuck in one of those elevators. But he has given us inspiring leadership for the whole cluster of programs on various regions of the world and various functions of international affairs. My belief is that the School will prove to have been one of the major focal centers for serious sustained work that crosses the regional boundaries. "It propinques," in George Ball's words. All one has to do is to get the elevators to work.

Seweryn, my dear colleague, was forged in the fires of World War II and trained at Columbia, and I'd like to

say that one of the things that Zbig Brzezinski and I have agreed upon for many years is that we both have had deep faith in Seweryn and believed that one day he would be one of the foremost scholars in the country, and would be the seminal thinker that he has proved to be. And so, I think that I speak for Zbig on this, we have great pride in what he has become, and we are proud of ourselves, too, for having seen that coming.

Michael Sovern has made an extraordinary commitment to make Columbia preeminent in international studies. That was an important commitment, and it was made before the events in the recent past that have given us a greater sense of urgency about it. When I came back from government this last time, I went to see Mike. He had been chosen as President, but not yet inaugurated, and I said to him, "This is what I think the country needs in the field of Soviet affairs, and I'm willing to do everything I can if you will back me up." And Mike said, "Do it, we'll back you up completely. This is what Columbia wants, and it's what the country needs." And he has indeed been as good as his word.

My friend Bob Legvold. When I first started to teach at Cambridge, my mentor then, who is also a friend of Zbig's, was Carl Friedrich. Carl—"Akhim," as he was called—took me to tea and said to me, "You may not believe this, now that you're beginning to teach, but one of your great joys will be when your best students stand on your shoulders and push past you." Bob Legvold has made that prophecy come true. I regard him as a wonderful man for the directorship of the Institute, not only because he is a distinguished scholar and a very good teacher, but because he is a man of character. And what is important in this field, I have come to believe, is not only intelligence, but character, because it is a field that has so many uncertainties that must be dealt with honestly and fairly, and which require an inner truthfulness to be able to weigh what we know and what we don't know. This, I think, means that character should be among the essential attributes, perhaps even higher than brilliance, in this field. So I am more than content—I am happy—that Bob will take the helm.

I also feel the presence here tonight, as Mike has said, of W. Averell Harriman, who is and always will be with us in all that we strive to do. I miss him. It's the first time in my life that he hasn't been around. And I have realized, more than I had before, what a lodestar he has been in our lives. What a true orientation he gave the compass—we should try to be faithful to him.

I would like to acknowledge before you all the contribution of Anne McSweeney, who is sitting over there, behind the flowers. She has joined the vision of Pamela and Averell Harriman and the resources of a great university, overcome the impracticalities of absent-minded professors like myself, and she has made the vision a reality. Without her, it wouldn't have happened.

I'd also like to speak of my inspiration, Colette. She will, I know, protect me from taking too literally the accolades bestowed upon me this evening. Members of my family are here: Colette's mother, brother, my brother, his wife, my daughter Lisa. It gives me great pleasure that they were able to join us this evening—and members of my student family, too, some of whom have come very long distances to be here. Some have, I would like to think, something of me in them, and others, I have to admit, have achieved great things in spite of me. But I have great pride in their achievements, and it touches me deeply that they are with us tonight. There are so many dear friends in this room, that I had been saying at dinner that I was a little worried about this evening and about the exaggerations that clearly would be expressed. The thing that I hadn't really anticipated was how deeply moved I would be by the presence of people whom I hold very dear indeed, who have done me the honor of being here tonight, and I thank you all for doing that. I would like to mention, also, that we're honored to have with us distinguished diplomats George Kennan, whom I respect so much; Tom Watson; and others, too, who have dedicated themselves to the diplomatic service of the country. And I have a word of encouragement for them: I would like them to know that we have extended our curriculum of training for diplomats who are preparing for service in Moscow. They are now all required to take courses in operating elevators and switchboards, in washing dishes, and in making pizzas.

