



UNITED STATES
MILITARY ACADEMY

WEST POINT, NEW YORK

The 16th
Sol Feinstone Lecture

on

THE
MEANING OF FREEDOM

by

Mr. A. Bartlett Giamatti

14 September 1988

The United States Military Academy is pleased to sponsor an annual lecture series on the Meaning of Freedom. It is significant that this lecture program has been made possible by the generosity of the late Mr. Sol Feinstone, a dedicated American patriot whose commitment to the ideals of the American Revolution led him to devote many years of effort, as well as considerable personal resources to the collection of important letters, manuscripts, and books dealing with our heritage of freedom. His donation of these items to libraries and educational institutions ensures that the message which they proclaim will be preserved and transmitted to future generations of Americans.

Mr. Feinstone's abiding faith in a brotherhood of free nations of men has found further expression in several lecture series which he has endowed in order to permit prominent Americans to interpret The Meaning of Freedom.

The U. S. Corps of Cadets and the staff and faculty of the Military Academy are pleased to recognize the generosity and loyalty of this great American for providing a living endowment in the defense of freedom.

AN EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM

Mr. A. Bartlett Giamatti

Thank you General Palmer, thank you Mrs. Palmer, for your extraordinary warmth and graciousness. I have never visited West Point before today, and I must say it's a profoundly moving experience for somebody to come for the first time the way I have. I'm grateful to you both for making me and Dr. McMullen so welcome. I'd like to thank Colonel Hoy and Lieutenant Colonel Kaufman for their remarkable graciousness in making us welcome as well.

In 1673, John Milton, old, blind, his head alive with visions and disappointments but still ever the revolutionary, published the second edition of an eight-page tract that he had first written thirty years earlier. That little pamphlet is called simply Of Education, and it is one of the most powerful treatises on education ever written in English. Echoing the ancients, especially Plato and Quintillian, it summarizes how a Christian faith and classical learning fuse to create an educated citizen who would strive to do, actively, the good in daily life because he knew what the good was in all its complexity and brilliant simplicity.

Several pages into this treatise, Milton says the following: "I call ... a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skillfully and magnanimously all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war." An education to prepare one to perform the offices of peace and war is your education, too; indeed, it should be the education of any citizen who wishes in any way to serve his or her country, and that -- I hope -- is every citizen.

Milton's educational scheme, therefore, has a civic goal as its end; he sees the purpose of intellectual training as finally leading to the good life lived with others. He does not propose an education for the offices of retired contemplation -- which would be a purely religious end; nor the offices in education for the offices of academic fulfillment -- knowledge for its own sake. While Milton's vision of education would incorporate both those goals, the larger end for him is the making of a citizen who would actively, forcefully participate in the shaping and the serving and the protecting of the state.

The state he happened to serve was the Puritan commonwealth -- the theocracy -- of Oliver Cromwell. Speaking only for myself, that is not my ideal state. I

*The Sixteenth Annual Sol Feinstone Lecture on "The Meaning of Freedom," presented at the United States Military Academy on September 14, 1988. Text is an edited version of the address. Copyright 1988 by A. Bartlett Giamatti.

would much prefer, thank you, our democratic constitutional republic. But the kind of state animated by this education, however, is not our issue, any more than the precise content -- the curriculum -- of the educational course of study is our concern. Students in military academies pursue curricula that may have some different requirements or some different emphases from siblings or peers in so-called liberal arts institutions or colleges of business or law or commerce or other professions. In this country, in fact, we cherish and promote this kind of diversity of educational method and this variety of types of institutions for education. We believe there ought to be diversity of route to serving the public's needs, a diversity that serves a vastly heterogeneous population, a diversity that induces competition among institutions of higher education so that quality in the marketplace will be most efficiently delivered, a diversity of method, of course work and indeed a kind of college or university that will maintain as many ways and things to know as possible. We believe as Americans in diversity in and of itself -- as a positive value.

