

References to Vertical File "S" for
the Schools will now be referred to
the subject matter of the school
referred to.

(Ex. School of Economics and Politics
is now filed under "E" for Economics
and Politics.)

STERN

-S-

*Ph.D. mem
K.A.F.*

Memorandum prepared for President Merriam to
explain the needs of the Section on the
History of Science.

1. In order to explain the needs of this section, it is necessary to go back a few years. When I began my work in 1910, abundant and valuable studies on the history of science were already available, but they were uncoordinated. It is true, societies had been organized in Germany, France, and Italy, and many lectures were offered in the Universities but the scholars engaged in these studies were amateurs - a few of them in the best sense, most of them in the poorer sense of that term. Scientists whose standards were the very highest in their own field, would engage in historical research with the utmost levity and produce worthless papers, of which they themselves would have been thoroughly ashamed if these papers had dealt with subjects more familiar to them.

There were already a few journals devoted to the history of science - more often to the study of medicine - but the majority of historical papers were published in almost every one of the innumerable scientific, scholarly, and even literary journals.

An immense amount of materials was scattered everywhere, and there was no means of knowing which were already available and which were not. For the sake of illustration it will be sufficient to say, that though I have explored the field in every direction during almost twenty-five years, I still have, occasionally, the experience of discovering materials which were already available long before the beginning of my career.

2. By the time I had obtained my doctor's degree (in mathematics) at the University of Ghent in 1911, I had already determined to devote my life to these studies and had reached the conclusion that to organize them on a sound basis it was necessary to create two instruments:

- (A) An introductory textbook including the outline of our knowledge and as complete a bibliography as possible.
- (B) A periodical journal, for the publication of new materials, and the registration and classification of all other materials, wherever they might appear.

I saw clearly - in 1911 - that these two undertakings were complementary. Both were necessary, neither was sufficient. I set to work in my Wondelgem study, accumulating whatever information was available to me in the Belgian libraries. The first undertaking implied such a large amount of preparatory work that it would necessarily remain unknown to the world for many years; but the second, owing to its nature, could be realized at once. The program of Isis was widely distributed at the end of the year 1912, and the first number appeared in 1913. From that time on many publications on the history of science were sent to the Editor of Isis from every part of the world, and he was thus in a position to know what was being done in his field and to take full advantage of it for the preparation of his Introduction.

3. After the publication of five numbers of Isis (1134 pp.) the twin undertakings were rudely interrupted by the outbreak of the War. After many vicissitudes, I was appointed associate of the Carnegie Institution on July 1, 1918, and could again devote myself to my original studies without undue anxiety.

It should be noted that the Carnegie Institution appointed me upon the understanding that they would support project A only. If I had had any economic freedom at that time I should have insisted that projects A and B were complementary, and could not be separated without detriment to both. But I had no choice and was only too happy to accept this appointment which saved my family and my life's work at a critical juncture. Moreover, I said to myself, that if the Carnegie Institution would take care of project A (by far the most difficult and the most expensive) I myself would take charge of project B. In fact, the publication of Isis was renewed in September 1919 and continued at my own expense and without any help

whatsoever until the end of the year 1923, five volumes being thus published (3114 pp., 12 pl.).

4. Upon the generous initiative of Professor David Eugene Smith, the History of Science Society was founded in Boston on January 12, 1924, and thus a larger and steadier income was provided for Isis. However the optimism of the founders was not justified by the results, and the membership of the History of Science Society never was large enough to cover the whole cost of Isis. The Society has remained a small though distinguished one, being a constituent member of the American Council of Learned Societies. This is not very surprising after all, because the Society does not appeal, as others do, to a definite and tangible group of scholars. There is not yet a "profession" devoted to the history of science, and most historians of science are not professionals but amateurs. Moreover, it is impossible to foretell where these amateurs are located, and any effort to reach them is necessarily blind: the recruiting of more members is thus especially difficult and expensive.

5. In spite of increasing financial difficulties I did not venture to explain my case more fully to the Carnegie Institution, because I was given to understand that its refusal to commit itself to project B was part of a general policy. I was told that the subject of aid to scientific periodicals was taboo. Indeed, it is well known that no scientific or scholarly periodical of a high standard is, or can be, self-supporting. They can exist only if they are endowed, or subsidized by some institution, or if the editor or some other person is willing to bear the recurring losses.

I appeal to-day to the Carnegie Institution because new circumstances (the devaluation of the dollar) have reopened the question and driven me to the wall. Moreover, I have been so absorbed in my own work that I overlooked my losses so long as they were at all bearable; in this respect I feel that I have not been

fair to the Carnegie Institution, for I have never taken the trouble to explain the whole situation.

The situation is undoubtedly so peculiar that it deserves special consideration. Isis is essentially different from other publications because of its uniqueness and its close ties with the development of my Introduction. To make this clearer let us consider some other subject, for instance, geology. There are so many geological journals, that the creation of a new one, whatever its point of view, could never justify an appeal to the Carnegie Institution. Indeed, any person who wants to be informed on the progress of geological studies has only to examine carefully half a dozen geological publications of various countries.

For the history of science the case is very different. There are other periodicals than Isis (though very few) but none is as encyclopaedic, as comprehensive, as full of information duly classified. Isis is not simply - and in the fullest sense - the mouthpiece of the History of Science movement, but also the organ of the New Humanism. Its purpose is not simply historical and philosophical, but humanistic, and it tries to coordinate the efforts being made to solve the fundamental educational problem of our time: how to bridge the increasing gap separating literary from scientific studies.

Moreover, incomplete and imperfect as my Introduction may be, I could not have produced it - not within measurable distance - without the simultaneous publication of Isis. To put it briefly, Isis is my best tool, in the absence of which I should be like an astronomer without his telescope. As editor of it, hardly a week passes but I receive from the most unexpected quarter some new information which otherwise would have remained unknown to me. The Introduction and Isis (i.e., projects A and B) are as deeply and closely related as any two projects ever have been. The Carnegie Institution says: "I am interested only in A, not in B". Such an attitude would be perfectly natural and defensible if A and B were independent, but it can easily be proved (with no reference except to the

Institution's own publications) that they are on the contrary as interdependent as possible. Hence the refusal to assume the burden of B, puts on my shoulders not only that burden, but also a part of the A burden. Is that right?

6. There is still another aspect of the interrelationship between these two projects which deserves to be indicated. One of the fundamental difficulties in historical work is the complete eradication of errors. This is especially true for our field, overrun as it is by distinguished amateurs of every kind. It happens only too often that when every effort has been made to uproot an error, some great scientist or philosopher - careless of historical facts - gives new currency to it! This is really disheartening.

I know of no better method of solving this fundamental difficulty than the one I have tried to follow. (1) To publish a survey of sufficient massiveness and accuracy to justify the trouble of detailed criticism - that is project A; (2) to publish periodically additions and corrections in such good order that any reader can obtain information on any point with a minimum of effort - that is part of project B. Indeed such corrections and additions are published in each Critical Bibliography of Isis and duly classified (see Introduction, vol.2, p. IX). Thanks to the parallel publications of the Introduction and of Isis it is thus made possible and indeed easy to secure up-to-date information on any part of the history of science.

7. The cooperation between both undertakings would have been carried even further, but for the financial difficulties which impeded me on every side. Isis is not by any means as good as it could and should be. No one can be more keenly aware of this than the Editor who has expressed his criticisms and wishes in many prefaces.

However, in spite of these handicaps for which he cannot be held responsible, the results are remarkable enough. Indeed, the Isis collection is not only the largest of its kind but it is far superior to many academic series published at

considerable expense by powerful universities and institutes. The following figures need no commentary.

Up to the time of writing, 19 volumes have appeared containing 11,922 pages, 198 plates, 288 memoirs, 342 shorter articles, 835 reviews, 26,618 bibliographical notes. Out of these 19 volumes, five were published without any outside help and 14 with insufficient help given by the History of Science Society.

8. The Editor's annual loss so far has averaged about \$500. A small amount of money as compared with the budget for publications of many institutions, yet a heavy tax on the budget of a man having no income but his salary. However, I bore it as gracefully as I could because I was even more afraid of losing my precious time than of losing money.

The devaluation of the dollar changes the situation completely. As the income for Isis is in dollars and the outgo in Belgian francs, a devaluation of 30% (such as it is at present) means an increase in cost of 30%. On that basis if the real expenditures are the same as last year, my total loss will amount this year to about \$1500, and will wipe out almost all that I have been able to save since my arrival in America twenty years ago, life insurance excepted. (My normal savings were almost cancelled year after year by the Isis losses, which explains the smallness of the total.)

I have no desire whatever for earthly possessions, and if I had wealth I would not wish to keep it, but on the other hand I am equally anxious not to place myself in jeopardy, if only because financial worries make steady work and clear thinking more difficult.

9. The situation is thus grave. If I receive no help I must face the necessity of abandoning project B, to which I have devoted the best part of my life, and of deteriorating project A to that extent.

Prudent people might blame me for having borne so long, to my family's detriment, a financial burden entirely out of proportion to my resources. However, I

was not as imprudent as I might seem. I carried the burden year after year, because I was always hoping that some university or institution would take it from my shoulders. I was encouraged in my hopes by the extravagant expenditures of many institutions and the modicity of my requirements.

I am less confident now and have no hope except in the Carnegie Institution, which for so many years has treated me with so much sympathy and generosity. It has supported project A in the noblest manner. My only hope is that it will finally realize that A and B are interrelated (the interrelationship can be ignored, but it is impossible to deny it), that the full support of A implies the support of B, and proceed accordingly.

I have no hope whatever of obtaining help from other institutions or universities. To be sure there is a growing interest in the history of science, but that interest is neither well informed nor genuine, except in the Universities of Chicago and California. Unfortunately these two universities have been so badly hit by the crisis that neither of them is now in a position to consider the creation of a new department.

The history of medicine has received fair recognition, a new institute - the Welch Medical Library of Baltimore - having been richly endowed for that purpose. To be sure the medical profession needs the humanization which can best be provided by historical means, but so do the other professions; and no one has yet imagined a better corrective for the humanist shortcomings of scientific and technical education, than the study of the history of science. Is it not strange that the history of medicine should have received such fair encouragement, while the history of science, which is more fundamental, should have been neglected? I do not grudge historians of medicine their relative popularity, but simply conclude that there is no hope for the history of science at present outside of the Carnegie Institution.

