HENRY M. JACKSON
FOUNDATION

Henry M. Jackson Foundation,
1501 Fourth Avenue, Suite 1580
Seattle, WA 98101-3225

Telephone: 206.682.8565
Facsimile: 206.682.8961
E-mail: foundation@hmjackson.org
Website: www.hmjackson.org

HENRY M. JACKSON FOUNDATION

Treasured Memories: Henry M. Jackson and the School that Bears his Name

BY KENNETH B. PYLE

About the Henry M. Jackson Foundation

The Henry M. Jackson Foundation is committed to the principles and values that guided Senator Jackson. International affairs education has been a central focus of the Jackson Foundation's work since its inception in 1983. In that regard, considerable Foundation resources have been devoted to the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies and The National Bureau of Asian Research, both in Seattle.

Treasured Memories: Henry M. Jackson and the School that Bears his Name

BY KENNETH B. PYLE

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON • JANUARY 26, 2006

Anne and Kenneth Pyle

With an endowment from the Henry M. Jackson Foundation, the University of Washington established the Anne H.H. and Kenneth B. Pyle Professorship at the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies. The following address was delivered by Dr. Pyle, who is also the first recipient of this professorship, on January 26, 2006, at the University of Washington.

Treasured Memories: Henry M. Jackson and the School that Bears his Name

I am deeply honored by the naming of this new professorship in American foreign policy and want to thank the Jackson Foundation and the University for this honor. It is gratifying for me to share this honor fully with Anne. She has been my partner in whatever I have been able to accomplish. As for the other honor, for reasons that I will explain tonight, it is extraordinarily meaningful to me to be designated the Henry M. Jackson Professor of History and Asian Studies. This indeed is a high point of my professional career. [*Editor's note: After Dr. Pyle relinquishes this professorship, future recipients will be known as the Anne H.H. and Kenneth B. Pyle Professor of American Foreign Policy*.]

A Bleak Beginning

It was forty years ago this month that Anne and I drove into Seattle in our Volkswagen beetle. Two nights before, we had been stuck in a blizzard in Weed, California, as we drove over the Siskiyous. Neither of us had ever been here. At that time, jobs were rather plentiful for Asian historians. I had half a dozen job offers, but the University of Washington promised me a light schedule so that I could finish writing my doctoral dissertation. My advisor at Stanford suggested that I go to the UW and try it for a year. I knew only one person in Seattle; that was the history professor who had given me a job interview in Tokyo the previous

spring. When we arrived and found a dingy motel on Aurora Avenue, the winter rains were in full swing. It was among the top three rainiest winters ever—at least until this year. As I recall, it was months before we could confirm that there was actually a Mt. Rainier. We had lost our infant daughter a short time before we came. The outlook seemed a bit bleak for us. I remember asking myself: should I have taken one of those other job offers?

But a funny thing happened. We fell in love with the land and the people of the Pacific Northwest. People were warm, open, and friendly; we noticed the absence of eastern reserve. At the University I found a remarkable, world-class coterie of scholars of Asian and Slavic studies assembled by the inimitable George Taylor—many were immigres and refugees from the iron curtain countries. They were of a stature that could not be surpassed anywhere. I discovered here a long and extraordinary commitment to the study of the non-Western world. Moreover, I found an unusual degree of student interest in the study of the non-Western world that is still unsurpassed by any other university.

Ninety-Seven and Going Strong

In 2009 we will celebrate the centennial of the Jackson School. It was founded in 1909 as the Department of Oriental Subjects, a quaint title for virtually a one-man department in which an Anglican clergyman and former missionary in Asia, Herbert Gowen, taught a variety of subjects that covered the whole area of the globe from the Suez around the world to the Bering Straits. He taught Sanskrit, Hebrew, Chinese, Japanese, and the history of many countries. Today, we have over 100 faculty to teach these subjects. Nonetheless, in those early days, the UW—along with Berkeley, Stanford, Harvard and a few others—were pioneers in the study of what were then called the Near East and the Far East. In the 1940s the Department became the Far Eastern and Russian

Institute. In 1978 when I was appointed director, the University agreed to a more comprehensive structure and we renamed it the School of International Studies. In 1983, after Senator Jackson's sudden death, the School was renamed the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies.

