

A black and white portrait of Leonard Garment, an older man with white hair, wearing a suit and tie. He is looking slightly to the right of the camera with a thoughtful expression. The background is a patterned fabric with large, dark, circular motifs.

**What do the arts need, and what is appropriate,
at this particular time and place? The answer
lies in the nation's agenda for education.**

— Leonard Garment, 1989

I AM HONORED that the Friends of Nancy Hanks and the American Council for the Arts have asked me to offer you some thoughts this evening about the arts and public policy. I will try to explain why I thought it so important in 1969 that the government give sustained subsidy to the arts and how right or wrong those thoughts seem now, 20 years later. But I want to be sure there is no misunderstanding about the limits of my qualifications to speak on the subject.

My connection with the arts, or at least with government and the arts, came from the accident of my association and friendship with Nancy Hanks, which began in 1969 and continued until her death. I took part in the events surrounding her appointment to the chairmanship of the National Endowment for the Arts, and it was through her that I participated in the subsequent growth of public support for the arts.

My part of that accident began back in 1963, when Richard Nixon, after his unsuccessful campaign for the California governorship, pulled up stakes and moved to New York to establish a new venue for his career. He joined the firm in which I was a commercial trial lawyer, and thus Mr. Nixon and I became law partners.

Six years and several thousand fascinating incidents later, I found myself in Washington helping by then President Nixon staff his new administration. My assigned search areas — to put it more precisely, the areas I appropriated because nobody else was particularly interested — were race, culture, and a grab bag of eclectic ideas about social programs the might alleviate the corrosive mood of America in the late 1960s.

One of our enterprises was to search for a new chairman to replace Roger Stevens, who of course had gotten the endowment underway in 1965. Actually, the correct word was not “replace,” for everyone knew Roger Stevens was irreplaceable. But with our choice of his successor we wanted at least to demonstrate that Republicans, too, could provide capable and devoted leadership in the arts. Our efforts were conducted under the watchful eyes of those Congressional midwives of government and the arts, Jack Javits and Clairborne Pell, who in the event prevented false starts from turning into fatal blunders.

The search squad included by friend Michael Straight, Roger Stevens himself, Charles McWhorter, a long-time assistant to Richard Nixon and a non-stop supporter of artists and arts organizations, and Nancy Hanks.

Nancy’s line of work was very different from mine. She spent her pre-government years administering a variety of public policy research projects for the Rockefeller family, and in 1969 she was also president of the Associated Councils on the Arts. But people who swim in the sea of America’s open, diverse, and relentlessly inclusive politics occasionally collide with a kindred soul who has a common interest or a matching resource. Together they do something neither could have done alone. And that’s what happened with Nancy and me.

One day as our search group labored through its frustrating job, we looked around and there in our midst, like Poe’s purloined letter, was Nancy Hanks. “Not me,” she protested. “Yes, you,” we insisted. The rest, as they say, is history.

Actually, what I’ve told you about landing in the area of arts policy by accident is not the whole story. Some personal history did propel me in that direction. I grew up in the 1920s and 1930s in the catch-as-catch-can culture of East New York and Crown Heights. These were sections of Brooklyn populated largely by immigrant Jews, like my parents, from Russia and Poland and elsewhere in Central Europe, but these neighborhoods also touched and were influenced by ethnic and racial enclaves filled with other immigrant groups — Irish, Italians, Germans and Southern Blacks.

Brooklyn in those decades was a commotion of cultures. By now there exists a small library of books — including one called *When Brooklyn Was The World* — that tell about the outpouring of novelists, poets and songwriters, jokesters, jugglers and artists of every description who grew up in Brooklyn or came to do their work in Brooklyn during those years. The names and numbers are astonishing: There were “The Three Normans,” Podhoretz, Mailer and Rosten; Irving Thalberg, Henry Miller, Alan King, Woody Allen, Mel

1989 Nancy Hanks Lecture on Arts and Public Policy

April 12, 1989

National Academy of Sciences
Washington, D.C.

Sponsored by the Gannett Foundation

Leonard Garment

Brooks, the architect Morris Lapidus, Danny Kaye, Alfred Kazin, Lena Horne, Robert Merrill, Richard Tucker . . . that's not even a start. When Duke Ellington wrote his famous tune "Take the A Train," everyone knew he meant the independent subway line that connected Harlem with Brooklyn's Bedford-Stuyvesant. And our "landlord" in this impressive building, Dr. Frank Press, president of the National Academy of Sciences, also grew up in the Brooklyn of those years. He was my closest friend, and the two of us hyper-energetic teenage idealists talked endlessly about our dreams of reforming the world.

