

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

April 26, 1986

10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Daniel Bell, Zeph Stewart,
Donald Straus, and James D. Wolfensohn, ex officio.

Faculty
representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer.

Secretary: Donna Manning.

The Chairman opened the meeting with the statement that the main topic of discussion in connection with beginning the search for a new Director is what the Committee members think are the necessary characteristics of the next Director of the Institute.

Professor Langlands reported that he and Professor Walzer had sent letters to a number of people soliciting their views as to the suggested qualifications of a Director as well as names of people to be considered as possible candidates. He thought that the responses confirmed the views of the Faculty. The two characteristics most often stated were: great public or academic distinction and the ability to perform the specific tasks required of the Director. Professor Langlands gave two examples of responses: the chairman of Princeton's Physics Department responded that the Director should be a person with widespread recognition and status who sees the strengthening of the School of Natural Sciences as one of his priorities, and one of the Trustees suggested that in addition to being a fund-raiser, the Director must be someone who can establish good contacts with sources of Federal funds at higher levels than can be reached by the Faculty members.

Professor Walzer noted that the responses he received listed three qualifications: academic distinction, administrative and diplomatic skills and the ability to raise funds with an emphasis on the urgency of fund-raising. He observed that academic distinction raises the topic of age. An older scholar would be more inclined to give up his academic work and take on administrative tasks. Age leads to the need to address the place of the Director in the Faculty. If a younger person is chosen as Director, would he be appointed by one of the Schools to its Faculty? One question raised by the respondents is the willingness of the Faculty or Board to open the Rules of Governance for discussion. Professor Lawrence Stone thinks that a good

candidate would not waste his time in the job as it is currently defined and restricted by the rules. Professor Langlands reported that the Faculty members come down on different sides of this topic. Some believe an energetic person can do a lot as Director under the present Rules of Governance, others feel that no good candidate would accept the position under the present rules.

Mr. Wolfensohn commented that his Committee concluded that there is currently drift in the Institute and to get someone who is first rate, the Institute needs to retain the strengths it has. It does not need someone to turn the place upside down, but the Director must be able to influence its direction. It is not necessary to renegotiate the Rules of Academic Governance prior to the appointment of a new Director. If the Committee finds the right candidate then there is the assumption that the Faculty will be willing to allow him to lead the Institute.

Professor Langlands reported that the scientists he heard from did not raise the question of reopening the Rules of Governance as did the respondents to Professor Walzer.

Mr. Wolfensohn emphasized the use of finances as a tool by the Director. There is no need for the Director to interfere with the academics of the Schools, but he can have influence through the budget. The Rules of Governance state in negative terms the Director's ability to bring about changes at the Institute. These need to be rephrased, but not now.

Professor Stewart agreed that it would be a mistake to try to appoint a Director while renegotiating the Rules of Governance.

Mr. Wolfensohn responded that once you find a first-class person on whom everyone agreed, then it should be possible to renegotiate those Rules he finds impossible to live with. If the Faculty wants him, they will open negotiations on these rules and do it quickly so as not to lose him.

Professor Bell compared what he was hearing to a motion picture studio looking for a star. The assumption is if you want someone bad enough you are willing to agree to conditions. The concern of some, as expressed in Sidney Drell's letter, is that the directorship could be used as a pulpit for a major scholar to speak out on various issues. The question raised is how far should this be allowed to go?

The Chairman, commenting on the need for a distinguished person, stated that to an outsider the Director should appear to be as distinguished as the Institute. He should therefore have enough academic experience so that the outside world views him as a representative of the Institute. This is not a position for a retired businessman nor is it a place for a young scholar competing with the Faculty for scholarly recognition.

Mr. Straus sees the need for someone who views the job as the pinnacle of his career in order for him to do a creative job, someone with a sense of mission. The Institute, rather than his academic career, needs to be his professional focus. Mr. Straus later explained what he meant by sense of mission--the desire on the part of a person to leave the Institute stronger than he found it. It must be compatible with what the Faculty want since they also should have a sense of mission. Mr. Straus went on to say that someone who identifies with and represents the Institute will make the best fund-raiser.