But for all this diversity, there must be -- and I think there is -- a unity of purpose, lest fragments fly off in all directions and no common goal or purpose exists. And in much of our educational philosophy, there is such a goal: in fact it is Milton's goal -- the civic result, the making of the good citizen -- and that is at its heart a concern with freedom.

I know freedom is our subject tonight, and we all know that freedom is an immense topic. When I first received the gracious invitation of the Academy to think aloud about freedom with you, I began to wonder what kind of freedom? I recalled Erich Fromm's distinction between freedom from -- from want, from hunger, from oppression -- and freedom for -- freedom for belief, for speech, and for assembly. I then thought that the state of freedom was in fact the state of liberty; that is, a state of being unrestrained by a prior restraint. I decided, therefore, that liberty and freedom were sufficiently similar so I would not worry overmuch about defining both, but confine myself to one. I also decided, Dr. Fromm to the contrary notwithstanding, that freedom to or for or by or about was an endless splitting of prepositional hairs -- that, in fact, our subject is the condition of freedom as a vibrant reality as well as a beckoning goal.

But what could I, said I in an internal monologue to which you will be subjected in its entirety, what could I, a mere civilian, one-time English teacher now privileged to work in the National Pastime, what could I contribute to the thinking on freedom at this ancient and famous Academy, seat of learning and training for one of the world's oldest and most difficult professions, a place that has nurtured some of the greatest thinkers, technicians, and men of action in our nation's history and home now to some of America's most

talented and committed young people? I decided that I could bring only what I had, which is a perspective on the condition or state of freedom as it is and has been the goal, deeply held and rarely articulated but omnipresent, for education as it has developed in the Western world. I remembered Milton's treatise and his assertion that education was the development of the capacity to perform all those offices, public and private, of peace and war, and I knew that if I had anything to share with you on the subject of freedom, it was how we came to believe what Milton said, and why -- regardless of where or what or how we study in America today -- we should believe it still.

Let me, therefore, tell you what I believe the condition of freedom to be, and then describe my view of how we in the West have arrived at that view. It may strike you that I am presenting my conclusions before I present the process that led to those conclusions. But, in fact, I think the elements of the condition of freedom are a constant -- whether you find them in Plato's Academy or West Point's, and I owe it to you to state my convictions -- conclusory as they may sound -- at the outset.

I believe that civilized order is the precondition of any freedom, and freedom is the goal of a responsible order. I believe, therefore, that there is no true freedom without order. I believe, further, that as we go along we learn there are limits to our freedom, limits we learn to choose freely in order not to undermine what we seek. After all, if there were, on the one hand, no restraints, no limits at all, but only the unfettered free play of desire -- everybody doing what he or she pleased -- then only anarchy of intellect and individual behavior and chaos of community would result. On the other hand, if all were restraint, if some overmastering order were all there were in reality, then release -- of any kind of energy, of inquiry, of emotion, of thought -- would be stifled, and another death, the death of the spirit and the denial of freedom, could only result.

To find freedom, therefore, I believe there must be the interplay of restraint and release, of limit and liberty, of order and energy, for that condition we call freedom to exist at all in our individual lives or in our life together. Without such an interplay -- called checks and balances in our constitutional system, called curbing and spurring in horsemanship, called sowing and reaping in our most ancient image of freedom within order, which is a farmed field -- without such an interplay within each of us, there can be no good life for any of us. Without freedom for one, there can be no real freedom for many. Freedom tends to exist as a condition only in a community of some kind, because only then is it tested by competing urges to freedom; only then in some communal setting is it the significant compound that binds us together as it releases our humanity. What we finally learn, I think, is how this mysterious condition of freedom depends for its very

existence and its life-enhancing significance upon freely chosen forms of order.