Happily this Institution has been founded for the very purpose of promoting research neglected by other agencies and "requiring the collaboration of special investigators, special equipment, and continuous effort." It has already done more for the history of science, than any other institution, and has every reason for completing the task it has begun so well.

10. Hence if the Carnegie Institution fails me and decides not to support project B as well as project A, I shall be obliged to recognize that I am beaten. My duty does not go beyond the limits of possibility. After next year I could not continue to support Isis without mortgaging my life insurance - and this I consider, would not only be beyond my duty but beyond my right. If the Carnegie Institution cannot afford to promote project B, surely I cannot afford it either, and will then simply adapt myself to this new necessity. In such a case, however, I should not be blamed for the shortcomings of project A. I may be depended upon in any circumstances to do my very best but I cannot be expected to do as well without a necessary instrument, or with a poor instrument instead of a good one.

George Sarton

Harvard Library, 185

September 2, 1933.

1938

vert. file "S"

11/5

SALARIES

Academic Personnel

Abraham Flexner

Originals of/confidential memo on salaries historically.

Filed in Vertical File under "S" for Salaries.

A, 10/18/56, Salary Material

File Copies

Do Not Distribute

Extract from letter from Dr. Flexner to Professor Riefler
dated November 2, 1938.

When the Institute was founded, there was a definite financial policy in reference to salaries and retiring allowances. In consequence of the slump that policy had to be suspended. We had either to cease growing, which at my time of life would have been, I think, a very serious matter for the future of the Institute, or we had simply to regard our policy as one of suspense pending financial recovery or the receipt of future endowment. The moment either of these two events takes place we are going back to the policy on which we started, for upon that policy and upon that alone can the eminence and distinction of the Institute be preserved.

Salaries and Pensions - General Policy

From the first address which I made to the Trustees of the Institute printed in Bulletin No. 1 I should like to quote as follows:

I emphasized a moment ago the fact that institutions of learning are made up of men and women. In this complex modern civilization with its steadily rising standard of living it is of the first importance that education and research should attract gifted and vigorous talent. During the last twenty-five years the world has undergone great and important changes. Institutions of learning, once situated in quiet villages, now find themselves in the heart of busy and noisy cities. Men and women who a generation ago might have devoted themselves to academic life are swept into the vortex of practical life. Professor Seligman of Columbia University has recently said that the "outlook for brains in American universities is an ominous one". The sacrifices required of an American professor and his family are to a high degree deterrent. The conditions provided are rarely favorable to severe, prolonged, and fundamental thinking. Poor salaries frighten off the abler and more vigorous and compel the university instructor to eke out his inadequate income by writing unnecessary textbooks or engaging in other forms of hack work. I do not need to argue that, despite individual exceptions, American scholarship cannot be promoted upon an unsound and unsatisfactory economic basis. It is therefore of the utmost importance that we should set a new standard. We do not need a large faculty. We should endeavor to attract into the Institute a small number of scholars and scientists who will be free from financial worry and concern, who will live and work amidst conditions favorable to intellectual activity. A professorship can of course never be as remunerative as the practice of law or medicine or a successful career in business. It need not be, for it has much to offer that neither law nor medicine nor business can offer. But, on the other hand, the German universities long ago proved that adequate remuneration with sufficient leisure amidst attractive and congenial living conditions and associations are absolutely necessary to the upbuilding of an academic group. I hope therefore that in these matters, upon which our success depends, I may count on the concurrence of the Board, to the end that whether we invite persons to be associated with us temporarily or permanently, the inducement and the conditions will attract the most vigorous and the best endowed minds of our generation."

Since that address was made almost ten years ago we have had considerable experience. Many things have happened in the world around us, but I am persuaded that in point of principle the position which I took in 1930 is as sound today as it ever was and that it will remain so.

The Institute has during this period achieved far more than any one could have expected. What is the explanation? The entire explanation is that the Institute faculty and all those associated in other capacities with the Institute are really the very best persons obtainable for their several posts. While these

persons are all in love with their work and love the Institute, we cannot and must never lose sight of the fact that in the long run the successful maintenance of the standard which we have set is dependent not only upon freedom to work, not only on the possession of the requisite facilities but upon adherence to a sound economic policy in respect to salaries and pensions which I set forth in the quotation cited above.

col 4

Our earliest appointments to professorships carried with them a salary of \$15,000 a year with an assured pension at \$8,000 a year on retirement, and \$5,000 to the widow. At the time we made these appointments everybody supposed that there would be an industrial recovery and, had such a recovery taken place, we would have adhered rigidly to this standard, for though it is sound policy to try young men like Meritt and von Neumann on lower salaries for a few years, it is equally sound and necessary to promote them to higher salaries when they have demonstrated that they are suitable members of the Institute group. Prosperity, however, did not return. It has not even yet returned. I was therefore within a few years faced with a dilemma. If we adhered strictly to the precedents set in the case of Professor Einstein, Professor Veblen, and Professor Weyl, our expansion would have had to be postponed. If, on the other hand, I decided to recommend expansion, I had for the time being to suspend the salary and pension scale and also to obtain such annual grants as I could from the various foundations. I gave many hours of anxious thought to the solution of this dilemma. I imagine that, if I had been forty years old instead of approaching seventy, I might have waited content to carry on the School of Mathematics, but as a matter of fact two factors intervened: (1) I was not forty but near seventy; (2) the Hitler regime was throwing upon the academic market scholars who under previous conditions could not have been attracted to any other country at all. I asked myself time and again the question: shall I wait or shall I use our modest income to set up in addition to the School of Mathematics two additional schools, that of humanistic studies and that of economics and politics, for the time being waiving, as circumstances per-

mitted, the salary and pension provisions originally made. I decided that the future of the Institute would be safer and sounder if my successor found in successful operation three schools. I decided further that in these schools it was of the highest importance to try out younger men like von Neumann. Having come to this decision it was obvious that with our income we would have to compromise temporarily in the matter of salaries and retiring allowances. My convictions on these latter points remain precisely what they were. I have represented to every person who has entered the faculty that, when we came into possession of larger funds, we would feel ourselves morally, though not legally, obligated to render their economic position as sound and satisfactory as that of Einstein, Veblen, and Weyl.

A few persons have indeed been put upon the higher basis in the matter of salary, namely, Meritt, Riefiler, Stewart, and Warren. A few have been raised from \$10,000 to \$12,500 - von Neumann, Alexander, and Morse. Herzfeld's salary has been improved. I would not change at this moment the financial status of either Mitrany or Earle even if I possessed the money, for I think they are both passing through the probationary period and that it remains to be seen whether they will be so effective as to deserve the higher rewards, but if the Institute is to continue to attract the best brains in the world, no matter how ideal the conditions of work may be, as soon as possible it is urgent that we shall provide in respect to salary and pension the same conditions for men like Herzfeld, Panofsky, and von Neumann as we provided for the original three persons. I regard this as a moral as well as an educational obligation, and if it is not done and if instead the work of the Institute is simply expanded, mediocrity will result and the Institute will cease to occupy the high position which it has obtained.

I have the same feeling precisely as respects the secretarial staff. We have practically no secretaries in the ordinary sense of the word. We have a most unusual group of women who have education, devotion, and all the human qualities required to deal with the men and women who come to the Institute from year to year. They are already all of them as well paid as and some of them better paid than they

would be in a lawyer's office or in a business establishment. This is not enough. They need salaries which will enable them to live in such a way that they can continue to grow because they are dealing with highly educated men and women and they themselves cannot afford for the sake of the Institute to lead humdrum lives. They ought to be so financed that they can study or travel and that they can regard their connection with the Institute as lifelong without any worry whatsoever as to their future. They should therefore be not only carried on the pension list of the Teachers Annuity Association but so recompensed that they can in addition save enough to feel sure that, when they retire, they can lead lives of dignity and independence. Meanwhile, none of the women whom we call secretaries is an ordinary person. Some of them are in respect to culture and scholarship very extraordinary, and all of them are engaged in improving themselves intellectually and in making themselves useful in a thousand ways to the strangers who come to Princeton as no ordinary young women could possibly do.

It is fair to ask how at a time when we are using the entire income we can carry out even the legal obligations into which we have entered in respect to pensions, should, for example, Professor Veblen retire. This is really a very simple matter and does not require any insurance at all. Let us suppose that Professor Veblen at 65 ~~is to retire at the end of this season.~~ were going to retire at the end of this season. He receives now a salary of \$15,000. In retirement he will receive \$8,000. Under the existing economic conditions his place need not be filled. Every one of the three groups is so strong that it can perfectly well go ahead without loss of prestige and without immediately filling vacancies even if available persons are at hand. If therefore Professor Veblen retired with a retiring allowance of \$8,000, we save \$7,000 plus \$750, premium paid by the Institute, plus the portion of the retiring allowance paid by the Teachers Insurance Association. If the Institute is not perfectly easy in a financial sense, we would make no reappointment. Now let us suppose that a few years later Professor Einstein retires, the same thing would be true. The Institute would pay Einstein \$8,000 less the annuity paid by the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Associ-

ation and we save this sum plus \$7,000 plus the \$750 now paid to the Teachers Annuity Association. Thus we would have from these two salaries money more than enough to add an additional member to the mathematical faculty without increasing our expenditure a penny. Neither the strength nor prestige of the faculty would suffer if we delayed in making an appointment of the same calibre as the present members. This is true of every one of the three schools. We can therefore rest easy and dismiss all concern as to our ability to carry out our legal obligations.

There is, however, another contingency, namely, that one of the young men may die and leave a wife and children. His accumulations in the Teachers Annuity Association would not alone be sufficient to maintain his widow and to enable her to educate her children. In that case, once more a considerable salary is saved, part of which should as a first duty on the part of the Institute be used to provide an adequate pension for the widow sufficient for her own needs and for the education of her children.

No institution can possibly at any given moment provide for every possible contingency, but there is on the other hand no institution whose problem in respect to retiring allowance is as simple and easy as ours at this time. I hope therefore that my successor will cling to the purpose to which the Institute pledged itself at the outset and that, until we are in position to make regular provision for all members, temporary situations may be met in the way in which I have above indicated.