If the Committee finds the right person, the Faculty will be with him regardless of the Rules of Governance. The safest person to appoint is someone like the President of Yale and the riskiest is, as Daniel Bell suggested, someone who has not yet peaked in his career. It would be a mistake to be committed to find someone who has already made his mark.

The Chairman suggested that they throw some names out to see the kind of people the Committee members were thinking about. He cautioned them not to assume a person is not available or would not be willing to take the job because of the person's present position.

The following people were suggested as possible candidates:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Bartlett Giamatti | President of Yale |
| Vartan Gregorian | President, NY Public Library |
| Sidney Drell | Physicist (Dept. Dir.), SLAC |
| Marvin Goldberger (age 64) | President, Cal Tech |
| Daniel Mostow | Mathematician, Yale University |
| Marshall Rosenbluth | Director, Inst. for Plasma Physics, University of Texas |
| Ed David | Former Head of Exxon Research |
| Henry Rosovsky | Former Dean at Harvard |
| George Field | Astrophysicist, Harvard |
| Matthew Meselson | Biochemist, Harvard |
| John Searle | Philosopher, UC Berkeley |
| Bob Solow (over 60) | Economist |
| Heinz Pagels | Director, NY Academy of Sciences |
| Hanna Gray | President, University of Chicago |
| Bill Luers | President, Metropolitan Museum of Art |
| Neil Rudenstein | Provost, Princeton University |
| Tom Ehrlich | Provost, Univ of Pa; and Former Dean Stanford Law School |
| Bill Carey | Head of AAAS |
| Steve Weinberg | Physicist, Austin |
| Frank Rhodes | President of Cornell, 10 years |
| Donald Winch | Pro-Vice Chancellor, University of Sussex |
| Ralf Dahrendorf | Former Director LSE |
| Leon Botstein (controversial) | President of Bard College |
| Alice Ilchman | President of Sarah Lawrence |
| Mike Sovern | President of Columbia |

Professor Walzer stated that they should keep in mind that the kind of person they chose (i.e. field of interest, administrator vs. scholar) could send a message by the Board about the direction of the Institute. Mr. Wolfensohn replied he hoped this would not be true.

The Chairman said the next step is to enlarge the list of names and asked for two lists from the Committee and the Board:

- (1) names of those who for obvious reasons are not candidates but could suggest possible candidates, and
- (2) names of actual candidates.

He raised the possibility of using a search firm, specifically AED (Academy for Educational Development), which has had lots of experience with searches such as the Institute's. The Committee agreed that the Chairman should explore the feasibility of the Committee using a professional firm in a limited way to provide background and current information about those people identified by the Committee.

Professor Langlands stated that the Faculty feels a sense of urgency about having a Director in place to take over when Harry Woolf leaves.

The Chairman suggested two more people who are good sources of names--Clark Kerr and Ed Mead.

He closed the meeting by announcing that there would be a meeting set for the end of May or early June after additional names have been received.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Manning

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

June 13, 1986

10:20

Members present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman; Zeph Stewart, Donald Straus and Jim Wolfensohn, ex officio

Faculty representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman began the meeting by listing the items he hoped to cover during the meeting: determination of which Committee members should talk to which of the suggested consultants, culling of the list of candidates and determination of whether or not the Academy for Educational Development (AED) can be useful to the search process.

The Committee reviewed the list of consultants to determine who might be helpful in suggesting additional candidates. The list was divided up as follows:

- Jim Wolfensohn - Morris Abram, Isaiah Berlin, Harold Brown, Fred Hechinger, and Steve Weinberg; he had already spoken to Josh Lederberg and John Deutch
- Donald Straus - Harlan Cleveland, William Golden, Nathan Pusey, Ed David and Frank Keppel
- Robert Landlands - Joseph Doob, Ralph Gomory, Lyman Spitzer, and John Wheeler
- Zeph Stewart - John Hunt and Gordon Ray
- Thornton Bradshaw - James Billington, John Brademas, Murray Gellmann, Marvin Goldberger, James Perkins, Cyrus Vance and Jerome Wiesner; he had already spoken to David Hamburg and Richard Lyman

The topic turned to the list of candidates. Don Straus suggested that because Ed David represents a category of people who should be considered, he should remain on the list in spite of his age. If, however, he was removed from the list of suggested candidates, he should be consulted to suggest candidates.