IT WAS MY GREAT LUCK to live in Brooklyn when an exuberant sense of experiment and possibility was in the air. Shortly after my mother Jennie arrived in the country from Poland, she went to work in the Wallenstein and Gershwin restaurant on the lower East Side, where she functioned as cashier and occasional companion to the children of one of the owners including a boy named George. As George Gershwin's reputation grew, my mother's account of her role in his upbringing kept pace, and during my childhood the opening clarinet glissando of "Rhapsody in Blue" was drilled into my head.

My older brothers, children of their time and place, were fanatic collectors of 78 RPM jazz and swing records, especially those of the great Benny Goodman. The neighborhood was literally clogged with talented kids who would one day take their places in jazz history: Terry Gibbs, Tiny Kahn, Frankie Socolow and later on Al Cohn and Randy Weston. They became not only my educational models but my friends and heroes.

When I finally decided to study clarinet at the age of 14 in 1938, my mother bought me a Buffet, the world's finest and most expensive clarinet. She paid for it week after week for years out of the glass jar containing the reserve from her household allowance. In a year or two we added a Martin tenor saxophone, and I was launched into my first educational and occupational passion: to be a jazz musician.

In 1942 the tenor saxophone unlocked the door to a small practice room at Brooklyn College where I met a man named Rector Bailey, a Charlie Christian-style guitarist who opened my ears by teaching me variations on basic blues changes and took me to places like the Putnam Social Club in Bedford-Stuyvesant to

listen and sit in. There my eyes, and not just my ears, were opened. Racial integration, even as an idea, was hardly talked about in those days. Actually integration, quaintly called "mixing," was even more rare and was viewed as an exotic, even dangerous thing. But for a young musician educated by raspy phonograph recordings of Louis Armstrong and Lester Young and Billie Holiday, this real-life introduction to the world of jazz was the pure gold of opportunity itself.

Then and in the years that followed — when I was working on 52nd Street, running frantically around to hear Charlie Parker's amazing new music called bebop, playing and living side by side with white and black jazz musicians in New York and on the road — my idealism became imbedded in the concrete of real experience.

I will spare you the details of my truncated career. I was good enough to play with some superb jazz artists but smart enough to know I couldn't do what they did. So I became a full-time lawyer and part-time musician. But in the years that followed, even when I was in government, I never felt fully separated from that world. With us tonight is Willis Conover, the Voice of America's long-time spokesman for American jazz, who took me to jam sessions with Russian musicians in Moscow in 1969. These days when I sit in I wait until the last set so the customers won't complain.

Jazz gave me the pleasure of playing and ease of access to worlds and people that would otherwise have remained abstract or alien or even frightening, but it gave me more than that. It taught me some general rules governing the practice of the arts.

It taught me the importance of fundamentals. Either you learn how your instrument works and what the musical rules are or you give up and get out.

It made me open always and everywhere to possibilities. That is what improvisation is about: you learn the rules, the forms, the themes, and then the variations are virtually infinite.

And most important, it taught me that there is nothing more central than standards. The first-rate jazz musicians among whom I grew up were frequently careless or self-indulgent, often dangerously so, about their personal lives. But they were tough-minded about artistic quality, their own and that of others. They quickly identified and rejected work that was bogus or second-rate. They were unsentimental, even cruel, toward players

who did not measure up. And they were right to be so. I was one of those who got the message, and that is why I took what talents I had elsewhere.

It is then no mystery why I was so sure in 1969 that the arts deserved more substantial federal recognition and support. My life had shown me beyond doubt that the arts were both a private need and a public good, that the arts existed for themselves and for their role in society, and that artists and artistic institutions could certainly use the money. And that, by God, was that.

AN UNEXAMINED LIFE, we are reminded almost to distraction, is not worth living. One might say as well that an unexamined government program is not worth sustaining. So now, 20 years after I went to work without a blink of ambivalence, joining Nancy Hanks and Michael Straight in the task of obtaining major funding for the arts, it's time to do some examining. As you will hear, I come out in more or less the same place — but with a few caveats, footnotes and suggestions.