Education and the Jackson Legacy

I would like to reflect this evening on why the naming of the School for him is so appropriate. It has to do with his career and the things he cared about and worked so hard to achieve.

In the summer of 1978, shortly after I was appointed director of the newly renamed School, I had business in Washington, D.C., and I decided rather brashly to go unannounced to Senator Jackson's office in Washington to seek his support for a fund-raising drive that I felt was necessary for the future of the School. He was, after all, the person in our part of the country with the greatest influence in foreign affairs. President Richard Nixon, after his first election, had tried unsuccessfully to persuade Scoop to become Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense, in part for his knowledge and experience, but also because Nixon recognized that Jackson was the leading Democrat who might run against him four years hence and he hoped to foreclose that possibility. Scoop had come very close to being president of the United States in the 1960s, when he was President John F. Kennedy's initial choice as running mate, in which case he would have become president after the assassination. Then in 1976 he came close to the presidency when he was for a considerable time the leading Democratic candidate in the primaries. In the aftermath of Watergate, however, the tide of public opinion ran against Washington insiders.

So 1978 was probably a good time for me to approach him because, having lost out to Jimmy Carter in the presidential race,

he had turned his mind back to foreign policy and was just then deeply engaged behind the scenes in promoting the normalization of relations with China. I had first come to know about Senator Jackson when I was a schoolboy in New England and, fascinated with history and politics, I was glued to the televised congressional hearings in 1954 in which Scoop helped bring down Senator Joseph McCarthy. But in 1978, having never met Senator Jackson, I had no idea what kind of reception I could expect. He was not in his office that day, but I talked to his press secretary, Rick Cocker, and Rick promised to get back to me. A few weeks later, when the Senator was in the state, Rick called and asked if the Senator could come by my office to talk. We talked for nearly two hours. He asked me all about the School. Of course, he knew about George Taylor's work in building up our predecessor, the Far Eastern and Russian Institute, and he remembered from his student days Herbert Gowen, the first chairman of the old Department of Oriental Subjects. He wanted to hear about our present situation. I explained that the School had reached a low point. In the aftermath of Vietnam, the country had turned its back on its traditional commitments. Students had difficulty establishing careers in international affairs. Public interest and backing for international studies had ebbed. The major foundations, like Ford and Rockefeller, which had supported the development of area studies at the University of Washington and other leading centers, had withdrawn their financial commitments. Moreover, a whole generation of distinguished scholars of Asia and Russia on our faculty had retired. In short, we needed to rebuild our institution—and we needed very substantial support to begin the process.

When I had finished discussing our plight, Senator Jackson spoke of his own concerns. He wanted to be reassured that in renaming the Far Eastern and Russian Institute and calling it the

School of International Studies we were not abandoning our traditional commitment to the in-depth study of the history, culture, and languages of different areas and substituting for it an abstract concern for international relations, like the other schools of international studies around the country. He believed that there was a critical national shortage of people who truly understood the workings of Asian, Middle Eastern, and Slavic countries. He was skeptical of international relations theory; politics was not a science; wisdom in the formation of policy for a region must spring from a protracted immersion in the study of the diverse countries. He was reassured to hear that my own training was as a historian and to learn of my own three years of language study in Japan, and that our commitment was to build a school whose foundation was set in the in-depth study of foreign cultures. I might say parenthetically that in the past few weeks, President George W. Bush gathered university presidents in Washington to inform them that the federal government now intends to place great emphasis on foreign area and language studies. It is what Senator Jackson was urging three decades ago.