The Committee proceeded to go through the list of candidates separating them into three categories: (1) Remain on the list, (2) Doubtful, or (3) Delete from the list.

It was decided to leave the following names on the list:

Ernie Boyer - T. Bradshaw spoke highly of him
Ralf Dahrendorf - several people spoke highly of him; J. Wolfensohn
will check specifically with I. Berlin
Thomas Ehrlich - several members knew him and thought him to be a
good prospect
Maurice Glicksman - M. Walzer will check with Joan Scott who
had suggested him
Ralph Gomory - R. Langlands worked with him on a Princeton
Visiting Committee and feels his interests are too narrow to be
Director
Alice Ilchman - T. Bradshaw finds her a remarkable lady, thinks she
may be ready to leave Sarah Lawrence; will obtain more
information
Paul Martin - Z. Stewart remarked that scientists think well of
him, but to outsiders he seems inarticulate and disorganized. It
was agreed to seek more information about him
Margaret McVicker - M. Walzer will check with Joan Scott
Matthew Meselson - Z. Stewart will speak to H. Rosovsky
Jerry Ostriker - R. Langlands will ask J. Bahcall for more
information
Heinz Pagel - not clear which direction his career will take
Martin Rees - R. Langlands will check with J. Bahcall
Marshall Rosenbluth - good possibility
H. Rosovsky - T. Bradshaw reported that he was one of the best deans
he has seen at Harvard
Neil Rudenstine - J. Wolfensohn finds him impressive; Z. Stewart
remarked that he went into administration early and gave up his
scholarly pursuits; M. Walzer noted that he works hard and will
probably be a candidate for the presidency of Princeton,
suggests his interest in IAS is minimal.
Robert Schreiffer - independently suggested by SNS faculty
John Searle - need to get more information about him
Isadore Singer - good mathematician, has respect of physicists
Johnathan Spence - heads the Division of Humanities at Yale
Fred Starr - T. Bradshaw will check with C. Vance
Steven Weinberg - distinguished in his field
Donald Winch - M. Walzer will check with Albert Hirschman
Norton Zinder - R. Langlands will check with A. Pais

The following names were added to the list: Michael Atiyah, Royal
Society professor at Oxford, former member at IAS; Howard Swearer,
president of Brown University and Harold Shapiro, president of Michigan

The following names were considered doubtful as possible candidates:

Paul Bragdon - D. Straus will check with J. Hester
and J. Wolfensohn will check with Tom Wyman
Robert May - R. Langlands will check with J. Bahcall
William Press - will check Treiman letter
Michael Rabin - M. Walzer will get more information
Maxine Singer - R. Langlands will check with F. Dyson

The Chairman touched upon the idea of not including tenured professorship with the Director's appointment. J. Wolfensohn stated that his Committee had discussed that possibility but they must keep in mind that the provision for the professorial appointment is in the Rules of Governance and the faculty would need to be consulted. It was agreed that the Search Committee should remain flexible on this point.

The Chairman reported that he and J. Wolfensohn had met with Ruth Weintraub of the AED, an organization that works with university and foundation searches. He had personally used their help in his search for a new president of the Aspen Institute. He feels that the Committee's search is being conducted in a truncated way depending on someone on the Committee to know each name that is brought before them.

A discussion ensued as to how AED could be most helpful to the Committee. Professors Langlands and Walzer cautioned that the faculty would be sensitive to the thought that a professional search firm was controlling the search for a new Director. The Chairman said he would make it clear to AED that they would be in a support role, providing information about the names the Committee supplied. It would also be possible that AED would suggest names and act as a screen once they understood the kind of person being sought for the Director.