In 1969 I was not looking for ironies in our campaign in behalf of the arts endowment. But today, from the vantage point of two decades later, one irony is especially clear: the refounding of the National Endowment for the Arts, for that is what it was, did not come about just because the powers that be suddenly changed their minds one morning and decided it was time to give culture the respect it deserved. Nor did it happen mainly because President Nixon was persuaded of the concrete political benefits that support for the arts would bring him.

More important was that Richard Nixon knew the extent to which the Vietnam War had turned America into two mutually hostile camps. The president wanted for his own an issue that would not automatically divide his audience into sympathetic hawks and hostile doves. It was more an effort to soften and survive than to divide and conquer, but this was the reason why my arguments found favor so easily with the president.

In other words, it was the country's biggest problem that provided Nancy and me with our opportunity. The political scientist John W. Kingdon has given a name to situations like the one we faced in 1969. He has written that major public policy initiatives usually go nowhere until historical events open up a "policy

window," like the temporary windows of good weather that NASA watches for when planning a space shot. A policy window opens when the community sees a pressing problem and when the policy idea proposed to meet that problem also meets the political needs of the elected officials who are involved.

At times like this, the problem that the community has focused on may not be the right problem. The calculations of the elected officials may seem cynical. But advocates pushing for a policy change do not have the luxury of asking for a better process. They take what they can get or they will get nothing at all.

That is what happened to us, and because of Nancy's enormous skills, our opportunity was pushed to its limits.

In the political circumstances that prevailed during those days, the arts endowment and its friends were probably right not to define their goals too exactly or get too specific in talking about why the country needed the arts. If the endowment made very clear distinctions between the arts activities most deserving of government help and the ones that should get none, the organization would almost certainly alienate some part of the different arts constituencies that Nancy Hanks was so creatively building all across the country. Even now, when critics call for a more well defined and coherent strategy by government arts organizations, these groups tend to resist and understandably so, out of fear of alienating the same constituency groups.

Jazz gave me the pleasure
of playing and **ease** of
access to worlds and
people that would otherwise
have remained **abstract** or
alien or even **frightening**, but
it gave me **more** than
that. It taught me some
general rules
governing the **practice**
of the arts.

The crucial problem with this political logic is that the policy window that once provided space for huge growth in the endowment closed long ago. The signal came at the beginning of the Reagan years, with the administration's proposal for deep budget cuts. Without Frank Hodson's extraordinary skill as chairman, and the line drawn and held by key members of Congress, like Clairborne Pell and Sidney Yates and members of the Congressional Arts Caucus, the damage would have been worse than it was. Even with all their efforts, funding has, as we know, not kept pace with inflation.

More has happened, though, than just the loss of money. In some states and localities, and even on the federal level, we have begun to see something not seen since the early days of the endowment, which is the open expression by some political and community figures of an active antagonism towards government support for the arts.

One dramatic example that many of you must be aware of occurred little more than a month ago, when the Ways and Means Committee of the Massachusetts House of Representative eliminated the entire budget appropriation for the state arts council. The cut was particularly shocking because of the high national regard in which the Massachusetts council is held. The Massachusetts House as a whole fought off the original committee proposal but ended up cutting the arts council budget in half.

At least half a dozen states have seriously considered eliminating their arts councils within the last four years. The Massachusetts case illustrates the general reasons.

Massachusetts, like other state governments, is facing a budget crunch. Moreover, a local group called Citizens for Limited Taxation has been actively lobbying on the budget issue and has favored zero-funding the Council. There is also general anti-government sentiment abroad in the state, part of the same rumbling that recently defeated the Congressional pay raise.

When I last worked as an advocate for the endowment, we assumed that the federal government has a right — or, more to the point, an obligation-to be in the business of supporting the arts. Congressmen who did not agree with us often had constituents back home who most certainly and vocally did. And not

many people were agitating the other side of the issue. Only people on the fringes of national politics argued that there was something inherently suspicious, something presumptively wrong about government undertaking to support an activity like the arts.

This is no longer the case. In many quarters in Washington, the presumptions are reversed. Our new president, George Bush, has not come to office to be an enemy to the arts, but there is hardly a policy statement he makes these days without reminding us that all initiatives are going to be measured by the great standard of the budget deficit.

In fact the whole language of political discourse in this country has changed in important ways, as we continue to feel the consequences of the political failure of the old and immensely decent liberalism, with its faith in central government and its generosity with the federal treasury. It has now become intellectually respectable to ask any money-spending government program to provide affirmative evidence that it is doing some good.