What I have said regarding leaving posts vacant is not new. Several years ago Professor Capps retired from the head professorship of Greek in Princeton University. His place has not yet been filled, and the University is making no haste to fill it, but the University as a whole has not lost in repute or prestige despite the fact that Professor Capps was one of its great ornaments. Still another case - in the year 1927 Mr. Jones of Chicago endowed two chairs, one the Fine Professorship of Mathematics, the other the Jones Professorship of Mathematical Physics. The Fine Professorship of Mathematics was filled immediately with Professor Veblen and, when Professor Veblen came to the Institute, Professor Lefschetz was put

in his place. The Jones Professorship of Mathematical Physics, despite the fact that not only Princeton but the entire country was weak in this subject, was not filled until Professor Wigner was made Jones Professor of Mathematical Physics recently. Thus the leading mathematical faculty of the country left unfilled an important professorship for a period of eleven years because it could not find the right person, and no harm was done. It could also have left the professorship unfilled for any other reason, financial or other, it does not matter.

I am absolutely sure that this method of dealing with our retiring and pension problems is far safer than an effort to tie up endowment in the form of insurance policies of a complicated nature.

Abraham Flexner

AF:ESB

1934-1944

VERT. FILE "S"

SALARIES

Academic Personnel

BENEFITS

PROFESSORS

Memorandum for Mr. Maass containing copies of certain letters bearing on salaries and retirement problems.

~~Filed 10/18/56~~

Filed in Vertical File under "s" for Salaries.

A, 10/18/56, Home, Material for Trustees Committee on Inst. Policy

MEMORANDUM FOR MR. MAASS

January 5, 1945

In response to your request I hand you herewith copies of certain letters bearing on salaries and retirement problems as follows:

August 23, 1943	Mr. Morse to Mr. Aydelotte
October 25, 1934	Mr. Flexner to Mr. Morse
January 4, 1945	Mr. von Neumann to Mr. Aydelotte
December 5, 1944	Memorandum of Conversation between Mr. Aydelotte and Mr. Alexander
November 10, 1944	Mr. Veblen to Mr. Aydelotte
December 11, 1944	Mr. Veblen to Mr. Aydelotte
November 5, 1938	Extract from Memorandum by Mr. Flexner
November 2, 1938	Extract from Letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Riefler

.....

January 28, 1936	Letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Herzfeld
April 13, 1939	Letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Herzfeld

.....

May 18, 1934 to February 4, 1944	Letters and memoranda concerning the status of Mr. Lowe
-------------------------------------	--

.....

I am sorry this correspondence is so bulky but I think it better that you should have all the relevant documents at hand. The upshot of it seems to me to be that we have a clear obligation to increase the salaries of von Neumann, Morse and Alexander to \$15,000 and a moral commitment to arrange the terms of retirement of Professors Lowe and Herzfeld so that it will be possible for them to continue their scholarly work. Now that the Institute can afford to do so, I think the terms fixed for the retirement of these two men might well be made somewhat more generous. The amounts involved would be small and the moral obligation seems to me to be clear. The terms fixed a year ago were, I think as generous as we were justified in making at that time, but now that the financial picture is brighter I hope the Committee will be willing to consider the matter again.

FRANK AYDELOTTE

FA:jsr

C O P Y

The Institute for Advanced Study
School of Mathematics
Princeton, New Jersey

August 23, 1943

Dear Doctor Aydelotte:

Thanks for the recent letter stating the probable amount of my annuity from the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association under my present salary. As a trustee of another educational institution I have come to recognize the great importance of a careful clarification of such matters affecting the life and security of faculty members. On my part I want to make available for your files and those of the Board of Trustees a letter bearing on the financial commitments of the Institute in my case, and a description of certain relevant circumstances.

My effective retiring annuity under my present salary and under the option of half annuity to my wife (on survival) will be \$3,397.60. At the time of my retirement my two youngest children will be of precollege age, 15 and 16 years old respectively, so that I could not properly use the single annuity option.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter from Dr. Flexner confirming a long conversation which I had with him. In this conversation Dr. Flexner referred to the expectation of raising the salaries of the professors in the School of Mathematics to \$15,000. It was this expectation which was finally decisive, as can be seen from the terms which Harvard was then offering me.

Had I remained at Harvard, the salary would have been \$10,000 a year, with good reason to believe that it would shortly be raised to the maximum. I was also furnished, without cost, a suite of rooms in the Eliot House. Harvard offered the chairmanship of the Division of Mathematics, and a reduction to three hours of teaching. The expected annuity from Harvard was somewhat more favorable than the one from the Institute based on my present

- 2 -

salary. There remained the important expectation of teaching two or three years after the ordinary retirement age.

I hope that these facts and circumstances will be useful to the Board when the appropriate time arises for considering them.

Sincerely yours,

Signed: MARSTON MORSE

Marston Morse

Dr. Frank Aydelotte
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, N.J.
MM:GB

C O P Y

October 25, 1934

Dear Professor Morse:

I received this morning your kind letter of October 24.

As I recall our conversation, I stated that it was my intention to recommend to the Board that the salaries of the professors in the School of Mathematics which are less than \$15,000 should be raised to that sum, but that, in view of the present financial situation, I am not prepared to take that step at this moment.

I am, however, prepared to offer you a salary of \$12,500, beginning July 1, 1935. Of this sum five per cent would be deducted and put into the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, the Institute paying, in addition to your salary, an equal sum.

The age of retirement is 65, but can be prolonged by the consent of both parties beyond that age.

If I have omitted in this letter anything which I said to you, I shall be glad to include it if you will recall it to my memory.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor Marston Morse
E-23 Eliot House
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

C O P Y

January 4, 1945

Dear Dr. Aydelotte:

These are the facts concerning my salary:

Dr. Flexner told me repeatedly that it was his policy and the Institute's policy to equalize all salaries in the School of Mathematics at the level of \$15,000 a year, and that he would do this without delay as soon as the financial situation of the Institute permitted it. He assured me that I could count on this.

Dr. Flexner's first statement to this effect was in 1935, and he repeated it two or three times between then and 1939. He informed me at the time of his retirement, that Dr. Aydelotte was informed of this promise and would make it his own.

Dr. Flexner told me in 1936 that the raise of my salary in July 1936 (from \$10,000 a year to \$12,500 a year) was the first step towards fulfilling this promise. In 1937-38 the Institute granted loans to members of the faculty for building or purchasing homes, the limit being double each man's yearly salary. Dr. Flexner told me that the limit in my case would be \$30,000 and not \$25,000, since he considered that \$15,000 was to be my salary. The loan I actually needed and obtained turned out to be \$26,528.68.

All these conversations were oral, neither Dr. Flexner nor I saw at the time a need to put our understandings in writing.

I am sincerely yours,

JOHN VON NEUMANN

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION WITH PROFESSOR ALEXANDER

December 5, 1944

Professor Alexander told me that he was appointed in 1933 with the same salary as Lefschetz to avoid any feeling that we were buying men away from Princeton and to avoid any financial question in the decision between Alexander and Lefschetz. A promise was made to Alexander that after a few years he would be increased. He was increased from \$10,000 to \$12,500 in 1936. At that time he was given the understanding that he would eventually be put on the same basis as Einstein, Weyl and Veblen.

Alexander is not anxious to put in a claim or to press the matter. He declines to make a written statement. He says that he is at the moment not in need of money personally and thinks the cases of Morse and von Neumann much more urgent.

FRANK AYDELOTTE

FA:jer

C O P Y

The Institute for Advanced Study
School of Mathematics
Princeton, New Jersey

November 10, 1944

Dear Frank:

In response to your inquiry, may I give you the following remarks about two of my colleagues, perhaps prefacing what I say by the remark that both of them belong in a very short list of the leading mathematicians of the world. It would be very hard to find a mathematician anywhere who is worthy of the name, who does not know about both of them and about their work.

Alexander belongs in the rare category of those who contribute a relatively small number of very deep ideas. Each of his papers contains a result which mathematicians in general had been trying without success to obtain, or initiates a line of thought which had not previously existed. The papers and books which have been written about his work exceed enormously in volume what he has written himself. His main field is topology, and perhaps his most famous result is what is known universally as Alexander's duality theorem. This is, however, only one among many of his contributions.

Morse is a more prolific writer, and not so much of a perfectionist as Alexander. His work nevertheless is known all over the world, and has been the subject of many other books and articles: for example, Variationsrechnung im Grossen (Theorie von Marston Morse) by Seifert and Threlfall, Leipzig and Berlin, 1938, is devoted almost entirely to analysis and amplification of some of Morse's discoveries.

Both of these men long ago received the principal distinctions which are open to mathematicians in this country. Of these I will mention only membership in the National Academy of Sciences; this body contains only a limited number of the leading scientists in each field, and their work is scrutinized very carefully before they are chosen. I may add that all professors in the School of Mathematics in the Institute are members of the Academy.

- 2 -

One final remark. Both of these men are now engaged full force on scientific work which, when it becomes known to the world, will reflect the highest credit upon the Institute.

Sincerely,

Signed: OSWALD VEBLEN

Oswald Veblen

Dr. Frank Aydelotte
Institute for Advanced Study

OV*GB

December 11, 1944

Dear Frank:

When Professor Alexander was appointed to the Institute Faculty, he was bracketed with Professor Lefschetz of the University Faculty. Dr. Flexner asked me for my opinion as between Alexander and Lefschetz. I declined to say that one was more suitable for the Institute Faculty than the other. Their work was closely related and it was clearly understood that the one of them who was not chosen for a position in the Institute would become my successor as the Fine Professor of Mathematics in the University. Dr. Flexner decided to ask Dean Eisenhart to choose which one would stay on the University Faculty. Eisenhart discussed the problem with me and the decision was finally made on non-mathematical grounds that it would be better for Lefschetz to stay in the University and Alexander to come to the Institute.

As a result of this situation, Dr. Flexner said to Alexander and to me that he thought that it was better for Alexander to accept the same salary which Professor Lefschetz would be receiving in the University for the first couple of years, after which he would be put on the same status as the other mathematical professors who at that time were Einstein and myself. Weyl had been offered a position on the terms which he ultimately accepted, but was still hesitating.

When von Neumann was appointed a little later, Flexner felt, with justice, that he could not be placed in a higher bracket than Alexander and therefore there was the same understanding about his appointment as about Alexander's.

So far as I can recall, nothing was put into writing in either case. The assurances which Dr. Flexner gave to me and to both Alexander and von Neumann were discussed by us frequently at that time and were regarded by us as completely binding.