How did such a view arise, of freedom being compounded of order and liberty, of reason and energy, each feeding and confirming the other to make the condition that we call "free"? Such ideas arose very early in the West and they remain constant. Different ages have expressed differently the commitment of a private mind to promoting a decent public order, which public order ensures the freedom of the private mind. Each age differently expresses its commitment to strength in the service of a common good, not in the service of an oppressive singleness of existence; and each age finds its own way, its own methodology for training the young in how to cherish and foster the essential values of life that can only be defined, much less flourish, in a condition of freedom.

But all ages, from Plato's Athens and Cicero's Rome, to Italy's Renaissance Republics to Milton's London, to the Philadelphia of our Founders, who desired the most that any people have ever aspired to make a reality, which was an independence that is a "far more perfect union," all have believed three things: first, freedom in some sense is the goal of civilization's restraints; second, freedom is the responsibility of all ethically educated women and men -- not just some; not just philosophers or theologians, but soldiers and painters and farmers and lawyers and weavers and bankers and people of commerce -- the high and the low, the rich and the poor, all who would enjoy freedom are responsible for understanding it first; and third, that education is the primary way to understanding freedom because freedom is not something that simply occurs, wild in nature; it was and always has been and is something made, not born; something crafted and cherished and ever guarded. A garden, after all, does not occur in nature. The jungle occurs; a forest occurs. A garden is made, not born, and is the result of cutting back as much as of growing, pruning as much as of planting, and it takes work -- real work -- lest the wild or the jungle come back and back and swiftly and silently reclaim its own. It is not mere chance, far from it, that our oldest image of civilization in the West is a garden -- either in Homer's Golden Age or in that place in Eden in Genesis. That is our earliest image of freedom -- a garden made by some Planter's Hand -- and those values of order leading to liberty, to liberality, to a full life are best -- indeed can only be. The West has decided -- transmitted by education, by the turning and cultivating of the soil of the mind -- or to change the figure -- by the toughening and training of the muscle of the mind, to apprehend an order in things so as to free each of us up.

All this Milton knew, and told us, was at the heart of performing the private and public offices of peace and war. Milton stood, in the late 17th century, at the end of the revival of the ancients and at the outer borders of the modern world. He was a Janus, facing both ways, back to our

common past, forward to what he knew was an expansive and difficult future, which is of course our present. To understand how he saw education, and made us see it, for we still share his values and they are what matter, let me go back and describe our subject -- Freedom -- not now as a condition but as the developing vision of education and of education's goal across western civilization.

The educational process whereby the mind is ordered so that it may be open is called by the ancients (and still by us) a liberal education. "Liberal" in this context has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with those meaningless designer labels, "liberal" and "conservative," that politicians and journalists and some others lovingly stitch on the rear ends of various ideas and ideologies. Those political connotations are completely irrelevant to this conversation, as they are to most serious discourse. Nor does "liberal" in this usage necessarily have anything to do with Cardinal Newman's idea of a liberal education as distinct from a commercial or technical one as found in the fifth discourse of that great book, The Idea of the University. By liberal education, I mean a training in the root meaning of the word liberal, ultimately derived from the Latin liber, which means free, the same Latin root that gives us liberty. In this meaning, a liberal education is training in freedom, and the ancients understood it this way. It is training in how to discern those essential human values that make us free, and in how to express, in speech and writing, our commitment to those values in order to keep us free. It is an education at whose core is the study of history, the history of the struggle of individuals or peoples to create institutions -- families, games, churches, schools, economic or legal systems, governments -- that will preserve an individual's or a people's freedom.

Such an education looks back at our common Western heritage and is one of the central means by which that heritage has been and is made continuous and available to the future. Let me trace briefly where the powerful idea and reality of a liberal education, an education concerned with freedom, came from and why it is so important we keep fresh and new the ancient traditions such an education embodies. I want to speak of the humanities and of humanistic study.

To discover what is meant by the Humanities as an education for freedom, in the true meaning of the word as it developed over practically 1900 years of our history, we must examine some other words and concepts. Those concepts or words are Renaissance, humanism, and humanist. Only by those routes can we get back to humanities, or studia humanitatis, or liberal studies, or studia liberalis. At that point, we will have arrived at the conjunction of wisdom and eloquence whose expression, the West believed, is necessary to make us free and keep us free. We will proceed therefore to freedom by way of history.