He talked of his recent trips to China and spoke with deep regret of the 20 years of estrangement and virtual non-communication engendered, in part, by the excesses of the McCarthy period. He considered the failure to understand the implications of the Sino-Soviet dispute one of this nation's greatest intelligence fiascoes. He remarked over and over how poorly prepared the government was, partly as a result of the McCarthy era, to deal with Asia. Many of the best people in the State Department had been forced out, leaving the country with inadequate expertise to understand, for example, the Sino-Soviet split.

I think you could say that Senator Jackson and I hit it off in that first meeting. He wanted to see the revival of the University's

national leadership in Far Eastern and Russian studies and he wanted his alma mater to take the lead in bringing expertise to bear on the policymaking process in Washington. At the end of our conversation, as we walked across the campus toward the University district where he had an errand, he said simply, “I want to help.” It was not, it turned out, an idle commitment.

From that time on, my association with Senator Jackson was like being swept up in a whirlwind, like one of those twisters one might see whirling across the Nebraska plains. It was a flurry of high energy activity—phone calls, letters, meetings, trips, plans. Scoop, I quickly learned, never did anything by halves. He threw himself into fundraising with endless energy and enthusiasm, immediately enlisting Eddie Carlson, the CEO of United Airlines, and T. Wilson, the CEO of Boeing, to co-chair a fundraising drive. He made countless visits to people of means urging their financial support of the School. He began sending me the honorarium checks that he received for speaking engagements, never asking what I was doing with them. There were frequent telephone calls right up to the day he died. One came at 6:30 on a Sunday morning, the day Chinese leader Deng Hsiao-ping was visiting Seattle, and Scoop wanted to talk about what to say in his introduction of Deng at the luncheon at the Westin Hotel that day. Scoop had a magnetic personality in person and on the phone. I can still hear that strong voice over the phone, “Ken, this is Scoop.”

Our Trips to China

It was a dizzying but wonderful experience for me. I have so many great memories—the major events when he came and spoke at the School, and of course the trips to China that he invited me on. Six weeks in all, prowling the boondocks of that country on that first trip with the Jackson family—Helen, Anna Marie and Peter—way out in the west with the nomadic mountain people on

the edge of Kazakhstan, down in the tunnels of Inner Mongolia (the tunnels that Mao had people dig in anticipation of a Soviet invasion), and up in the border regions of Manchuria. And then, of course, there were the several hours of private meetings with Deng Hsiao-ping with whom he had such a good relationship. I was entrusted with keeping the notes of these conversations, which were focused on the geopolitics of the Cold War.

But there were some light moments. Scoop would always, good naturedly, refer to himself as "the Senator from Boeing." Deng, sitting there in his overstuffed chair, chain smoking, a spittoon at his feet, was amused. On one occasion, Scoop asked Deng about his smoking. At the time there was much public speculation about Deng's health and longevity. Scoop said he had already given up smoking when he was 12. But Deng replied that he was convinced smoking was good for his health. Scoop responded that if his colleague, Senator Jesse Helms from the tobacco growing state of North Carolina heard that, he would certainly change his dour view of China's leadership.

The different experiences with Scoop constantly challenged my horizons. Most of my still brief academic career, after all, had been preoccupied with clawing my way up the tenure ladder, a process scarcely designed to broaden one's perspective then or since. Quite the contrary. Churning out the monographs and articles and book reviews, I sometimes thought I learned more and more about less and less. I recall on that first China trip 27 years ago we were having a luncheon with the Prime Minister and Scoop was discussing with him China's immense energy needs, as the rest of us listened. I was seated at an adjacent table with Dwight Perkins, the Harvard economist and China specialist, and John McCain, who was then a young naval liaison officer assigned to our trip, and some Chinese officials. Scoop nudged the prime

minister and I swallowed hard as I heard him say, "in my group here is Dr. Pyle, a specialist on Japan. Let me ask him how Japan is managing its energy needs. Ken, tell us what percentage of Japan's electricity comes from nuclear power." Well, I could have told them anything they wanted to know about John Stuart Mill's influence on nineteenth century Japanese intellectual history or the impact of Bismarck's social policies on the Japanese bureaucracy at the turn of the century. But electricity from nuclear energy? Dwight Perkins sized up the situation immediately and whispered under his breath to me, "Make something up!" Feigning self-assurance, I quickly responded, "Senator, the Japanese now get 20 percent of their electricity from nuclear power." Scoop was pleased and went on with his conversation with the prime minister. When I got back to Seattle I checked and was relieved to find I was only two percentage points off!