There was further discussion on how to describe the person being sought for the Director. T. Bradshaw summed up such a person as one who is known and respected in the outside world which is important for a number of reasons, including fund raising. He should be someone who represents the Institute, not a hired hand. He should be a man of vision who will help IAS realize its potential and not be allowed to drift. R. Langlands felt it was important for the Trustees to talk to the scientists including such scholars as Gellmann and Weinberg.

Meetings were set for the afternoon of July 21st and the morning of August 11th.

The Committee members were asked to send to the Secretary any information they obtained on the potential candidates or additional suggestions for candidates as soon as they could.

The meeting was adjourned a few minutes past noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Manning

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

April 26, 1986

10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Daniel Bell, Zeph Stewart,
Donald Straus, and James D. Wolfensohn, ex officio.

Faculty
representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer.

Secretary: Donna Manning.

The Chairman opened the meeting with the statement that the main topic of discussion in connection with beginning the search for a new Director is what the Committee members think are the necessary characteristics of the next Director of the Institute.

Professor Langlands reported that he and Professor Walzer had sent letters to a number of people soliciting their views as to the suggested qualifications of a Director as well as names of people to be considered as possible candidates. He thought that the responses confirmed the views of the Faculty. The two characteristics most often stated were: great public or academic distinction and the ability to perform the specific tasks required of the Director. Professor Langlands gave two examples of responses: the chairman of Princeton's Physics Department responded that the Director should be a person with widespread recognition and status who sees the strengthening of the School of Natural Sciences as one of his priorities, and one of the Trustees suggested that in addition to being a fund-raiser, the Director must be someone who can establish good contacts with sources of Federal funds at higher levels than can be reached by the Faculty members.

Professor Walzer noted that the responses he received listed three qualifications: academic distinction, administrative and diplomatic skills and the ability to raise funds with an emphasis on the urgency of fund-raising. He observed that academic distinction raises the topic of age. An older scholar would be more inclined to give up his academic work and take on administrative tasks. Age leads to the need to address the place of the Director in the Faculty. If a younger person is chosen as Director, would he be appointed by one of the Schools to its Faculty? One question raised by the respondents is the willingness of the Faculty or Board to open the Rules of Governance for discussion. Professor Lawrence Stone thinks that a good

candidate would not waste his time in the job as it is currently defined and restricted by the rules. Professor Langlands reported that the Faculty members come down on different sides of this topic. Some believe an energetic person can do a lot as Director under the present Rules of Governance, others feel that no good candidate would accept the position under the present rules.

Mr. Wolfensohn commented that his Committee concluded that there is currently drift in the Institute and to get someone who is first rate, the Institute needs to retain the strengths it has. It does not need someone to turn the place upside down, but the Director must be able to influence its direction. It is not necessary to renegotiate the Rules of Academic Governance prior to the appointment of a new Director. If the Committee finds the right candidate then there is the assumption that the Faculty will be willing to allow him to lead the Institute.

Professor Langlands reported that the scientists he heard from did not raise the question of reopening the Rules of Governance as did the respondents to Professor Walzer.

Mr. Wolfensohn emphasized the use of finances as a tool by the Director. There is no need for the Director to interfere with the academics of the Schools, but he can have influence through the budget. The Rules of Governance state in negative terms the Director's ability to bring about changes at the Institute. These need to be rephrased, but not now.

Professor Stewart agreed that it would be a mistake to try to appoint a Director while renegotiating the Rules of Governance.

Mr. Wolfensohn responded that once you find a first-class person on whom everyone agreed, then it should be possible to renegotiate those Rules he finds impossible to live with. If the Faculty wants him, they will open negotiations on these rules and do it quickly so as not to lose him.

Professor Bell compared what he was hearing to a motion picture studio looking for a star. The assumption is if you want someone bad enough you are willing to agree to conditions. The concern of some, as expressed in Sidney Drell's letter, is that the directorship could be used as a pulpit for a major scholar to speak out on various issues. The question raised is how far should this be allowed to go?