Over these years, more citizens have become vocal in their opposition to new taxes and more determined that their elected officials should act accordingly. In addition, I think more of them have developed a resentment of a national establishment that they think rules the country according to its own whims and fashions about what is good for other people.

For instance, one of the newspapers that reported on the cut of the Massachusetts Arts Council's budget started its story by quoting a Massachusetts arts representative who said, "It was like being told that civilization has come to an end." The story's reporter was reinforcing the image of an arts establishment that still insists on the supremacy of its particular goals in an era when all other national programs are grappling with the question, "Compared to what?"

This image is unfair. Arts organizations have not claimed exemptions from the budget problem and have done their share of making more out of less. In addition, the endowment and the arts councils have been extremely sensitive to the danger of elitism and extremely careful to put money into arts activities accessible to many people, especially members of minority groups. But this good behavior, even combined with the country's strong arts coalition, is not probing powerful enough to withstand the high wind of the changing general mood.

It is not that the arguments have become invalid; it is that they are running out of competitive steam.

ONE NECESSARY RESPONSE is for arts organizations in this country to continue their move toward self-reliance and conservation of resources. A friend who is here tonight has suggested one idea: to arrange for smaller arts groups to get help in the form of volunteer accountants and other technical experts, in guiding them through the maze of paper and regulations they face and in stretching the available funds to the limit. Retired business executives constitute an under-utilized pool of talent for this job.

Arts advocates should continue to argue for what is in fact a minuscule cost of living increase in what is in truth still a very modest budget, just as they will continue to try to reverse the tax measures that have cut so deeply into sources of private support for arts institutions. These are continuing and essential efforts.

The root of the problem, though, is the gap that has not been closed, even with the grants and programs and performances, between the vast majority in this country and any sort of appreciation of culture. I believe this gap is what lies behind the indifference to the arts, or worse, that we see gaining political expressions.

The reasons for the gap are broad and powerful. We are living in a time when a symphony orchestra performance has to compete not just with a recording but with a laser-driven compact disc apparatus hooked up to an audio system that could fill this whole auditorium with high-quality sound. Multiple-channel cable and video cassettes provide home entertainment alternatives to the live cultural experience. This is also a time when the liberal arts colleges that used to turn out citizens with a broad cultural education — the audiences for the arts — have simply ceased to do their job for the majority of their students.

This is not to say that we are without cultural interests and resources. Audiences in some areas and for some activities are holding their own. We now have, in addition, more talented and technically proficient young artists — musicians, singers, actors, dancers — than ever before in our history. They also happen to be artists who find it harder and harder to get jobs, because of persistent problems in the size and quality of audiences that performers need to survive.

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that the old coalition exerts less force and its members grow more vulnerable to demands for retrenchment.

But, as we old Washington hands say, when God closes one policy window, he opens another. There are trends in America today that may allow us to meet the most fundamental needs of the arts, not by claiming special privileges but by contributing to an enterprise that concerns the vast majority of Americans — the enterprise of education.

The roots of America's current worry about education are deep. In part it comes from the old political debate of the past 20 years about whether our public schools were spending too much of their energy on frills and not enough on the basics of reading and arithmetic.

BUT THE MORE MODERN CONCERNS about our educational system are broader. Today the root of the worry is economic. To an extent we have not seen for years, opinion makers these days are openly talking about the need to promote this country's fundamental economic interests.

The arrival of *glasnost* in the Soviet Union gives us at least glimpses of a future world where ideological struggle will no longer dominate foreign policy and when the problems of international economic competition will lead the television news broadcasts on many nights. In this competition we think we are being taken to the cleaners by the Japanese and other rapidly

There are trends in America today that may allow us to meet the most fundamental needs of the arts, not by claiming special privileges but by contributing to an enterprise that concerns the vast majority of Americans — the enterprise of education.

If our children are to
innovate, they
must have a broad
education that makes
them feel **at home**
in the world.

growing nations, and we think on reason is that American students do not work hard enough or learn enough, This worry is no phantom of our imaginations. Just recently the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement released its

1988 report on science achievement in 17 countries. In its comparison of 14 year olds, the U.S. ranked third from the bottom, in a dead heat with Thailand. People realize that considerable shaping-up is in order.