The Senator as a Role Model

John McCain became a great admirer of the Senator. When he was on our trip, he had only recently returned from five years in a North Vietnamese prison cell and then, as his last assignment before leaving the military, he was given responsibility for accompanying members of Congress on their foreign trips. In this capacity, he came to know and work with Senator Jackson. In a book he recently published, entitled *Worth the Fighting For*, Senator McCain writes of the five or six people that inspired him to enter politics after he left the military. He devotes a chapter to his admiration for Scoop Jackson. He describes the Senator's staff as the "best in Congress." He concludes in part, "The great Scoop Jackson of Washington was and remains for me a model of what an American statesman should be. He had no vices that I knew of, or for that matter, any hobbies or pursuits that would distract him for a moment from his duty… His work was everything to him…. Few

members of Congress have ever accumulated the record of accomplishment and influence Jackson had. He wasn't charismatic in the style [that] most politicians [had] tried to ape since John Kennedy's election….Whatever he lacked stylistically, Scoop more than compensated for with hard work, intelligence, and a vision of America that was informed by his hardheaded, practical idealism. Most of all, Scoop had faith in his country, faith in the rightness of her causes. He had faith that our founding ideals were universal, the principal strength of our foreign policy, and would in time overcome our enemy's resistance. Until the day he died, he never wavered in his faith…. Although many in his party and mine would fault him for being too stubborn in a world that required subtlety and cunning, he was a hero for our time, the last half of a violent century, and absolutely indispensable for our success [in the Cold War]. Few presidents can claim to have served the Republic as ably, as faithfully as Scoop Jackson did…. [McCain concludes] He was, to me and many others, an ideal whose example I revered."

I have many treasured memories of little things, such as lunches in the Senate Dining Room at his special table in the corner; or bringing our son, Will, then in Bellevue High School, along into Scoop's Senate office; and Scoop would ask him about his grades and then inevitably say "We're all very proud of you." When we got off the plane from China four days before he died, Anne was waiting there at SeaTac with Will and Annie. Will, still in high school, had just finished intensive Russian in UW summer school and Scoop immediately asked him about his grade. Will eagerly reported that it was a four point, doubtless expecting a "we're all-very-proud-of-you" accolade, but instead Scoop asked "When are you starting Chinese?" Then there is that memory of my last visit to his office in Washington on a hot early summer day in

1983. When we finished talking and I was headed back to the hotel, he walked me out to the street. Before I knew it, there was the Senate's most senior statesman out in the traffic flagging a taxi for me. I can still see him in his cord suit out in the street trying to shout down a taxi for me outside the Senate Office Building.

Scoop cared about ordinary people and their problems. I remember that black book he carried in his breast pocket filled with phone numbers of people, and when he had a spare moment he would be on the phone calling this or that constituent in Colfax, or Ritzville, or Walla Walla to discuss their problems. He was accessible. There was a total lack of pretense. It helps to explain why he won his senatorial re-elections by margins of up to 87%, as he did in 1970—an extraordinarily divisive year in American politics. He sought and inspired loyalty as a basis of trust, a quality which is so essential in Washington, D.C., and any organization and is so often absent. He was bipartisan or, better, nonpartisan in matters of foreign policy. How many times did I hear him say, "you can disagree without being disagreeable"? Quite a contrast with the poisonous partisanship in Washington today.