Yours sincerely,

Signed: OSWALD VEBLER

Dr. Frank Aydelotte
The Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

November 5, 1938 Extract from Memorandum by Mr. Flexner:

"Our earliest appointments to professorships carried with them a salary of \$15,000 a year with an assured pension at \$8,000 a year on retirement, and \$5,000 to the widow. At the time we made these appointments everybody supposed that there would be an industrial recovery and, had such a recovery taken place, we would have adhered rigidly to this standard, for though it is sound policy to try young men like Meritt and von Neumann on lower salaries for a few years, it is equally sound and necessary to promote them to higher salaries when they have demonstrated that they are suitable members of the Institute group. Prosperity, however, did not return. It has not even yet returned. I was therefore within a few years faced with a dilemma. If we adhered strictly to the precedents set in the case of Professor Einstein, Professor Veblen, and Professor Weyl, our expansion would have had to be postponed. If, on the other hand, I decided to recommend expansion, I had for the time being to suspend the salary and pension scale and also to obtain such annual grants as I could from the various foundations. I gave many hours of anxious thought to the solution of this dilemma. I imagine that, if I had been forty years old instead of approaching seventy, I might have waited content to carry on the School of Mathematics, but as a matter of fact two factors intervened: (1) I was not forty but near seventy; (2) the Hitler regime was throwing upon the academic market scholars who under previous conditions could not have been attracted to any other country at all. I asked myself time and again the question: shall I wait or shall I use our modest income to set up in addition to the School of Mathematics two additional schools, that of humanistic studies and that of economics and politics, for the time being waiving, as circumstances permitted, the salary and pension provisions originally made. - I decided that the future of the

Extract from letter from Dr. Flexner to Professor Riefler
dated November 2, 1938.

When the Institute was founded, there was a definite financial policy in reference to salaries and retiring allowances. In consequence of the slump that policy had to be suspended. We had either to cease growing, which at my time of life would have been, I think, a very serious matter for the future of the Institute, or we had simply to regard our policy as one of suspense pending financial recovery or the receipt of future endowment. The moment either of these two events takes place we are going back to the policy on which we started, for upon that policy and upon that alone can the eminence and distinction of the Institute be preserved.

C O P Y

January 28, 1936

Dear Professor Herzfeld:

Professor Walter W. S. Cook of New York University has showed me your letter of December 28. He and I have reached an understanding on the basis of which you have been elected to be a professor in the School of Humanistic Studies of the Institute for Advanced Study at a salary of \$6,000, towards which New York University will contribute \$2,000 and the Emergency Committee also contributes \$2,000. As a return for this action on the part of New York University you will be asked to give one course at that University, which will mean leaving Princeton early in the morning once a week, giving a lecture, and returning in the afternoon. I hope that on this basis you may begin an American career, and I can give you the assurance that as the resources of the Institute for Advanced Study increase, as we have every reason to believe they will increase, your salary will be raised. The amount now promised you, however, will enable you to live in comfort and dignity in Princeton.

A pension is provided by an arrangement with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, according to which the professor pays 5% of his salary monthly and the educational institution with which he is connected pays an equal sum. These combined sums increase at compound interest and form the basis of a retiring allowance at sixty-five years of age or later, if it is acceptable to the trustees of the institution.

- 2 -

Your appointment will begin July 1, 1936, and your salary will be paid to you monthly at the close of each month, if you accept this invitation. Checks will be mailed to you during the summer at any address that you desire.

I am forwarding to you under separate cover the latest bulletin of the Institute. You will observe that the term begins on October 1 and ends on May 1. I hope that, like Professor Panofsky, you will find Princeton an agreeable, happy, and congenial place in which to carry on your work. You are fortunate in the fact that Princeton University possesses an unusual group of humanists, with whom you, Professor Panofsky, and your future associates will be at work in the happiest cooperation.

Trusting that I may hear from you affirmatively in the near future, I am, with great respect and all good wishes,

Very sincerely yours,

(Sgd) ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor Ernst Herzfeld
20 Queen Street
London, W. 1, England

AF/MCE

COPY

April 13, 1939

Dear Professor Herzfeld:

Mr. Stewart called on me this morning to tell me something about your conversation with him yesterday. One of the topics he spoke of was your very natural feeling about your library. I want to give you every possible official and binding assurance that as long as you live your library can and will, if you so desire, remain in the quarters prepared for it in the new building, and that you will have absolutely unrestricted access to it whether you are active or on the retired list. My earnest hope is that your vigor and health will continue to be what they now are, as I believe they will, and that you will remain on the active list far beyond the nominal retirement age which was adopted merely as a safeguard and will, I hope, never apply to you.

With warmest greetings to your sister as well as yourself, believe me

Ever sincerely,

(Sgd) ABRAHAM FLEXNER

Professor Ernst Herzfeld
10 Bayard Lane
Princeton, New Jersey

AF/MCE

May 13, 1934 - Town L. Fleury
one p pp 1-2

Dec 7, 1935 - Fleury L town
one sentence notes

Dec 9, 1935 - Fleury L town
one sentence

Jan 27, 1936 - 30 minutes
7 lines, appointment

Jan 13, 1936 - Fleury L town
Enter

Apr 25, 1940 - Conversa Kleva town & FG
Enter

May 4, 1943 - Fleury L Appleton
enter

June 10, 1943 - town to FA

2 passer mesh

June 11, 1943 - FA to town

enter

Aug 20, 1943 - town to Caydelon

enter

Dec 11, 1943 - town to Caydelon

enter

Sept 14, 1943 - FA to Fluxus

enter

Sept 16, 1943 - AF to FA

enter

Sept 22, 1943 - AF to FA

enter

W

Sept. 23, 1943 - Q F L F A

enter

Sept 27, 1943 - F A to M + L

enter

Sept 28, 1943 - Mason L F A

A weeks

Jan 27, 1944 - Lane L F A

enter

May 18, 1934 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Flexner explaining his financial situation in Oxford.

December 7, 1935 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe, invitation to the Institute.

December 9, 1935 Supplement to foregoing concerning pensions and retirement.

January 27, 1936 Motion passed by Trustees appointing Professor Lowe.

February 13, 1936 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe implying that the Institute will underwrite the subsidy which Mr. Lowe had received from the Carnegie Institution.

April 25, 1940 Memorandum of conversation between Mr. Aydelotte and Mr. Lowe in which Mr. Lowe urges that Institute underwrite this subsidy.

May 4, 1943 Extract from letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte approving proposed pension arrangements for Mr. Lowe and Mr. Herzfeld.

June 10, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte enclosing Mr. Flexner's letters of December 7 and 9, 1935 (given above) and urging the continuation of the subsidy formerly received from the Carnegie Institution.

June 11, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe suggesting other possible sources for research funds.

July 12, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe summarizing proposed conditions of retirement and pension previously discussed.

August 20, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte saying that he does not find these proposed arrangements acceptable.

August 23, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe asking him to state his case.

September 11, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte stating his case in full.

September 14, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte's reply asking clarification of certain points.

September 14, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Flexner inquiring whether he understood that the Institute had underwritten the Carnegie subsidy.

September 16, 1943 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte "hoped that the Institute would be able to see his work through but that does not constitute a contract."

(Note by FA: In this connection it is my opinion that Professor Lowe was justified in interpreting Mr. Flexner's letter of February 13, 1936 as a definite promise.)

- 2 -

September 22, 1943 Extract from letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte urging prolongation of active service of Mr. Lowe and Mr. Herzfeld.

September 23, 1943 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte on same subject. While there is no legal commitment there is a scholastic obligation to do so.

September 27, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Maass and Mr. Leidesdorf strongly urging more liberal terms of retirement for Mr. Lowe and Mr. Herzfeld.

September 28, 1943 Mr. Maass's reply suggesting that the matter be further considered by the Committee on Pensions.

December 16, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe informing him of more liberal arrangements approved by the Executive Committee.

January 24, 1944 Faculty Meeting called at request of Mr. Einstein and Mr. Lowe to consider pension arrangements after full discussion passes following motion:

January 27, 1944 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte expressing appreciation of action taken and asking certain questions about the accounting for his research subsidy.

January 28, 1944 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe answering these questions.

February 4, 1944 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte expressing satisfaction with these arrangements.

As a background to this discussion I quote the following extract from a letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Riefler, dated November 2, 1938 and an extract from a memorandum by Mr. Flexner dated November 5, 1938, in which Mr. Flexner makes it clear that when the Institute became financially able to do so, all members of the Faculty would be placed on the same footing as Mr. Einstein, Mr. Veblen and Mr. Weyl so far as salary and retirement allowances were concerned.

letter didn't say that; but then up if they were worried.

May 18, 1934 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Flexner:

"My dear Flexner,

"Let me begin by thanking you for your kind words about the volume of C.L.A. which has just appeared. I cannot forget that you were one of the men who helped to launch the project, so that your approbation, even though unprofessional, is peculiarly gratifying. I am also grateful to you for expressing the hope that I may be spared 'many, many years' - to use your own repetition - to complete this publication; for it will take a few! And it will be worth doing, since I am not alone in the conviction that once completed C.L.A. will become the starting-point and foundation for endless future studies in Latin palaeography. Hence my anxiety to make the sort of change which will give me fresh energy without depriving me of the favourable working conditions which I possess at the moment: viz, a salary sufficient to live on, teaching hours reduced to a minimum, clerical assistance and the means for travelling.

"I am enclosing Merriam's two recent letters, from which you will see that his attitude is entirely friendly, but I suppose, as you say, we can leave it at that for the present. From Putnam I have heard nothing; the reason is not difficult to understand. I have had a letter from Morey asking my opinion about a manuscript, in which he took occasion to say as follows: 'We have heard some rumours that you might be settling in Princeton, and the whole Department is greatly hoping that this may be the case. It would be quite wonderful to have you here to talk over our manuscript problems with, and I am sure you would find the crowd a good bunch to work with and Princeton a delightful place to live. Here's hoping the rumour is true.'

Now to answer the question you raised regarding the financial arrangement between Washington and Oxford. The Carnegie Institution pays

- 2 -

May 18, 1944 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Flexner:

me four thousand, five hundred dollars a year, minus the five percent deducted for the deferred annuity. The University of Oxford pays me four hundred pounds, minus five percent for the annuity: Corpus, of course, pays me nothing, mine being a University appointment. These two sources of income have during the past five years (we are now in the fifth and last year) been augmented by the honorarium received for editing C.L.A. This extra emolument amounts to roughly four thousand dollars, since three thousand came to me as salary, five hundred dollars as contingent fund and one hundred pounds in rental for the scriptorium for C.L.A. operations. Deducting rates and income tax, I have in recent years (the last four and a half) had roughly ten thousand dollars to live on; and without doing anything that might be described as a splurge, we found that our modest life in Oxford and the education of our three daughters ate up nearly all of it. I should also mention that in addition to the above salary, my travelling and per diem expenses while doing field work outside Oxford were met by funds from the Rockefeller Grant - amounting to roughly fifteen hundred dollars a year. Secretarial assistance was also paid for from the Grant and not by me.