Giorgio Vasari, who in 1550 published a famous book

called Lives of the Great Painters, Sculptors and Architects, first used the Italian word renascita to describe the rebirth of arts and letters in the two centuries preceding him. We do not use, however, that Italian word to describe the great period in Western culture between 1350 and 1650. We use the French word renaissance because in the 19th century the famous French historian Jules Michelet published his massive History of France, the seventh volume of which was entitled La Renaissance. The result was that period was forever after in Western and American culture designated by the French word.

The renaissance is, to some extent, therefore, an invention of the nineteenth century, at least as a historical term. So also is the word Humanism. Humanism was coined as a word in 1808 by a German high school teacher named Friedrich Niethammer, who was upset with the vocational direction taken by German secondary education. He wished to defend the study of Latin and Greek and invented the word humanism. Therefore, although Renaissance and its central educational movement for the elite, humanism, derive as terms from the nineteenth century, they have their roots in that three-hundred-year European reality that occurred between the middle of the fourteenth and the middle of the seventeenth century.

A Humanist was simply somebody in the Italian university of the 1480's and 1490's and the 1500's who was a person who taught Greek and Latin letters for a living, whether a professor, a student or a teacher. It finally became the term applied to anybody who taught ancient letters or emulated ancient wisdom or promoted ancient languages and it came to include secretaries to rulers, civil servants, anybody who wrote or instructed others in ancient thought and civic virtue. Humanism is finally defined as either the study and transmission of ancient ethics and ancient letters or as the propagation of civic virtue based on ancient ethics and Christian precept.

The studia humanitatis, humanities, came from the Romans. Cicero and Gellius, Roman philosophers and orators, used the term studia humanitatis to translate into Latin the Greek word paideia. Paideia meant culture or education; it really meant those cultural values whose study is education and whose understanding or apprehension creates the good citizen. These "humanities" or "good arts," as the ancients called them, were the means, the Renaissance said, whereby wisdom is gained; once gained, it was shaped and refined by rhetoric, the art of speaking and writing well that moves the private perception of the good out of the self and into the public, where virtue was then able, when persuasively presented, to shape the free and civil state.

To conjoin, therefore, wisdom with eloquence, thence to move humankind to freedom and virtue in civic or political terms, was the driving ideal behind the Renaissance's study of the ancients and of the study of the subjects of grammar, rhetoric, history, poetry, and moral philosophy, which are

what the humanities were. Humanism, the humanists, the study of the humanities, all of this was supposed to be done to celebrate the active life, not the contemplative one. It was meant to promote the active engagement with the world in so far as we are political and civic beings. The purpose of study was to improve, by enlarging the freedom, the political life of the community. It was meant to improve the lot of human beings not simply as some ancients that celebrated that life but as indeed the Christian faith taught as well.

Let me illustrate these assertions about freedom, because they have formed the heart and soul of everything that we have inherited in all our educational systems. Let me illustrate these assertions about freedom and education by citing one of the most influential treatises on education written in the Renaissance. We would now say that this was a treatise on humanism by a humanist about the humanities. Peter Paul Vergerio, of Padua, who wrote this treatise in about 1404, dedicated it to a noblemen's son and entitled it simply "On The Noble Customs." Vergerio treats the purpose of education for the young, the subjects of study, how to exercise and train for war, how to find recreation. It is a fascinating treatise; like all wise writers on education, Vergerio is interested in the whole person.

Remember that for him the core meaning of "liberal" was "free." He says that "liberal studies," -- that's what he calls it, "studia liberalis" -- give first place to history, next to philosophy, and then to eloquence.