Building Academic Programs and Bridges

Throughout this intense five-year period we were constantly talking about two things: how to build foreign area studies at the UW and how to bring expertise on these areas into the policy-making process in Washington. Scoop had become the best-informed member of Congress on both China and the Soviet Union and on the geopolitics of the Middle East. Anyone discussing the Middle East with him in those days inevitably became engaged in the significance of Baluchistan or the Straits of Hormuz. He was fascinated by central Asia and pleased that we offered language study on Uzbek and other uncommon languages; when we visited the major

university in Inner Mongolia he was pleased to hear that the University of Washington's work on Mongolia was well known there.

His fascination with Asia went far beyond Cold War strategy. He foresaw the impact that China's emergence would have for the region and for the American place in Asia. He took a strong interest in our relations with Japan and personally pressed President Reagan to reappoint Mike Mansfield as our ambassador. Mansfield was appointed by Carter and as a Democrat would not ordinarily have been renewed by a new Republican president, but Reagan accepted Scoop's suggestion. Mansfield was one of the fellow members of Congress the Senator respected most. On one occasion when the late Mike Oksenberg, the University of Michigan China specialist, and I were traveling with him on a train, we got Scoop to talk about members of Congress he most admired. He talked about Mansfield, Sam Rayburn, Richard Russell, and Paul Douglas, the great battler for civil rights. Aside from the fact that they were all Democrats, I noticed the judicious weighing and balancing of different considerations. Russell from Georgia was a proponent of a strong defense; Douglas from Illinois was a constant advocate of civil liberties. He had me appointed to the founding committee of the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation when it was established by Congress and asked to be kept informed of what was done to honor his friend from Montana.

As a history professor, I always took pleasure in hearing Scoop counsel students to study history. Dorothy Fosdick, who was his foreign policy advisor for 28 years, recalls that "in dealing with the critical issues of foreign policy and defense, the Senator had found the missing ingredient to be what he called 'people with good judgment.' 'Judgment,' he said, 'is the most valuable of

all qualities—the ability to make good decisions in the face of uncertainty.… Study of history is the foundation of wisdom in decision making. History is the great corrective for the distortions, exaggerations, bombast, and verbal abuses of the present.'" I love those lines. "Poor decisions," he emphasized, "were so often traceable to the failure of people to comprehend the full significance of information crossing their desks, their indecisiveness, or their lack of wisdom." As Dorothy Fosdick later observed, "Throughout his official life, the Senator drew on a remarkable group of experienced, historically oriented advisers whom he informally consulted in person, by letter—often by phone—to get their judgments on issues with fateful international strategic implications."

Were he in the Senate today, I can well imagine that Scoop would be chairing an investigation of our massive intelligence failures, asking why we had so few Arabic speakers, and above all he would be seeking out academic specialists who were immersed in study of the foreign regions critical to our national interest.

Foreign Policy and Young People

He relished meetings with young people. I remember taking groups of visiting Japanese students to his Senate office to meet him and how much he enjoyed engaging them. He loved interaction with young people. I have always believed that after he retired from politics he would have liked to hang his hat at the School and discuss history and politics with our students. He encouraged students to think courageously about human problems and dilemmas. On one occasion, he put it this way: "In essence, history is what we know about the accountability of human beings before each other and before God, and [history is] the repository of what we have learned about how human beings should behave—indeed must behave—if life is to be humane and decent.… Therefore, [he told the students] study and comprehend

history if you want to shape the future." He was invariably an optimist in these discussions. "Don't be discouraged," he would conclude, "what people messed up, people can straighten out."

In foreign policy he succeeded in successfully merging the two opposing traditions in America's approach to the world: Theodore Roosevelt's realism and Woodrow Wilson's idealism. Ideals, he thought, are the essence of what it is to be an American, but they must be won through strength. In his speeches he would often quote the words of Reinhold Niebuhr: "There has never been a scheme of justice in history which did not have a balance of power at its foundation. If the democratic nations fail, their failure must be partly attributed to the faulty strategy of idealists who have too many illusions when they face realists who have too little conscience."