The Chairman, commenting on the need for a distinguished person, stated that to an outsider the Director should appear to be as distinguished as the Institute. He should therefore have enough academic experience so that the outside world views him as a representative of the Institute. This is not a position for a retired businessman nor is it a place for a young scholar competing with the Faculty for scholarly recognition.

Mr. Straus sees the need for someone who views the job as the pinnacle of his career in order for him to do a creative job, someone with a sense of mission. The Institute, rather than his academic career, needs to be his professional focus. Mr. Straus later explained what he meant by sense of mission--the desire on the part of a person to leave the Institute stronger than he found it. It must be compatible with what the Faculty want since they also should have a sense of mission. Mr. Straus went on to say that someone who identifies with and represents the Institute will make the best fund-raiser.

If the Committee finds the right person, the Faculty will be with him regardless of the Rules of Governance. The safest person to appoint is someone like the President of Yale and the riskiest is, as Daniel Bell suggested, someone who has not yet peaked in his career. It would be a mistake to be committed to find someone who has already made his mark.

The Chairman suggested that they throw some names out to see the kind of people the Committee members were thinking about. He cautioned them not to assume a person is not available or would not be willing to take the job because of the person's present position.

The following people were suggested as possible candidates:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Bartlett Giamatti | President of Yale |
| Vartan Gregorian | President, NY Public Library |
| Sidney Drell | Physicist (Dept. Dir.), SLAC |
| Marvin Goldberger (age 64) | President, Cal Tech |
| Daniel Mostow | Mathematician, Yale University |
| Marshall Rosenbluth | Director, Inst. for Plasma Physics, University of Texas |
| Ed David | Former Head of Exxon Research |
| Henry Rosovsky | Former Dean at Harvard |
| George Field | Astrophysicist, Harvard |
| Matthew Meselson | Biochemist, Harvard |
| John Searle | Philosopher, UC Berkeley |
| Bob Solow (over 60) | Economist |
| Heinz Pagels | Director, NY Academy of Sciences |
| Hanna Gray | President, University of Chicago |
| Bill Luers | President, Metropolitan Museum of Art |
| Neil Rudenstein | Provost, Princeton University |
| Tom Ehrlich | Provost, Univ of Pa; and Former Dean Stanford Law School |
| Bill Carey | Head of AAAS |
| Steve Weinberg | Physicist, Austin |
| Frank Rhodes | President of Cornell, 10 years |
| Donald Winch | Pro-Vice Chancellor, University of Sussex |
| Ralf Dahrendorf | Former Director LSE |
| Leon Botstein (controversial) | President of Bard College |
| Alice Ilchman | President of Sarah Lawrence |
| Mike Sovern | President of Columbia |

Professor Walzer stated that they should keep in mind that the kind of person they chose (i.e. field of interest, administrator vs. scholar) could send a message by the Board about the direction of the Institute. Mr. Wolfensohn replied he hoped this would not be true.

The Chairman said the next step is to enlarge the list of names and asked for two lists from the Committee and the Board:

- (1) names of those who for obvious reasons are not candidates but could suggest possible candidates, and
- (2) names of actual candidates.

He raised the possibility of using a search firm, specifically AED (Academy for Educational Development), which has had lots of experience with searches such as the Institute's. The Committee agreed that the Chairman should explore the feasibility of the Committee using a professional firm in a limited way to provide background and current information about those people identified by the Committee.

Professor Langlands stated that the Faculty feels a sense of urgency about having a Director in place to take over when Harry Woolf leaves.

The Chairman suggested two more people who are good sources of names--Clark Kerr and Ed Mead.

He closed the meeting by announcing that there would be a meeting set for the end of May or early June after additional names have been received.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Manning

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

June 13, 1986

10:20

Members present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman; Zeph Stewart, Donald Straus and Jim Wolfensohn, ex officio

Faculty representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman began the meeting by listing the items he hoped to cover during the meeting: determination of which Committee members should talk to which of the suggested consultants, culling of the list of candidates and determination of whether or not the Academy for Educational Development (AED) can be useful to the search process.