By philosophy, we learn the essential truth of things, which by eloquence we so exhibit in orderly adornment as to bring conviction to differing minds. And history provides the light of experience -- a cumulative wisdom fit to supplement the force of reason and the persuasion of eloquence. For we allow that soundness of judgment, wisdom of speech, integrity of conduct, are the marks of a truly liberal temper.

After establishing the conditions of a truly free mentality, what he calls a truly liberal temper, Vergerio then reviews the other subjects that are necessary to study in order to create in oneself this condition or mentality -- grammar, poetry, arithmetic, music -- and offers the clearest statement anybody does of the place of this kind of study, leading to this kind of condition of freedom in the life of any human being.

Respecting the general place of liberal studies, we remember that Aristotle would not have them absorb the entire interests of life; for he kept steadily in view the nature of man as a citizen, an active member of the State. For the man who has surrendered himself absolutely to the attractions of letters or speculative thought follows, perhaps, a self-regarding end and is

therefore useless as a citizen or as a prince.

What he said and what Western culture believes is that study should be lifelong but not life consuming. If the life is consumed in study for freedom, the study is not shared; if it is not shared, it cannot be useful to others in enlarging their freedom; if it is not useful to others, it plays no role in shaping the freedom and cohesion of the Civil State in which everyone, the learned and the unlearned, may live a free and decent life.

The humanities, in short, were elite culture but not the private property of the elite. If a person kept his learning for the condition of freedom to himself, he had not in their view gained wisdom. He was merely informed; he had failed to become educated. The humanists of the Renaissance knew better than anyone -- and we ought to remember today -- that the very word education is most probably derived from the Latin, educere, "to lead out;" it is the leading out of the condition of freedom in the individual mind, out into the public for the greater good, that was the constant goal of humanistic study, and should be so today.

If the end of study was to enlarge freedom in its paradoxical compound of order and liberty, is that civic goal assured simply by the studying of the humanities and by the sharing in active, daily life -- by deeds, not simply by words -- the fruits of that study? Yes, Vergerio would have said -- if the subjects studied are those designed to make a person better, then the study of them will lead to betterment. What he actually says is that if the studies are liberal, designed to induce freedom, they will lead out to greater freedom. But let him say it himself one last time:

We call those studies liberal which are worthy of a free man: those studies by which we attain and practice virtue and wisdom; that education which calls forth, trains and develops those highest gifts of body and of mind which ennoble men, and which are rightly judged to rank next in dignity to virtue only.

That is how the west for most of our history has believed an education to freedom works.

If those who are free study the liberal arts, study the studia humanitatis that exalt freedom and recall the condition of humankind in freedom, if they are truly internalized, then freedom -- intellectual and political -- will be maintained. It is no accident that Humanism -- this perspective on freeing the mind in order to maintain a free state -- first developed and spread from Florence and Venice, which were republics, ruled by electorates based upon the ideals that they had studied closely and well of the Roman Republic and Periclean Athens.

All of this lay behind Milton's convictions that education is meant to fit us to perform all the offices,

public and private of peace and war -- meant to fit us to perform all the offices of an active life. He knew, and he passed on, the humanist devising of an educational program based on our instinctive human urge to surge to freedom, first articulated by the ancients, refined and affirmed by the moderns. Milton, like them, and like us, believed that such study was a life-long activity of a citizen. They believed, and I believe, that education pursued in a rigorous and disciplined fashion creates in the mind the ideal and the reality of the very condition of freedom.

The mind, as we have suggested, is a muscle. By working it hard, by stretching and exercising it according to a program -- a curriculum -- by toughening this muscle, ordering it, training it in its limits, it will find its strength, its true power, its compounded force. That is to create in the mind by the mind the condition of freedom; and that is to bring it to discover its full range and power by disciplining and toughening it, the mind will release itself, free itself just as through exercise and rigorous work the body develops itself to find its full potential; which is both a combination of its maximum energy and its own inborn limitations. When that happens -- when, however you define it, by application, by sweating the sinews of the intellect, by grappling with various aspects of life by thinking hard, the mind will have apprehended the ideals -- but even more than the ideals the sensation -- of a full and free life for itself and can then bring to daily existence, for the benefit of itself and others, that very same condition for the community's everyday life.