"Since I am being explicit about my money arrangements, I should add that my wife, as you know, earns a little money from time to time by her translations; but I must also add that we are paying off, at the rate of five hundred dollars a year, a debt of several thousand dollars incurred for the children's education, before I began receiving the Rockefeller Grant. We have no other debts whatever. On the other hand, I must face the fact that for the next several years my daughters' education will continue to require financial support from me, and there is no telling how many years

- 3 -

May 18, 1934 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Flexner:

after that they may still be dependent on me. As for my wife and myself, we require nothing but a quiet life in healthy surroundings and to go on with our work.

"I have not lived in U.S.A. enough in recent years to know how living expenses there would compare with our expenses here. You would know that better than I. The important consideration in my eyes, committed as I am, is that I should find a place with healthy living conditions, a minimum of teaching, the necessary secretarial assistance and time and money to do the necessary field work."

December 7, 1935 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe:

"My dear Lowe:

"I have just cabled you as follows:

'Am mailing you today invitation to professorship in Institute.
Confidential.'

"I have, as you know, wanted from the beginning to associate you with the School of Humanistic Studies of the Institute, but there were problems that had to be settled before I could do so, which I need not explain to you.

"On Monday last I had a separate interview with Leland and Merriam, and they were immensely pleased with the idea that you should come here and that the Carnegie subvention would be continued. As I understand it, money for the publication of your monumental work is already in the hands of the Clarendon Press, which is contributing one-third to the cost of publication. The making of photographs, so Leland explained, is cared for by the sale of the same. / Under these conditions, I am authorized to inquire whether you would accept a professorship in the Institute at a salary of \$10,000 a year plus the subvention of the Carnegie Foundation of Washington of \$4,500 a year, which will take care of secretary, travel, and other expenses. / I hope very much that the situation is such that you can be added to our humanistic group, which for the present consists only of Panofsky, formerly of Hamburg, and Meritt, whom I took before I intended in order that he might not accept another post in an environment which, in my judgment, would not have been stimulating to him. Doubtless you have met him in Oxford and formed your own opinion as to his abilities and promise. Your appointment can begin any time after July 1, 1936, when your present arrangement with Oxford can be decently and honorably brought to an end. No one knows of this except the members of the Executive Committee and Miss Belle Greene with whom I have talked in the strictest

- 2 -

December 7, 1935 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe:

confidence from time to time. I am sure she will not mention it until the Board has acted, which in the case of an affirmative reply from you they will do at the meeting to be held on January 27, 1936.

"I need not say that you will be most heartily welcomed. I shall do everything in my power to make you happy here and to promote the great work to which you are devoting your life. If there are any factors, however, with which I am unacquainted please let me know about them in order that the Board may be fully acquainted with the responsibilities which it is undertaking.

"We are having a very successful year, and the enthusiasm among the faculty and the workers at the Institute is at white heat.

"Eleanor is busy at her job and in excellent health. She and her mother join me in warmest greetings to you and your wife and the girls."

December 9, 1935 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe:

"My dear Lowe:

"It occurred to me after I mailed my letter dated December 7 that I had omitted to say that, as I understand it, you are now accumulating a pension in the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, towards which you contribute 5% of your salary monthly and towards which the Carnegie Institution contributes 5% monthly. The Institute would of course continue the same arrangement. / The retirement age is set at sixty-five, but it can be prolonged by mutual consent year by year. /

"You will also see, if you read the Bulletins of the Institute, that it is understood that, while professors of the Institute are free to accept remuneration and honoraria for strictly professional work, they are not to engage in activities simply for the sake of financial returns. I know that it is superfluous to mention this in writing to you, for you are one of the few people who have nothing to sell and would not be disposed to do so if you had. I call attention to it, however, merely in order that I may mention every point which affects the constitution of the faculty of the Institute.

"I can think of nothing else that I have neglected to say.

"With all good wishes,"

January 27, 1936 Motion passed by Trustees:

"The Director nominated Professor E. A. Lowe a professor in the School of Humanistic Studies on the following terms:

"That his appointment as professor in the School of Humanistic Studies date from July 1, 1936; that his salary be fixed at \$10,000 a year, of which he will contribute 5% to the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association of America, the Institute contributing an equal sum monthly; and that, unless his term of appointment is prolonged by mutual consent, he retire at 65 years of age.

"On motion, the nomination of Professor E. A. Lowe as professor in the School of Humanistic Studies was approved."

February 13, 1936 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Lowe:

"There is nothing in Leland's letter regarding Merriam that need give you any concern. These foundations never pledge themselves except for a period of years, usually three and never more than five. Merriam was genuinely interested in your work and genuinely desirous of retaining your relationship to Carnegie. If anything now unforeseen should happen which makes this impossible, the sum involved is not enough to disturb you or me; so don't worry about the future. The Institute finances have been so cautiously managed that it would take a good deal of disturbance to cause anybody any inconvenience, though, to be sure, a gift such as Merriam has been making is always welcome. In your place, however, I would make no further allusion to it in writing anyone, but if Merriam should write you you would naturally express your appreciation and your hope that the relationship which has been so useful in this great undertaking may be continued."

April 25, 1940 Memorandum of conversation between Mr. Aydelotte and Mr. Lowe:

"Professor Lowe understands that his appointment at the Institute at a salary of \$10,000 plus a \$4500 grant from the Carnegie Institution of Washington amounted virtually to a guarantee by the Institute that he would receive this grant or its equivalent. The grant was afterwards reduced from \$4500 to \$4000. Professor Lowe does not mind that reduction, but he feels that the \$4000 over and above his salary is indispensable to the success of his work.

"This \$4000 has now been reduced by the Carnegie Institution to \$1000. The Institute is for 1940-41 undertaking to pay an assistant for Professor Lowe at a salary of \$1800. \$1800 plus \$1000 makes \$2800, leaving a balance of \$1200, which Professor Lowe feels that the Institute should find for the support of his work. It would be used mainly for travel, assistance abroad, and miscellaneous expenses. Professor Lowe will understand perfectly if in the present condition of the Institute budget this \$1200 cannot be found, but he would like an understanding that the Institute would meet this expense when funds are available, or perhaps induce the Carnegie Institution to increase the amount of its subsidy."

May 4, 1943 Extract from letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte:

"I am quite satisfied with the figure which you have reached as to pensions for Lowe and Herzfeld. I hope that they will be enabled to go on with their respective tasks."

June 10, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

"My dear Aydelotte,

"Here are Dr. Flexner's two letters. On rereading them I find that the Institute is quite within its rights in retiring me at the age of sixty-five; and I wish to say that I appreciate the generous offer of the trustees to raise my pension from \$2,600 to \$4,000.

"I think, however, that it is my duty to remind you that the main reason for getting me to the Institute was to enable me to continue the publication of Codices Latini Antiquiores. Three volumes are out, a fourth should be out this year, and there are six more in various stages of preparation. To complete these I must resume work in the European libraries, which cannot be done before the war is over, and that may not be before I am due to retire.

"I cannot expect the Institute to have one policy for one professor and another policy for another as far as retiring is concerned, but circumstances vary with different professors. In my particular case the thing that matters is that I should not be forced to discontinue the publication of C.L.A. just at the moment when it can be resumed. It is immaterial how the Institute would designate the financial support of the publication, but in my opinion it is morally obligated to do so for at least the few years after my retiring age while I am fit and able to carry on this particular work.

"I have talked the matter over with Dr. Einstein since his retirement comes first of all, and I have his permission to tell you that he considers my case entirely different from his and that he regards the nature and claims of my work as entitling me to further support by the Institute. It is one thing to retire on four thousand dollars to enjoy one's old age and quite another to retire on it and prosecute my sort of work - especially as I have a family to take care of as well."

June 11, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"Many thanks for Dr. Flexner's letters, which I return, and for your own understanding statement. The difficulty is exactly what you say: that it is impossible for the Institute to have one policy for one professor and another for another.

"I think we must put our heads together to see whether further support cannot be found for your work. I think of three possible sources:

"1. The Carnegie Institution: If they would resume their payments at the rate of \$4500 for a period of three to five years, that would take care of the matter.

"2. The Rockefeller Foundation: Stevens has a real interest in humanistic projects and it would seem to me that this would be one that might appeal to him.

"3. The American Philosophical Society: They have upwards of \$50,000 a year to spend on grants in aid and they could hardly find a project which would equal yours in intellectual value.

"If you will think all these possibilities over I should be glad to talk with you about them and to concert with you the proper steps to be taken. The Carnegie Institution is the source I should prefer above all others, because of their past support of your work."

July 12, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"I am writing this letter to confirm to you in writing the substance of our various conversations in regard to your retirement. If my records are correct you were born in October 1879, will become sixty-five in October 1944, and will be due to retire as of July 1, 1945.

"The collections built up in your name with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association under the 5% contributory plan would entitle you to a single life annuity of approximately \$2700. The Trustees feel that this is not a sufficient provision for your old age and it gives me great pleasure to inform you that they have voted to supplement your annuity from the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association by whatever sum is required to bring your annuity up to \$4000.

"I very much hope, as do the Trustees, that you will find it possible to continue to live in Princeton and to carry on your work in Fuld Hall. I am happy to assure you that the Institute will be glad to provide quarters for your work as long as you are able to use them and I shall be glad to assist by any means in my power to find funds from sources outside the Institute to defer the expense of trips to Europe, of providing photographs and reproductions, and other expenses incident to the completion of your great work."

August 20, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Aydelotte:

"During the past month I have been giving a good deal of thought to your letter of July 12, as well as to your letter of June 10, 1943. I am deeply concerned as to what they imply as regards my family, myself and the continuation of my work.

"I am going into the facts of the case as thoroughly as I can, and shall write you at length some time in the future. Meantime I think I ought to let you know that I do not find the proposed arrangements acceptable."

August 23, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"I have your letter and hasten to say that I shall be very glad to have from you a full statement of your own views about retirement and of what you understood the obligation of the Institute to be. I should be glad if you would write your proposed letter as soon as you conveniently can so that I may have time to consider it myself and to consult the Trustees' committee before our meeting in October."

September 11, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Aydelotte:

"You were good enough to write me recently that you would like to have from me a more detailed statement of the reasons why the proposals contained in your letter of July 12th seem unacceptable. I am glad to comply with this request, especially as you were so considerate as to assure me that you meant to settle the difficulties which have now come to the surface in a spirit of equity, as one deeply concerned with the moral aspect of the questions involved.