A Place in History

Senator Jackson's significance in American history will be defined by many things, including his key role in environmental protection, issues of energy, public power, land use and labor relations, but probably above all for his critical role in the Cold War. It was what preoccupied his attention at the height of his career. I recall after we left a meeting with students at Beijing University, where he had talked with them about Cold War issues, we got into the microbus to ride back to the hotel. I asked him—this would have been in 1983—"How do you think this is all going to work out? How is the Cold War going to end?" It was a memorable discussion. He reflected on the many vulnerabilities of the Soviet system, its economy, its unwieldy empire, its treatment of its own people; the conclusion was we had to stay the course. He was dogged, persistent, relentless in his determination. To his critics, he was a stubborn "Cold Warrior," but I do believe as we gain historical perspective on the Cold War, his persistence is vindicated.

He was at the center of three profoundly important turning points in the Cold War, each of which probed and exposed the vulnerabilities of the Soviet system. First, he was leading critic of the arms control efforts that Nixon and Kissinger were trying to negotiate with the Soviets, insisting that they be based on parity and that they be aimed at reductions, something the Russian leaders were loathe to grant. Secondly, he was a leader in pressing for normalization of relations with China, which changed the balance of power in the East-West struggle. Third, through the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 Trade Reform Act, he introduced the deeply troubling issue for the Soviets of how they were to treat their own people in the Soviet Union and in the countries they dominated. Jackson-Vanik linked trade benefits, which the Soviets desperately needed, to an improvement of human rights—especially the right to emigration.

In the last few months, the Yale historian John Lewis Gaddis has published a history of the Cold War. The critical turning point he discusses came in the 1970s when Henry Kissinger's effort to reach a détente with the Soviets would have allowed Russian leaders to stabilize their relations with the West. Kissinger believed that given the nuclear stalemate, it was not feasible to seek victory in the Cold War, but instead we should seek to manage it. The two superpowers should find ways to stabilize their relations through agreements and compromises, and in so doing achieve détente. If it meant that peoples in the communist world would be indefinitely denied the liberties that people in the West enjoyed, then that was the price that must be paid for global security. Given what we now know of the vulnerabilities of the Soviet system, the policy of détente seems no longer defensible. As Gaddis emphasizes, it was the treatment of their own people that would bring down the system. The Jackson-Vanik amendment was

a critical blow. Jackson was anathema to the Russian leaders. As Soviet Ambassador to the U.S. Anatoly Dobrynin later wryly admitted in his memoirs: "The Kremlin was afraid of emigration in general (regardless of nationality or religion) lest an escape hatch from the happy land of socialism seem to offer a degree of liberalization that would destabilize the domestic situation." Jackson-Vanik brought to the forefront the internal contradictions of the Soviet system.

The former Soviet dissident and KGB prisoner Natan Sharansky last year published a best-selling and influential book, *The Case for Democracy*, in which he pays extraordinary homage to Jackson as a model of courage and passion for the extension of human rights and for linking it inseparably to America's fundamental foreign policy goals. Sharansky writes of the time that the KGB put him on trial for treason and for plotting an anti-Soviet conspiracy. In those trials "there was one name mentioned not once, not dozens, but hundreds of times, the name of the man who was singled out as head of this plot, as my closest and most important comrade in crime. It was the name of a man whom I had never met or spoken to on the telephone, but who symbolized for me all those in the free world who had supported the struggle for Soviet Jewry, the very best that was in the West. It was the name of Senator Henry Jackson."