What is interesting about this concern, though, is that it is not limited to subjects like math and science. People are also concerned with E.D.

Hirsch's "cultural literacy." The level of our student's general knowledge is very low, and it is recognized that this lack puts them at a distinct disadvantage in the century ahead. As Hirsch himself states it, "Children who possess broad background knowledge will be able to learn new things more readily than those who lack it."

Hirsch's argument gets confirmation from author James Fallows in his recently published book, *More Like Us*. Fallows warns Americans not to think that they will triumph over the Japanese by becoming more like them. On the contrary, he says, America's strength, like that of the immigrants who formed it, has always come from innovation, imagination and the ability to find a way through immense seas of disorder. The education we need is an education that will help develop those characteristic strengths. This means that mathematics is not enough. It means that the education of our children must be broad enough to give them a head start in meeting uncertainty.

Education in the arts is an indispensable part of this kind of broad education — not just for private enjoyment or development but for public activities, economic and political.

The reasons are numerous, and, I submit, quite powerful.

First, the experience of dealing with the arts is necessary for younger children. For most of them, producing art is their introduction to the idea of work. They start learning the discipline they will need to achieve their goals. They learn what powerful satisfaction work can provide. They learn to explore and they experience success. These are the impulses a human being needs most if he is to work hard and happily in life, and no children's activity is better than art at instilling these attitudes. This is no small contribution for the arts to make to human upbringing.

If we think as we must about the early education of disadvantaged children, the case for the arts becomes even more compelling. This is an area in which such children are not disadvantaged. The arts provide them with alternative ways of achieving success and learning about its personal rewards.

The same is true for the education of disadvantaged older children as well. If what they learn of the arts is diverse, then they, too, have an increased chance of discovering a field in which they are among the best. Alternative opportunities to achieve success during these years are crucial to giving young people pride, a sense that they have a place in the world, and a clear vision of a productive future.

With older children, teaching about the arts is important in other ways as well. If our children are to innovate, they must have a broad education that makes them feel at home in the world. If they are to vote on issues and decide among goals and values beyond the realm of their personal experience, they must know about the arts, which as much as anything have taught Western civilization the difference between what is lasting and valuable and what is not. If they are to give their own children schools capable of meeting modern challenges, they must know enough to be able to judge those schools.

IF WE ARE TO DEEPEN our children's attachment to our country and our civilization, and have them think that societies like ours are worth sustaining, they must know about the arts, which constitute one of our chief points of pride. If we are to teach them the difference between decent and indecent nations in this world, we must teach them to respect the arts. A child

who has never had his mind touched by a poem or a story will not know what it means to see a government burning books.

This is no small job to ask the arts to do in the schools. Not just any artist and not just any teacher can do what is necessary, and to date we have not given enough attention to the job of getting these educators ready. But some people have begun thinking about the specialized curriculum and specialized teacher training essential to an expanded role for the arts in education. We have a beginning on which to build and a climate, despite budgetary constraints, in which people may be willing to make the necessary effort.

If arts organizations choose to devote a preponderant part of their efforts to the project of education, they will find themselves part of a new coalition much broader than the old one. The White House is now vitally interested in the problem of literacy. The education lobbies, which arts advocates have often regarded as a threat, can be powerful allies. Day care advocates — strengthened by anticipated major funding — have made their interest clear. The major foundations, both liberal and conservative, are already active. Media attention is likely to be heavy and favorable. And the reason for all this friendliness? It is that the new coalition will be able to define itself as a coalition not for the arts or the sciences or the teachers alone but for the children of America.

The endowment is not going to get lost in the process. For one thing, arts organizations can bring prominent people and visibility to this project in a way that few other organizations can. More important, the endowment has a role that none of the other participants in this effort can perform, which is to champion high national standards of quality. The National Endowment for the Humanities, which has worked so hard and so well to insure the quality of the humanistic training our children receive, must be a collaborator in this effort. Both endowments and the state agencies must try to insure that teachers and texts do not impose upon children the sort of second-rate stuff that stifles an interest in the arts and humanities instead of encouraging it.

This is an agenda that will present the arts and humanities as powerful tools for understanding the nature of our civilization, which binds us all together as citizens, and from which we all profit. It will

present them as indispensable parts of the program for training our children for the next American century.

There is also a secret agenda here. Paying serious attention to these school programs is like sowing seed corn. What we will be doing is building future audiences.