"The difficulties have arisen primarily, I think, as a result of each of us holding different views of the conditions of my appointment. My view is based first of all on letters received before and after the resolution adopted by the Trustees in January 1936, then on conversations held with those in authority, and lastly on certain practical steps taken by the Institute.

"The threefold conditions of my appointment were these: (1) I was to receive a salary of ten thousand dollars a year. (2) This salary was to be supplemented by a sum of \$4,500 to be used exclusively for defraying expenses for secretary, assistants, travel, books, etc. in connection with editing "Codices Latini Antiquiores." (3) The retiring age was sixty-five, 'but it could be prolonged by mutual consent.' My comment follows.

"The letters which I possess make it clear that the main object in honoring me with a professorship at the Institute was to provide adequate physical conditions and ample financial support for the successful completion of C.L.A. - an enterprise launched by a very generous grant from the Rockefeller Foundation (in which Dr. Flexner's backing was invaluable), supplemented by aid from the Carnegie Institution and the Library of Congress, and pursued under the supervision of the Union

- 2 -

September 11, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

Academie Internationale - in short, a semi-public undertaking.

"The first condition has never been open to question.

"The second condition, however, has been a source of concern almost from the start. For several years it has not been fulfilled, with results detrimental to the progress of my work.

"The condition dealing with retirement has the clause 'but by mutual consent' added to it. To my mind this meant that if there were valid reasons why a professor should continue to hold his chair, he would not be retired. I submit in all modesty that such valid reasons operate in my case. I refer to the fact that I am in the middle of an important work, in fit condition to continue it, but unable to go ahead with it unless suitable support is forthcoming and I am freed from financial worries. To make sure that my view of the retirement condition was correct I took the trouble in May of this year to consult Dr. Flexner, to whose unselfish and constant interest in my work I owe my position at the Institute. As the author of the clause he surely knew its exact meaning and intention. He told me that I was right in thinking that retirement could be postponed and that there were valid reasons in my case for doing so.

"Certain steps taken by the Institute helped to build up and give emphasis to my definite belief that sixty-five was not a fixed and unalterable retiring age. For instance, before Fuld Hall was built I was asked what sort of a room I needed, and I was given a room which is a palaeographer's dream - six windows, specially built-in shelves for large portfolios, and pulpit-desks for holding them open. Furthermore, I was encouraged to build a house on Institute land - a house fit for a professor to live in. No one in his senses would have built such a house had he known beforehand that he would live in it only for five years. For, as you must know, no

- 3 -

September 11, 1943 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

man can afford to live in Princeton in such a house and do his work on the pension proposed by the Institute.

"The expense of continuing the publication of C.L.A. - for trained assistants, secretarial work, books and travel, when this again becomes possible - cannot be less than \$4,500 per annum. Living expenses of my family and myself, even on the most modest scale, will amount to more than \$5,000 a year. You can see, therefore, why the proposal of retirement at the figure indicated by you, and without any commitment on the part of the Institute to provide the funds necessary for the continued publication of C.L.A., has been so disturbing to me.

"As I understand it, one of the guiding principles of the Institute, from the beginning, was that its salaries and retiring allowances should be, as stated in its bulletins, 'such that the teaching staff is free from all financial concern.' I am sure that you will agree that the situation with which I appear to be confronted is not one in which I can be free from financial concern. And, of course, I am not the only professor who is faced with this problem.

"In conclusion let me say that when I gave up my Oxford position - a position held for twenty-five years - it was because I was led to believe that the Institute intended to the best of its ability to help me to get on with the publication of C.L.A. and to bring it to a successful conclusion, health and world conditions permitting. I cannot but believe that the Institute will find the necessary means for fulfilling this moral obligation."

September 14, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"Many thanks for your letter of September 11th, which raises two or three questions I should like to get clear. In the first paragraph I think the word 'hoped' would describe what I said to you better than 'meant,' since the eventual settlement must, of course, be made by the Trustees. I certainly hope that the Trustees will be willing to suggest a settlement which will seem to you to be fair.

"The points I am concerned about are as follows:

"1. I should be very glad to see any of the letters which you mention in your second paragraph.

"2. You do not mention the Carnegie Institution. Did you understand that your appointment involved the underwriting by the Institute of the \$4500 which you formerly received from them in case the Carnegie Institution should cease payment of that subsidy?

"I am anxious to have the fullest possible information to present to the committee of the Board in the near future."

September 14, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Flexner:

"Dear Dr. Flexner:

"Did you understand that it was one of the terms of Lowe's appointment that the Institute should supply this \$4500 a year from the Carnegie Institution if the Carnegie people found themselves unable to continue with that subsidy? Lowe thinks that this was one of the conditions of his appointment and I see that various letters to you bear that out, as do statements which he has made to me. I had taken the line that we hoped the Carnegie Institution would keep on with that subsidy, but I had not understood that we had undertaken to supply it if they failed. The whole matter is connected with the question of Lowe's retirement, about which I want some further talk with you the next time I get to New York."

September 16, 1943 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Frank:

"I have yours of September 14 regarding the conditions of Lowe's appointment to the Institute. As I remember it, I hoped that the Carnegie Institution would continue its subsidy, and on several occasions I talked to Merriam in that sense. Merriam was interested in Lowe's work and was glad to have the Carnegie Institution share in so important and creditable an undertaking. The subsidy was continued for this reason, but I do not know for how many years. It was not made an indefinite grant. Merriam and I retired the same year, and I have no knowledge as to what the attitude of Bush was or is.

"You say in your letter that 'various letters to you (that is, me) from Lowe bear' this statement out. I do not see how letters from him to me could be conclusive. The question is what did I say or write to him and what was said in the letter in which I announced his appointment and its terms. I imagine that I said to him that I hoped that the Institute would be able to see his work through. To that opinion I still hold, but that does not constitute a contract."

September 22, 1943 Extract from letter from Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte:

"It was bound to happen when the Institute for Advanced Study was started that now and then productive scholars would be active and useful when they were past 65 years of age. For this reason retirement at 65 was not made compulsory but was left to be determined on the basis of individual value and importance.

"In the cases with which you are dealing, I should say that Lowe and Herzfeld give every indication of being physically and mentally as good at 65 or perhaps better than at any previous time in their lives. They are both great scholars who bring unique distinction to an institution of learning. In my judgment, every effort should be made to prolong their activity. What a waste it would be if arbitrarily and without exception all scholars and scientists should be retired when they have reached 65 years of age. In your place, I should make every possible effort to make it feasible for Lowe and Herzfeld to complete the monumental work upon which they have been engaged and which has brought such great distinction to the Institute for Advanced Study."

September 23, 1943 Mr. Flexner to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Frank:

"Reflecting on my notes written yesterday, it occurs to me to add one more consideration:

"The Institute is under no legal obligation to any professor beyond his 65th year, nor in my judgment is it under any moral obligation, for a 'hope' which I expressed and would continue to express to every appointee has absolutely no binding force unless in case of individuals who are engaged in monumental and important research.

"I believe that, when you were appointed, it was understood that you would serve until 70, but you are elected annually, as I asked to be, and the Board is under no obligation to re-elect you unless it is pleased with your conduct of the Institute. In my first report I emphasized the fact that the Board was at liberty to drop me whenever it so wished.

"There is, however, in all appointments a scholastic obligation which is far stronger than a legal or a moral or a supposedly moral commitment. Of every professor at 65 you are bound to ask what has he done, what is he doing, what can he yet do that is of vital and significant importance in the field of science or scholarship. That, in my judgment, is the acid test to which every man who hopes to continue his activity has to submit, and at this time you are the sole judge.

With all good wishes,"

September 27, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass:

"Dear Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass:

"As I think the matter over I am convinced that the action of the Committee on Pensions at its last meeting in limiting the research funds to be made available to Professors Lowe and Herzfeld during their retirement will injure the scholarly reputation of the Institute. I blame myself for taking too much for granted that the Committee would understand the importance of the work which these two men are doing.

"In appointing Professor Lowe the Trustees of the Institute inevitably assumed the responsibility for the Codices Latini Antiquiores. This is a scholarly undertaking of great importance. It has been supported by large contributions from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Library of Congress, the Carnegie Institution of Washington, and the Oxford University Press, and the work has been conducted under the scholarly supervision of the Union Academique Internationale. When we appointed Professor Lowe as a member of our faculty it was assumed by him and by scholars everywhere that we were proposing to complete this great undertaking and that we expected to receive our share of the credit for what is perhaps the most notable contribution to Paleography of this generation.

"The war has intervened and sadly interfered with the progress of the work. That is neither Lowe's fault nor ours, but meanwhile Lowe comes to his retiring age. I do not suggest that his retirement should be postponed on that account, but I do very strongly urge that we make an appropriation which would enable him with due economy and sufficient energy, to finish the job. The \$7500 or \$10,000 suggested in the committee meeting would be merely a futile gesture. Under the circumstances I wonder if you would agree to the following report from the Committee:

"That we set aside for Professor Lowe a research fund of \$12,000 for his use in completing the Codices Latini Antiquiores, with the understanding

- 2 -

September 27, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass:

that he may use this sum as needed up to the maximum of \$4,000 per year and that if he finds this amount inadequate and if he is in good health and making good progress on his researches he may two or three years after his retirement apply to the Committee for further assistance, it being understood that the Committee does not promise in advance to grant this assistance but only to consider his application on its merits.

"The situation of Herzfeld is somewhat like that of Lowe. He is, as I have often said to the Board, founding a new branch of knowledge. I do not know whether you have seen the bibliography of his published works, but I enclose a copy in case you have not. Before the war his contributions to Persian archaeology were regularly published by European academies. They can be most economically printed in Cairo, where Arabic and Persian type is available and where compositors who understand these languages do not command fancy prices. The war has stopped all this and Herzfeld now has three important books which could be ready for publication in perhaps three years. It is a question, however, whether any European academy will be able to publish for him for a long time after the war. What he needs to complete his career is enough money to enable him to live and work in Princeton and a subvention for publication which will help to bring out his works.

"Would you agree in the case of Professor Herzfeld that he be made an appropriation of \$9,000 to be used by him as needed up to a maximum of \$3,000 per year, in order to enable him to continue his work, and that when he has material ready for publication he may apply to the Committee for a publication subsidy, it being understood that the Committee does not promise in advance to grant this subsidy, but only to consider his application?"