The Committee reviewed the list of consultants to determine who might be helpful in suggesting additional candidates. The list was divided up as follows:

- Jim Wolfensohn - Morris Abram, Isaiah Berlin, Harold Brown, Fred Hechinger, and Steve Weinberg; he had already spoken to Josh Lederberg and John Deutch
- Donald Straus - Harlan Cleveland, William Golden, Nathan Pusey, Ed David and Frank Keppel
- Robert Landlands - Joseph Doob, Ralph Gomory, Lyman Spitzer, and John Wheeler
- Zeph Stewart - John Hunt and Gordon Ray
- Thornton Bradshaw - James Billington, John Brademas, Murray Gellmann, Marvin Goldberger, James Perkins, Cyrus Vance and Jerome Wiesner; he had already spoken to David Hamburg and Richard Lyman

The topic turned to the list of candidates. Don Straus suggested that because Ed David represents a category of people who should be considered, he should remain on the list in spite of his age. If, however, he was removed from the list of suggested candidates, he should be consulted to suggest candidates.

The Committee proceeded to go through the list of candidates separating them into three categories: (1) Remain on the list, (2) Doubtful, or (3) Delete from the list.

It was decided to leave the following names on the list:

Ernie Boyer - T. Bradshaw spoke highly of him
Ralf Dahrendorf - several people spoke highly of him; J. Wolfensohn
will check specifically with I. Berlin
Thomas Ehrlich - several members knew him and thought him to be a
good prospect
Maurice Glicksman - M. Walzer will check with Joan Scott who
had suggested him
Ralph Gomory - R. Langlands worked with him on a Princeton
Visiting Committee and feels his interests are too narrow to be
Director
Alice Ilchman - T. Bradshaw finds her a remarkable lady, thinks she
may be ready to leave Sarah Lawrence; will obtain more
information
Paul Martin - Z. Stewart remarked that scientists think well of
him, but to outsiders he seems inarticulate and disorganized. It
was agreed to seek more information about him
Margaret McVicker - M. Walzer will check with Joan Scott
Matthew Meselson - Z. Stewart will speak to H. Rosovsky
Jerry Ostriker - R. Langlands will ask J. Bahcall for more
information
Heinz Pagel - not clear which direction his career will take
Martin Rees - R. Langlands will check with J. Bahcall
Marshall Rosenbluth - good possibility
H. Rosovsky - T. Bradshaw reported that he was one of the best deans
he has seen at Harvard
Neil Rudenstine - J. Wolfensohn finds him impressive; Z. Stewart
remarked that he went into administration early and gave up his
scholarly pursuits; M. Walzer noted that he works hard and will
probably be a candidate for the presidency of Princeton,
suggests his interest in IAS is minimal.
Robert Schreiffer - independently suggested by SNS faculty
John Searle - need to get more information about him
Isadore Singer - good mathematician, has respect of physicists
Johnathan Spence - heads the Division of Humanities at Yale
Fred Starr - T. Bradshaw will check with C. Vance
Steven Weinberg - distinguished in his field
Donald Winch - M. Walzer will check with Albert Hirschman
Norton Zinder - R. Langlands will check with A. Pais

The following names were added to the list: Michael Atiyah, Royal
Society professor at Oxford, former member at IAS; Howard Swearer,
president of Brown University and Harold Shapiro, president of Michigan

The following names were considered doubtful as possible candidates:

Paul Bragdon - D. Straus will check with J. Hester
and J. Wolfensohn will check with Tom Wyman
Robert May - R. Langlands will check with J. Bahcall
William Press - will check Treiman letter
Michael Rabin - M. Walzer will get more information
Maxine Singer - R. Langlands will check with F. Dyson

The Chairman touched upon the idea of not including tenured professorship with the Director's appointment. J. Wolfensohn stated that his Committee had discussed that possibility but they must keep in mind that the provision for the professorial appointment is in the Rules of Governance and the faculty would need to be consulted. It was agreed that the Search Committee should remain flexible on this point.