In the past decade, we have learned a disturbing lesson about government support for the arts. It is that what government giveth, government taketh away. A more solid foundation for the arts is needed in this country. The children can provide us with one. Many children who learn a little bit about the arts may forget it as easily as they forget almost everything else about their education. But even for those who are not deeply interested, their early experience may in later years make the arts less foreign to them and thus a less likely object of resentment.

With some students, the exposure will excite real interest. Even if they are a relatively small percentage of their classes, they will add up over time to a great many adults creating an increased audience and a vastly increased constituency for the arts.

Most of what I have said this evening originates not with me but with men and women who have spent these recent years working to incorporate the arts and humanities into the mainstream of American education. May I take a moment to recite some of the credits? I am sure I speak for everyone here when I congratulate the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities, and their two splendid chairmen, Frank Hodsoll and Lynne Cheney, for their pathbreaking reports on arts and humanities education; and to Livingston Biddle, who participated in the organization of the endowments and performed so splendidly as chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts under President Carter. I also offer my warm apprecia-

A child who has
never had his mind
touched by a **poem**
or a story will not know what
it means to see a government
burning books.

A more solid
foundation for
the **arts** is needed in
this country. The
children can
provide us with one.

tion to the Gannett Foundation, to Eugene Dorsey and Milton Rhodes of the American Council for the Arts and to the Friends of Nancy Hanks for their generous sponsorship of this annual Nancy Hanks lecture, and to friends like Samuel Lipman, Gunther Schuller, Billy

Taylor, Victoria Newhouse, Ronald Berman, Michael Straight, Lani Lattin Duke of the Getty Foundation and Marion Wright Edelman of the Children's Defense Fund, for sharing their time and thoughts with me. Finally, there is my debt to the work of educational researchers and theorists like Elliot Eisner, Howard Gardner, Ralph Smith and Brent Wilson,

and a personal word of gratitude to a dear friend, Bryna Cooperman, a teacher of teachers of children.

I take personal responsibility, of course, for the sum of my experiences and convictions. I have concluded that we are back to the question we faced in 1969: what do the arts need, and what is appropriate, at this particular time and place? The answer lies in the nation's agenda for education. The next great stage in the development of public policy towards the arts is in the institution-building task of raising the level of knowledge, culture, and taste in America. This is crystal clear to me, which is not to say that it will happen easily or quickly or even successfully. Obstacles to human collaboration are always great and in this case some are especially deep-rooted. But the alternative to such action is a steadily worsening decline into a peripheral and merely symbolic status for the arts in America and, more generally, the strengthening of the powerful momentum towards mediocrity in our education system.

This is one of those rare and passing moments when the energies needed to achieve basic political change

can be mobilized by a crisis.

We may never again see a creative incubator like Brooklyn circa 1938, or a political atmosphere sympathetic to the arts like the Nancy Hanks years, but we can make our general climate more hospitable to the arts, and today's hard times may give us just the opportunity we need.

IT IS MY HOPE that next year's Nancy Hanks lecture will be less about crisis and more about progress. There could be no better celebration of Nancy's confidence in the rightness of her cause, her irrepressible spirit, and her never-to-be-forgotten contribution to the arts in America. ■

Leonard Garment

Leonard Garment is counsel and heads the public policy practice group of Dechert Price & Rhoads. He began his career in 1949 with the firm of Mudge, Stern, Williams & Tucker, became partner in 1956, and remained with the firm as the head of the litigation department until he joined partner Richard M. Nixon at the White House in 1969. Garment rejoined Mudge Rose Guthrie Alexander & Ferdon in 1976, and then was a senior partner in the Washington, D.C. firm of Dickstein, Shapiro & Morin, from 1980 through 1993.

Garment's government experience includes: serving on the White House staff as Special Consultant to President Nixon 1969-1974; Counsel to the President 1973-1974; and Assistant to President Ford in 1974. He was Vice Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States, 1973-1974, under then-Chairman Nino Scalia; was named by President Ford to be U.S. Representative to the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations Economic and Social Council from 1975 to 1977; served as Counselor to the U.S. Delegation to the United Nations with Ambassador Daniel P. Moynihan from 1975 to 1976; and chaired Senator Moynihan's Judicial Selection Committee from 1976 to 1988. Garment graduated from Brooklyn Law School (LL.B., *summa cum laude*, 1949), where he was Editor-in-Chief of the *Brooklyn Law Review*.