- 3 -

September 27, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass:

"I believe Mr. Bamberger would favor these proposals very strongly if he understood the situation. If you prefer to have the matter settled now once and for all, I think the earmarking of \$31,000 (\$16,000 for Lowe and \$15,000 for Herzfeld) would meet the situation.

"I have said nothing to Professors Lowe and Herzfeld about the action of the Committee and shall say nothing until I hear your reaction to this letter.

"We are trying to build here an institution with a world-wide reputation for the advancement of scholarship and we shall make that task much harder for ourselves and make it much more difficult to induce first-rate men to come here if we throw these two important scholarly enterprises on the ash heap half completed. The \$10,000 which the Committee would save by curtailing my recommendations will not solve our financial problem. Two years from now we must find an additional \$100,000 per year to enable us to stay afloat and a good deal more than that if we are to go forward. I think we will have a good deal better chance of finding that money if we use the modest funds now available to complete what we have already begun."

September 28, 1943 Mr. Maass to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Dr. Aydelotte:

"Your letter of September 27th, addressed jointly to Mr. Leidesdorf and to me, has been considered and discussed by both of us.

"The matter of Professors Lowe and Herzfeld was seriously discussed last Friday afternoon by the Pension Committee and the views expressed by Dr. Weed and Mr. Moe were so vigorously expressed that we do not believe that any modification of the decision reached should be attempted except as the result of a further meeting of the entire committee and a full and frank discussion of your new proposals.

"Neither Mr. Leidesdorf nor I is unsympathetic to the point of view which you express and possible implications upon the future of the Institute and the morale of the faculty. Nevertheless, the amounts involved are substantial and the times are uncertain, and we, therefore, again suggest that you re-convene the committee for a further discussion, saying that the new meeting is the result of a conference among you, Mr. Leidesdorf and me.

With kind personal regards, I am,"

December 16, 1943 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"It gives me pleasure to inform you that the Executive Committee at its meeting on December 14th voted, subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees, that at the time of your retirement, in addition to an annuity of \$4000, a research fund of \$13,500 should be set aside for your use in the completion of the Codices Latini Antiquiores. This fund is to be used by you as needed, with the approval of the Director and the Treasurer, up to a maximum of \$4500 per year.

"The Executive Committee voted furthermore that if at the end of three years the C.L.A. is not completed and if you are making good progress on your researches you may apply to the Trustees for further assistance, it being understood that the Trustees do not promise in advance to grant this request but only to consider the application on its merits and in relation to the funds then available.

"It was further voted that you should be invited to keep your present quarters in Fuld Hall during the lifetime of the research funds made available for your use.

"I very much hope that the action taken will make it possible for you to complete the great project which promises to reflect so much credit on you and on the Institute.

"With kindest regards, I am"

January 24, 1944 Extract from Minutes of Meeting of Faculty:

"It was moved and seconded that the Faculty record a vote of thanks to the Director 'for the way he has worked out his proposals to the Trustees for faculty pensions and retirement allowances.'

"The motion was put by the Secretary and was passed unanimously."

January 27, 1944 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Dr. Aydelotte:

"Thank you for your kind letter of yesterday's date. I am grateful to the Board of Trustees for confirming the action taken by the Executive Committee on December 14, 1943 making it possible for me to continue my work on Codices Latini Antiquiores. I am particularly happy to know that the funds voted for the prosecution of C.L.A. will come out of surplus income of our own Institute.

"Will you be good enough to confirm our conversation regarding the manner in which the grant of \$4500 is to be used. You told me that it was to be left to my discretion and that I was not to be embarrassed by having to ask for permission to make expenditures, in other words, that I am to use it on the same conditions as I used the annual Carnegie grant."

January 28, 1944 Mr. Aydelotte to Mr. Lowe:

"Dear Lowe:

"In reply to your letter of January 27th I am glad to assure you that it will not be necessary for you to obtain authorization in advance for expenditures within the limits of this grant of \$4500 per year for three years. The fund is intended to replace the grant which you formerly received from the Carnegie Institution and to be used in the same way as that fund was used, i.e., for the pursuance of your work on the Codices Latini Antiquiores. The Trustees would, of course, like an accounting at the end of each academic year of the purposes for which the fund has been used.

"Please note furthermore that any unexpended balance in the fund at the end of a given year will be placed to your credit to be used for similar purposes in the year following, so that the more sparingly the fund is used the longer it will last."

February 4, 1944 Mr. Lowe to Mr. Aydelotte:

"Dear Aydelotte:

"Thank you so much for your reassuring communication of
January 28, just arrived. It makes it perfectly clear how the special
C.L.A. grant is to be used. I am so glad to have your official
ruling on this matter."

November 2, 1938 Extract from letter from Dr. Flexner to Professor Riefler:

"When the Institute was founded, there was a definite financial policy in reference to salaries and retiring allowances. In consequence of the slump that policy had to be suspended. We had either to cease growing, which at my time of life would have been, I think, a very serious matter for the future of the Institute, or we had simply to regard our policy as one of suspense pending financial recovery or the receipt of future endowment. The moment either of these two events takes place we are going back to the policy on which we started, for upon that policy and upon that alone can the eminence and distinction of the Institute be preserved."

November 5, 1938 Extract from Memorandum by Mr. Flexner:

"Our earliest appointments to professorships carried with them a salary of \$15,000 a year with an assured pension at \$8,000 a year on retirement, and \$5,000 to the widow. At the time we made these appointments everybody supposed that there would be an industrial recovery and, had such a recovery taken place, we would have adhered rigidly to this standard, for though it is sound policy to try young men like Meritt and von Neumann on lower salaries for a few years, it is equally sound and necessary to promote them to higher salaries when they have demonstrated that they are suitable members of the Institute group. Prosperity, however, did not return. It has not even yet returned. I was therefore within a few years faced with a dilemma. If we adhered strictly to the precedents set in the case of Professor Einstein, Professor Veblen, and Professor Weyl, our expansion would have had to be postponed. If, on the other hand, I decided to recommend expansion, I had for the time being to suspend the salary and pension scale and also to obtain such annual grants as I could from the various foundations. I gave many hours of anxious thought to the solution of this dilemma. I imagine that, if I had been forty years old instead of approaching seventy, I might have waited content to carry on the School of Mathematics, but as a matter of fact two factors intervened: (1) I was not forty but near seventy; (2) the Hitler regime was throwing upon the academic market scholars who under previous conditions could not have been attracted to any other country at all. I asked myself time and again the question: shall I wait or shall I use our modest income to set up in addition to the School of Mathematics two additional schools, that of humanistic studies and that of economics and politics, for the time being waiving, as circumstances permitted, the salary and pension provisions originally made. I decided that the future of the Institute would be safer and sounder if my successor found in successful operation three schools. I decided further that in these schools it was of

November 5, 1938 Extract from Memorandum by Mr. Flexner:

the highest importance to try out younger men like von Neumann. Having come to this decision it was obvious that with our income we would have to compromise temporarily in the matter of salaries and retiring allowances.

My convictions on these latter points remain precisely what they were.

I have represented to every person who has entered the faculty that, when we came into possession of larger funds, we would feel ourselves morally, though not legally, obligated to render their economic position as sound and satisfactory as that of Einstein, Veblen, and Weyl."

1936-49
SWARZENSKI, HANS

vert file "S"
Biographical

Asked (and accepted) by Rockefeller Foundation to inspect museums Czeckoslovakia, Poland, Greece and Yugoslavia to ascertain damages of war for UNESCO. Went June, July, 1947.

Oppenheimer to Meritt--Swarzenski will be charged against stipends School of Humanistic Studies, 1948-9--\$4,000

Appointed February 18, 1947 for five years, July 1, 1947 with TIAA membership.

Panofsky to Swarzenski April 4, 1949, acknowledging Swarzenski's letter of resignation.

Material on above filed in Vertical File under "S" for Swarzenski.

D, Swarzenski, Hans

HARVARD UNIVERSITY - FOGG MUSEUM OF ART
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

August 31, 1943

Dr. Hanns Swarzenski
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

Dear Dr. Swarzenski:

This may strike you as a strange and perhaps impertinent letter, but nonetheless I should like to inquire in a friendly and confidential way whether you could receive a leave of absence from the Institute in order to accept a research post (for the duration) at the National Gallery in Washington at a salary of \$4,600.00 a year.

I have been asked to make this discreet inquiry and to point out also that there might be a continuation of the post after the war, but that the authorities of the Gallery would, of course, under no circumstances wish to have you even consider the matter unless it were understood it is purely on a leave basis from the Institute so that at the close of the war you would be in a position to re-occupy your post at Princeton if there turned out to be no permanent post in Washington.

Awaiting the favor of your kind reply, I am

Sincerely yours,

(Sgd) Paul J. Sachs

Permission granted by my director with consent of
Parsons with understanding Swz. could return after
war to assist Parsons further. (Memo G. L. Sachs 9/10/43.
D Sw. Hanns

March 11, 1946

Professor Marston Morse
Institute for Advanced Study
Princeton, New Jersey

Dear Morse:

With the authorization of the School of Humanistic Studies, I should like to request you to take the necessary steps that the salary of Dr. Hanns Swarzenski be raised from \$3,000 to \$3,500.

Dr. Swarzenski who has been a Research Assistant at the Institute since 1938 and whose salary is paid out of the general budget was given a leave of absence in 1943 in compliance with a request from the National Gallery of Art in Washington which wished to secure his services for the duration of the war. He has been assured that he could resume his position with the Institute under the same conditions after the end of the above assignment and plans to resume his activities here on June 1, 1946. In the meantime, however, living costs and taxes, the latter now amounting to \$330 in the present case, have risen to such an extent that he would be considerably worse off than those who did not take another assignment during the war were his salary not raised to the figure stated above.

Sincerely yours,

Erwin Panofsky

EP:jsr

I wish to add that I spoke to Dr. Aydelotte before he left, and that he consented to a raise for Dr. Swarzenski; an exact figure was not mentioned at the time because I did not have the necessary information and because other analagous cases were visible on the horizon.

copy

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. (25)

May 10, 1946

Dear Dr. Aydelotte:

I would like to write you to tell you that my work at the National Gallery of Art will be finished June 1st, and that I am very glad to come back to your institute to resume my studies on Mediaeval art.

Professor Panofsky and Paul Saxl have probably told you that the Warburg Institute has invited me to go to London for the months of September and October to do some research and to hold a seminar on bible illustrations and other problems connected with my work in Princeton.