Jackson's strong views on arms limitation talks and human rights passion greatly complicated Henry Kissinger's attempt to broker détente. In the last volume of his published memoirs, mainly devoted to a defense of his détente policies toward the Soviet Union, Kissinger described the Senator as his "permanent adversary," a stubborn idealist who stood in the way of the Nixon-Kissinger plan to reach a modus vivendi with the Soviets. The tapes and archives that we now have reveal that Kissinger was

often profane in discussing Scoop, even in discussing him with Brezhnev. After several chapters in his memoirs devoted to their struggle over détente policies, there is an interesting section in which Kissinger reluctantly confesses his respect for Scoop's championship of human rights and acknowledges him as "a seminal figure" in national security strategy.

After the Senator died September 1, 1983, just four days after we had returned from another trip to China, I was an honorary pall bearer at his funeral. As I looked around the church up in Everett that day, I noted that there was present a large portion (66 members) of the United States Senate; members of both parties had chartered a plane and flown out. Then Vice President George Bush was there. Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren Burger was there. One other figure in the assemblage caught my eye. It was Henry Kissinger.

Senator Jackson served in Congress through the terms of nine presidents, from FDR to Reagan, a period then encompassing more than a fifth of the entire existence of the American republic. I was in the White House Rose Garden several months after his death when President Ronald Reagan awarded the Medal of Freedom to him posthumously and Helen Jackson accepted it. The President concluded his remarks by describing Jackson as "the greatest bipartisan of our time" who, he believed, deserved to be thought of as one of the all-time great senators along with Henry Clay, John Calhoun, Daniel Webster, Robert LaFollette, and Robert Taft.

Over the years since his death, I have often thought about what he stood for and what many of us call "the Jackson tradition" with all it connotes in terms of integrity, public service, concern for the common welfare of people, his accessibility and lack of pretense, bi-partisanship in foreign policy, stewardship of the envi-

ronment, and devotion to the highest principles of personal and professional conduct.

The bedrock of the Senator's character was his integrity. In my files I have a newspaper clipping of a story based on material a reporter had gotten from public records that told that he was the one member of Congress to give away all his honoraria for public speaking. No one knew it at the time because he never talked about it. When he died, I remember the columnist George Will writing that "Scoop Jackson was the finest public servant I have ever known." Many people said and thought the same thing. David Broder, the *Washington Post* correspondent, wrote: "'Scoop' Jackson was a protector of the land and its people, an environmentalist (before we knew the word) and a battler for civil rights….But he was also a strong defense advocate and an implacable anti-communist. Most of all, he was a thoroughly decent, upright public servant who trained a long string of others of similar bent."

I had the extraordinary opportunity to observe and share in these many sides of Senator Jackson and what excitement and what a special privilege it was to have had his energy and enthusiasm thrown into the projects that I was working on at the School. For his remarkable career and devotion to an intelligent foreign policy based on a deep understanding of the culture and history of the diverse regions of the world, for his constant interest in young people and their studies, for his commitment to our highest values and ideals, for all of these reasons, I believe it is an honor—and an inspiration—for the University of Washington to have his name permanently associated with our School of International Studies. And, as you can tell from what I have said this evening, it is an extraordinarily meaningful honor for me to be designated the Henry M. Jackson Professor of History and Asian Studies.

Kenneth B. Pyle has been a professor of History and Asian Studies at the University of Washington for four decades. From 1978 to 1988 he served as director of the Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies. In 1989 he was the founding president of The National Bureau of Asian Research.

Dr. Pyle is the author and editor of several books and articles on foreign policy in Asia. He is the founding editor of the Journal of Japanese Studies *and currently serves as chairman of its board of trustees. From 1992-95 he chaired the Japan-U.S. Friendship Commission and co-chaired the U.S.-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange. In 1999 he was decorated by the Emperor of Japan with the Order of the Rising Sun.*

He is a member of the Foundation's Board of Governors and the recipient of the Henry M. Jackson Award for Distinguished Public Service.

Dr. Pyle holds a B.A. magna cum laude from Harvard College and a Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University where he was the Walter Hines Page Fellow in International Relations. He also held a Ford Foundation Fellowship at the Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies in Tokyo and has been a visiting faculty member at Stanford and Yale Universities.