It has been my good fortune to be a teacher. From my boyhood I have felt that the highest service I could imagine would be to be a professor. It has seemed to me, if I don't sound too soupy to you, a divine calling, a trust, like that of a man of the cloth. There have been times when I have come out of a classroom walking on air, thinking, What on God's green earth could I do that would be as deeply satisfying as watching these people grow and develop? And there have been other times when I didn't do that well. But now, my cup runneth over. Not only to have been a professor, but as I learned tonight, to have a chair that will bear my name—it seems to me the ultimate fulfillment. It means more to me than I can possibly say to you. I thank you all from the bottom of my heart for this extraordinary recognition. I suppose someday some students will ask, "Who was this fellow?" And somebody else will say, "I don't know, but he must have been rich." Well, rich I am, in friendship and kindness.

I would also like to express my thanks, my joy, tonight at the announcement of the PepsiCo Fellowships for students, which owe to the foresight of Don Kendall. He has devoted himself to the cause of better understanding of the Soviet Union, and it is characteristic of him to have seen that the place to begin is with the students. That's the important thing. The only thing that was wrong was that when I took Don to the bar tonight, what were they serving but Coca Cola.

Now I'd like to leave a few thoughts with you, prompted by this occasion. The road to this evening began forty-one years ago for me, in the Pacific, where I was waiting to be brought home at the conclusion of the war. It gave me time to think, to reflect on the meaning of the experience we had just been through, and particularly the atomic explosion. It seemed to me that it pointed to the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States as the crucial problem of the coming period, and I determined then to devote myself to this, and have done so. My preoccupation with the problem of nuclear weapons became so great that Colette says that when I want to make cocktail chatter I just talk about tactical nuclear weapons. But it is clear (is it not?) to all of us, that this is the essence of the matter. History has fated us to live in a period when a major fact of international life is the rivalry between the two great powers, as de Tocqueville foretold. The question that is in our hands to answer is how we will understand and how we will manage this relationship. It is a tormenting subject, full of complexities and contradictions. It is testing to the full our powers to understand, our strength of character, and wisdom to respond with an accurate and a proportionate measure to the challenge it represents. Our recent experiences have not been encouraging. The times have been out of joint; the drift of events has been toward a period of international chaos and violence. These are times of testing for all of us—how to be true to our values and to bring an enlightened understanding to the national management of the relationship, and, in particular, to the nuclear/military competition. There is no more critical need before the nation than to manage the competitive relationship with the Soviet Union knowledgeably and competently, so that it not only does not plunge the world into nuclear war, but leads toward a less dangerous and more constructive relationship in the future. This is particularly true at a time when the Soviet Union is going through significant changes, or possible changes—one cannot yet say. They require us to surmount the slogans and the primitive stereotypes that now govern public discussion of this central issue, and to respond to these changes—if they take place—in ways that will advance our security, our interests, and our democratic values. To make this possible, we shall have to prepare new generations of highly trained public officials, diplomats, scholars, journalists, and influential citizens capable of studying Soviet behavior and Soviet society with insight and objectivity.

This is the purpose to which we are now rededicating ourselves. The Harriman Institute was created to serve a flagship function, to raise the levels of advanced training and research on the Soviet Union across the United States and throughout the non-Communist world. The high quality of the students who have been attracted to the Institute since it was founded encourages the belief that the Institute will stand as a perpetual monument to the achievements and the purposes of Averell Harriman. We are engaged, all of us, in a noble enterprise—teachers,

administrators, and public citizens who share in the enterprise—and our hope and our reward will be in our students.

The effort is well begun. The time has now come to turn over the helm to others. I am delighted that it will be in the eminently capable hands of Robert Legvold. It may very well be that the most distinguished contribution I have made to the Institute is having participated in his selection as my successor. To paraphrase I do not know whom, perhaps it will be said of me that nothing became him in office like his leaving of it.

As for myself, I pray that the period ahead will be a culminating one. In the words of Robert Browning, "The best is yet to be, the last of life, for which the first was made." Yet I wondered today whether Robert Browning ever had the experience of climbing twelve flights of stairs in this building with a briefcase under his arm when the elevators failed. Thank you.