The Chairman reported that he and J. Wolfensohn had met with Ruth Weintraub of the AED, an organization that works with university and foundation searches. He had personally used their help in his search for a new president of the Aspen Institute. He feels that the Committee's search is being conducted in a truncated way depending on someone on the Committee to know each name that is brought before them.

A discussion ensued as to how AED could be most helpful to the Committee. Professors Langlands and Walzer cautioned that the faculty would be sensitive to the thought that a professional search firm was controlling the search for a new Director. The Chairman said he would make it clear to AED that they would be in a support role, providing information about the names the Committee supplied. It would also be possible that AED would suggest names and act as a screen once they understood the kind of person being sought for the Director.

There was further discussion on how to describe the person being sought for the Director. T. Bradshaw summed up such a person as one who is known and respected in the outside world which is important for a number of reasons, including fund raising. He should be someone who represents the Institute, not a hired hand. He should be a man of vision who will help IAS realize its potential and not be allowed to drift. R. Langlands felt it was important for the Trustees to talk to the scientists including such scholars as Gellmann and Weinberg.

Meetings were set for the afternoon of July 21st and the morning of August 11th.

The Committee members were asked to send to the Secretary any information they obtained on the potential candidates or additional suggestions for candidates as soon as they could.

The meeting was adjourned a few minutes past noon.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Manning

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

July 23, 1986

2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Zeph Stewart, James Wolfensohn, ex officio

Faculty Representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman stated that he had three topics to cover during the meeting:

- (1) Discussion of the list of candidates
- (2) Proposed New York Times article on IAS and the search for a new director.
- (3) Use of the services of AED during the search.

Z. Stewart reported that he had disappointing results in his attempts to reach those on his list of people to contact and is waiting to hear back from them.

J. Wolfensohn said that the first person he talked to was Morris Abram who enthusiastically suggested Alexander Morgan Capron, Professor of Law and Medical Ethics at the University of Southern California. Abram had met him while a member of the President's Commission for Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine of which Capron was executive director. He is in his early 40's and Abram judges him to be a fine writer and good scholar.

Wolfensohn did not reach Isaiah Berlin who is presently in Italy. H. Brown, with whom Wolfensohn consulted, recommended (1) John Deutch, provost of MIT, a member of the National Academy, former director of Office of Energy Research, a chemist by training. J. Wolfensohn knows him through Deutch's advisory role of a joint venture fund and finds him to not be shy about his views and to have a good sense of humor about himself; (2) Rochus E. Vogt, physicist and provost at Cal Tech; (3) John Baldeschwieler, Chemistry Professor at Cal Tech; (4) Cornelius J. Pings, chemical engineer and provost of the University of Southern California; (5) Henry Rosovsky and (6) Marty Feldstein, economist, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Wolfensohn reported that Fred Hechinger recommended (1) Michael T. O'Keefe, vice-president of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, (2) H. Rosovsky, (3) Fred Starr and (4) Mary McPherson, president of Bryn Mawr.

Wolfensohn is still checking on Ralf Dahrendorf and is checking with Klaus Moser regarding Gomory. He is also waiting for a list from M. Sovern.

R. Langlands reported that Herman Goldstine also recommended Gomory. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences; his area of math is applied mathematics. M. Walzer reported that he had spoken to W. Bowen about Gomory who is presently a Princeton Trustee. Bowen suggested the Committee check with N. Katzenbach. Goldstine also recommended Zilkowski, who had been on the list, as well as Gerry Neugebauer and Stuart Rice. Langlands reported that John Bachall had asked on behalf of the School of Natural Sciences to have S. Drell's name returned to the list.

J. Wolfensohn asked whether the Committee should narrow the list or increase the number of names. M. Walzer suggested that the list be narrowed to a smaller number to allow the Committee to concentrate on those names. The result was a list of 15 names. The Committee's assignment is to get as much information about these people as possible. Members are to suggest who could be asked for information about the candidates. R. Langlands noted that it is important to get impressions of the candidates in different roles. It was agreed that they need to suggest names of people capable of judging the performance of the candidates as a director.