Above all, this practical and concrete program of study knew one great basic truth that has animated Western thought from the Greeks through the nineteenth century, and which we must never, never forget: If there must be an effective education in liberty of mind so that there will be liberty of civic behavior, that is because political freedom is predicated upon freedom of thought. We must never forget whatever our duties or beliefs -- that if freedom does not first reside in the mind, it cannot finally reside anywhere. If we love freedom and if we are bound to protect and serve it, then freedom must first exist as the condition of the individual mind, comprehended through the toughening and ordering of the individual mind, before it can in any sense truly exist in family or community or country.

Is this view of the purpose of an education for freedom in conflict with the kind of education you receive here, or others sworn to defend the country receive elsewhere in other service academies, or indeed others receive in technical or commercial or so called liberal programs of study? I don't think so; indeed, I think quite the opposite. The purpose of your education, regardless of its content, the purpose must be to induce in you an understanding of the condition of freedom so that you may know precisely what it is, in all its complexity and brilliant simplicity, that it is to be served and protected.

We know that freedom does not mean simply doing whatever you feel like doing, or following your own impulse or whim or sentiment in disregard of the rights or needs of others. We know that freedom in our democracy and in anyone's version of a practical, working democracy is a tough, crafted alloy, a man-made compound -- whether justified by natural law or not, whether divinely sanctioned or not -- it is the mix, in the mind and in the state, of limits and liberty, of order and energy; it is the strength deriving from the disciplined imagination.

Rather than being in conflict with the training here, I would hope that such a view would be very near the core of everything that is taught, else how will you know in your guts and brains what that freedom you bear such a responsibility to defend consists of? We all as citizens have that responsibility and no one can shirk it, but you have been given and have freely assumed here a unique burden to train and to be those who will perform all the offices, public and private, of peace and war.

I trust, therefore, at the center of your superb education here is that deep instinct for the goal of education as the definition and fostering of freedom as we as a people have defined it. And I hope, and I believe, that within your training here there lie three efforts: first, to deepen a sense of history, so that future leaders, which is what you are, will know who they are as human beings and as Americans; second, to develop the capacity to think not simply obediently but analytically and creatively, each mode testing and affirming the other -- the very operation of the creation of the condition of freedom at least as I understand it; and third, to have the ability to express your thinking, of whatever kind, with logic and clarity, which two qualities will give grace. Leadership, in the military or anywhere else, is not a function of memo or the mere issuance of order; leadership is as hard as the assertion of a moral vision, the forceful communication, by deed as well as word, of conviction based on clarity and courage. The communication of it is as important as the achievement. By those ordering acts, by that kind of mental toughening, one begins to make the mind free, and thus affirm order, and thereby preserve the freedom of all of us.

In America, it has ever been the case that in order to make a good soldier, one must first make the good citizen. Unlike most societies in the history of the west, in this society those two roles are hardly in conflict or incompatible; indeed they must fit, and by and large they have and do in this 200+ year history of ours. This great Academy has as its mission the preservation of a society of justice, equality and dignity for all. Here the offices of peace and war, as matters of private mind and public duty, are completely understood. It is not as important that humanities per se are embraced in all their historical splendor as it is that their motive, the maintenance of freedom within and without, is an active, daily principle of

training for leadership. It is a complex task, but the condition of freedom is always hard won and dearly maintained. Nothing is more precious in this life. Life as we know it is compounded of that compound which is freedom. Let that my friends, then, be our individual conviction, just as our common desire, every moment, will be to preserve an America which is civil, cohesive and free.

ABOUT THE SPEAKER ...

Mr. A. Bartlett Giamatti is a true Renaissance man whose accomplishments as a teacher, scholar, and administrator led him to the Presidency of Yale University, to national recognition as a spokesman for excellence in education, to his selection as the President of the National Baseball League, and most recently to his election as the seventh Commissioner of Baseball.