As the Warburg Institute will be responsible only for my traveling expenses, I would like to ask the institute for leave of absence with pay for the period of my absence, which will terminate in the middle of November, when I shall be back at Princeton. I thank you very much.

With kindest regards,

Very sincerely yours,

(Signed) Hanns Swarzenski

Dr. Frank Aydelotte
The Institute for Advanced Studies
Princeton,
New Jersey

May 16, 1946

Dear Swarzenski:

I have your letter of May 10, and hasten to send you a very hearty welcome back to your job at the Institute. I am instructing Miss Miller to include your name in the salary role again as from June 1. At the next meeting of the Faculty of Humanistic Studies, I shall be glad to recommend that you have leave of absence with salary for the months of September, October, and the first two weeks of November, in order to enable you to accept the invitation of the Warburg Institute in London.

Looking forward with great pleasure to having you back, I am,

Yours sincerely,

Frank Aydelotte

Dr. Hanns Swarzenski
National Gallery of Art
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, D.C. (25)

FA:mh

May 24, 1946

Dr. Hanns Swarzenski
National Gallery
Constitution Avenue and Sixth Street
Washington, D. C.

Dear Swarzenski:

I am delighted to know that you are coming back to us and I take pleasure in offering you a formal appointment to your previous position from June 1, 1946 to June 30, 1947, fixing your salary at \$3,500 instead of the \$3,000 which you previously received.

Looking forward with great pleasure to your return to the Institute, I am

Yours sincerely,

Frank Aydelotte

FA:jsr

Copy to Miss Miller
Professor Panofsky

C O P Y

LETTER TO PROFESSOR ERWIN PANOFSKY FROM FRANCIS WORMALD, HEAD OF THE
MANUSCRIPTS DEPARTMENT OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM

506 Beatty House
Dolphin Square
London, S.W.1

13 February 1947

Dear Professor Panofsky:

Thank you for your letter of the 10th of this month. It gives me very great pleasure to say that in my opinion Hanns Swarzenski is probably the most learned of the younger scholars in the field of MS. illumination, and to this learning he adds a great and wide understanding of the principles of art history, with its implications and ramifications, reaching far beyond the confines of stylistic criticism. He manages to treat works of art as general historical documents; not just as beautiful objects with a history and development of their own, and not awfully much connection with the general history of the period in which they were produced.

If there is any criticism, I should have said that he is a shade overcautious, but in my opinion this is a fault on the right side, since too much brilliance is like fireworks often of only short duration and easily dimmed by rain!

I am not quite clear whether the Institute for Advanced Study is only concerned with research. If it is, I feel that Hanns Swarzenski will be a great ornament to it, since he seems to me to have the real scholar's approach to research.

Yours sincerely,

FRANCIS WORMALD

C O P Y

THE WALTERS ART GALLERY
BALTIMORE 1, Maryland

February 21, 1947

Dear Doctor Panofsky:

Please forgive my being so tardy in replying to your letter of February 10th. It arrived in the very midst of the pressure attendant upon such immutable tasks as the Annual Report and the Catalogue of the Byzantine Exhibition, and I did not want to write something hurried and half thought out.

You require of me a candid statement of my opinion of Hanns Swarzenski as a scholar. In my opinion, he is one of the most gifted medievalists in the country. In order to answer your question, I have tried to analyze what I have observed of his scholarly attitudes and approaches, his intellectual method--in short, his whole scholarly personality. My conclusion is that he has an incredible combination of qualities that puts him in a class by himself. Who, in the presence of objects of art, has his peculiar and vigorous mixture of familiar enjoyment and stubborn curiosity, of imagination and caution, of keen observation and sharp memory, of aesthetic analysis and historical interest, of intellectual audacity and humility? He has a notably vast stock of experience and knowledge of the materials in the medieval field, but he is hardly less at home in the realm of Renaissance or of contemporary art.

In giving a "candid opinion" one is supposed to be critical, and not just appreciative. In trying to look at Hanns from this point of view, I can think of only one thing that might be considered a "criticism". I know it has occurred to others: we all wish he would "produce more." This, however, can only be understood in the narrow sense of producing written studies, so that his findings and ideas might be shared with more scholars. In the other and fundamental kinds of production--meticulous study, constant speculation, restless investigation, imaginative inquiry--he is not only productive in a very real sense, but he is creative. The process of writing is an arduous one for him. I have often thought that we should be grateful for this, rather than bemoaning the lack of a long, long list of titles. Because of the very fact that the effort is laborious, whatever he writes is compact with value, with vast information and experience, each work being a distillation of much research and great thought. One cannot imagine Hanns writing something "poor" or trivial or ill-considered, or, most impossible of all, not of great use to scholars.

So, if by "scholarly production" is meant rich and valuable works, rather than the frequency with which the author's name is found in indexes, then Hanns is fully as productive as we have a right to want. Because of his flair for objects, Hanns is a gifted museum man--but there is no question but that only such unharried conditions and circumstances as those provided by the Institute for Advanced Study would make it possible for him to produce, at his own tempo, the permanent works that are still in his mind and experience. It would be splendid if this could be brought about.

Very sincerely,

DOROTHY MINER

C O P Y

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
THE WARBURG INSTITUTE
Imperial Institute Buildings
South Kensington
London S.W.7

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

When Dr. Swarzenski was the guest of the Warburg Institute in the autumn of last year, relations between continental and English art in the eleventh and twelfth centuries were discussed. A group of specialists from the British Museum and Oxford, and members of the Institute, took part. The general impression was that Dr. Swarzenski had advanced our knowledge to a stage which none of those present had reached; firstly because his acquaintance with the material is extraordinary - a large section of the material which he presented was unknown to those participating in the discussion - and secondly because he combines accurate historical method with a feeling for style and an understanding of artistic phenomena, which is unusual in a field where most scholars have, up to now, concerned themselves with either one or the other side.

What became apparent and was much appreciated in these discussions is characteristic of Dr. Swarzenski's scholarship in general. He is one of the few mediaevalists who would be as much in his right place at an Ecole des Hautes Etudes as in a great museum, where he would have to deal with works of art of all periods.

His book on thirteenth century illuminated manuscripts from Western Germany (1936) is a mine of information. The extensive material had never before been collected, and the notes to the single manuscripts are so full that they are consulted by many other scholars than those interested in this special field. His recent monograph on the Berthold Missal (Morgan Libr. Publ., 1943) contains far more than the title suggests. It deals with one of the essential problems of the twelfth century - English influence on continental art. Dr. Swarzenski's conclusions are again based on extensive material. But this is characteristic: in spite of its wider aspects the book remains an art monograph - one of the very few existing monographs on a twelfth century master. He always approaches historical material from the detail which has aroused his artistic curiosity, and after carefully examining all the details he proceeds to important general problems.

F. SAXL
Director

March 1947.

*To a. from Penzance, - work in the museum -
comes too late for notice.*

August 31, 1948

Dear Dr. Oppenheimer:

I am writing this as an appeal to see if you will help us in an emergency. My Assistant Curator of Paintings has received a fellowship in the American Academy in Rome and is leaving in September. I entirely approve of his doing so but it leaves us very short handed at a critical time in the Painting Department.

For some time now we have been preparing a catalogue of our paintings and Mr. McLanathan, our Assistant, has been working on this. The one young man of whom I can think who would be qualified in every way to carry on this work is Hanns Swarzenski. The routine work of the Department we could take care of but we need a real scholar of parts to do the necessary research for the catalogue.

I saw Mr. Swarzenski in Paris and asked if he would be willing to come to us for a year to engage in this work. He said he would be glad to do so but not without the approval of Princeton. This, of course, was an entirely correct attitude. Could I possibly persuade you to give him leave of absence for a year to do this important work for us? I really think Mr. Swarzenski would benefit by having this work to do, particularly in view of the fact that his father, Dr. George Swarzenski, is our Fellow for Research in Mediaeval Art and Sculpture, and could assist him. Dr. Swarzenski is one of the most learned, and perhaps the very most learned member of our staff. If you could release Mr. Swarzenski for this purpose for one year, it would be a most welcome favor and courtesy from one institution of learning to another.

Faithfully yours,

G.H. Edgell, Director

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer
Institute for Advanced Studies
Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

GHE:ESH

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

September 19, 1948

AIR MAIL

Dear Dr. Swarzenski:

The Director of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston has recently written to Dr. Oppenheimer suggesting that should you have leave of absence from the Institute for the coming year, he would wish to offer you the position of Assistant Curator of Paintings for that period. Dr. Oppenheimer has cabled his approval from abroad and has referred the matter to the Standing Committee of the Faculty for action.

In the absence of Dr. Oppenheimer, the Standing Committee has asked that you be advised of the Institute's approval of leave of absence for one year without pay should you wish to accept the invitation from the Museum. I have also informed Mr. Edgell of this approval.

Will you please let us know whether you accept the offer from the Museum so that the necessary adjustment can be made in your grant-in-aid.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs. John D. Leary)
Aide to the Director

Dr. Hans Swarzenski
The Warburg Institute
University of London
Imperial Institute Buildings
South Kensington, London S.W. 7
England

Copy: Standing Committee - ✓ Professors Stewart, Meritt, von Neumann
Professor Panofsky
Miss Walton

Note to Standing Committee - Professor Meritt acted on this since he was in residence.

OK - Lows

C O P Y

LETTER TO PROFESSOR ERWIN PANOFSKY FROM FRANCIS WORMALD, HEAD OF THE
MANUSCRIPTS DEPARTMENT OF THE BRITISH MUSEUM

506 Beatty House
Dolphin Square
London, S.W.1.

13 February 1947

Dear Professor Panofsky:

Thank you for your letter of the 10th of this month. It gives me very great pleasure to say that in my opinion Hanns Swarzenski is probably the most learned of the younger scholars in the field of MS. illumination, and to this learning he adds a great and wide understanding of the principles of art history, with its implications and ramifications, reaching far beyond the confines of stylistic criticism. He manages to treat works of art as general historical documents; not just as beautiful objects with a history and development of their own, and not awfully much connection with the general history of the period in which they were produced.

If there is any criticism, I should have said that he is a shade overcautious, but in my opinion this is a fault on the right side, since too much brilliance is like fireworks often of only short duration and easily dimmed by rain!

I am not quite clear whether the Institute for Advanced Study is only concerned with research. If it is, I feel that Hanns Swarzenski will be a great ornament to it, since he seems to me to have the real scholar's approach to research.

Yours sincerely,

FRANCIS WORMALD