A. Bartlett Giamatti was raised in South Hadley, Massachusetts, only a few blocks from Mount Holyoke College, where his father was a professor of Romance languages and Italian literature. Majoring in English, he graduated magna cum laude from Yale in 1960, and sustained by a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship, received his Ph.D. in comparative literature from Yale in 1964.

After two years at Princeton as an instructor in Italian and comparative literature, he joined the Yale faculty as an assistant professor of English. As a respected scholar of medieval and Renaissance literature and one of Yale's most popular teachers, Dr. Giamatti rose rapidly in academic rank, becoming a full professor in 1971. In 1977 he assumed the John Hay Whitney Professorship of English and Comparative Literature.

Selected in 1978 at age thirty-nine to be Yale's youngest president in more than 200 years and its first not wholly of Anglo-Saxon ancestry, he distinguished himself quickly as a national leader among those seeking to stimulate academic excellence in American higher education. At Yale he resisted the increasing trend toward vocationalism and championed that university's return to a more structured core curriculum with more emphasis on the fundamental areas of the liberal arts and with required courses in science, the social sciences and foreign languages.

"It is not enough," he said in 1983, "to offer a smorgasbord of courses. We must insure that students are not just eating at one end of the table." During his eight-year presidency he was recognized widely for having returned Yale to its traditionally prominent place among American institutions of higher learning.

Dr. Giamatti has had a lifetime interest in baseball. When selected to be Yale's president, this long-time Boston Red Sox fan jestingly told newsmen that his only ambition in life was to be president of the American League, not Yale. He has written widely and with knowledge and feeling about the national pastime. In 1977 he won a sports writers' award for an essay in Harper's on "Tom Seaver's Farewell," which criticized the New York Mets for trading Seaver, "a man of such qualities of heart and mind and body that he transcends even the great and glorious game, ...such a man is to be cherished, not sold." In 1986 such sensitivity and principle, and his experience and reputation as a tough-minded administrator, led to his selection as the twelfth

President of the National Baseball League.

The historian Jacques Barzun has said that "to know America, you must know baseball." If so, then A. Bartlett Giamatti's perspective on "The Meaning of Freedom" promises a richness appropriate to the legacy of Sol Feinstein.

PAST FEINSTONE LECTURES

- 1971 - General Harold K. Johnson
- 1975 - Rear Admiral Jeremiah A. Denton, Jr.
- 1976 - Herman Wouk
- 1977 - Sidney Hook
- 1978 - Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.
- 1979 - Barbara W. Tuchman
- 1980 - Alistair Cook
- 1980 - Isaac Bashevis Singer
- 1981 - Carl Sagan
- 1982 - George F. Will
- 1983 - Hanna H. Gray
- 1984 - Milton Friedman
- 1985 - Daniel Patrick Moynihan
- 1986 - Tom Wolfe
- 1987 - Elie Wiesel



Dr. Sol Feinstone, (1888-1980), Founder and First Director of the David Library of the American Revolution, Washington Crossing, Pennsylvania, presenting to Major General J.B. Lampert, Superintendent, USMA, a gift of an original George Washington Letter (24 February 1965).

SOL FEINSTONE'S CREDO

DEDICATED TO

The Judeo-Christian commitment of self-sacrifice for peace on earth, and the brotherhood of free nations of free men;

The Spirit of '76, a struggle of free men to remain free;

The immigrants who came after the revolution and helped build our country in freedom;

The underprivileged of all races who, by uplifting themselves, will raise all mankind to a higher humanity.

MY DEFINITION OF FREEDOM

In the beginning there was the void of sameness; the spark of life made everything different.

The stamp of sameness is the stamp of death.

Freedom to me means a social order based on individual freedom to live differently and to dream differently. I dream of a Brotherhood of Free Nations of Free Men.

Sol Feinstone