Given a smaller list and the potential sources for information about the candidates, it was decided that it would not be necessary to hire AED to help with the search.

There was a discussion about the planned New York Times article. It was decided that J. Wolfensohn should be the person to talk to the reporter, Tony DePalma. If there is to be an article that involves the search then the committee would want to have some input, however, it is better to have one person on the Committee speak to Mr. DePalma.

A meeting for the Search Committee will be set for either August 28 or 29.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

August 28, 1986

3:30 p.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Zeph Stewart and Donald Straus

Faculty Representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman asked the Committee to review the list of names established at the previous meeting, relating any additional information any of them had about the candidates.

First Z. Stewart brought up a question he had raised at an earlier time regarding what had appeared to him to be a proportionately greater number of candidates on the list in the area of Natural Sciences. R. Langlands responded that the SNS faculty have been more active in suggesting names than have the faculty in the other schools and in the last decade or two some people close to the Institute have suggested that the SNS had a series of problems which needed attention.

D. Straus suggested that a director with a career in administration would be more help to the SNS if Natural Sciences were not his own field.

M. Walzer added that if the Board wants a distinguished academician it would have to choose a mathematician or physicist since he is more likely to have completed, at an early age, the work which made him distinguished while a historian or social scientist does not usually achieve distinction until later in his career.

R. Langlands passed on comments he had received from faculty members about the names on the list. The mathematicians would favor Singer over Atiyah. Inquiries about Deutch resulted in the comments that those who knew him at the Department of Energy were very impressed. While he held strong opinions, it was agreed that he was willing to change his mind. However, at MIT many are not favorably disposed toward him finding him insecure and manipulative. A third inquiry resulted in softer criticism but a response that he was hard to get along with and that the description that he was political and manipulative was not inaccurate.

R. Langlands went on to report that the SNS faculty preferred S. Drell over the other candidates in the field of Natural Sciences. The faculty had reservations about R. Gomory citing his tendency to narrow opinions. They preferred others to Rosenbluth. Schreiffer appears to be a reasonable candidate although there were reports that he finds it hard to make difficult decisions.

The Chairman had talked to Howard Johnson, former head of MIT, who had the following comments on several of the candidates: Dahrendorf - had a mixed record at LSE; Deutch - high on him; Gomory - the same; Rhodes - may be tired of Cornell; Rosovsky - talented and good as dean; Shapiro - good president at Michigan; Swearer - riding the pop culture in education but high on him.

The discussion turned back to Drell. Some think he would be interested in the Directorship. The question came up as to why he left the Board of Trustees. It was suggested at the time that the School of Natural Sciences believed his interests did not coincide with theirs. R. Langlands questioned whether or not Drell conveyed a clear assessment of the School.

D. Straus suggested that Ed David or someone like him be on the list - someone with experience in more than one field. Such a person, if qualified in other areas, would inject something as the Institute looked toward the future. R. Langlands pointed out that David was responsible for the David Report which resulted in government funding of mathematics.

Z. Stewart wasn't sure that it is a crucial point and therefore not necessary to look specifically for such a person.

The Chairman suggested that they review those traits agreed upon at the first meeting of the Search Committee which they felt a potential Director should have: 1) universal respect of the academic community; 2) a track record indicating that a candidate could handle the kinds of situations found at the Institute; and 3) enough acceptance in the world outside of academics which would allow him to raise the necessary funds. D. Straus reminded him that there was a fourth trait - the ability to rephrase the vision of IAS for the 1990's which is where he thought experience in scientific research would be crucial.

M. Walzer said he had some comments to pass along as well as additional names. In going over the July 23rd list he realized there were no women on it. With the help of Joan Scott, he is suggesting the following names: Alice Rivlin of the Brookings Institute, Cathleen Morawitz, a mathematician at the Courant Institute and Juanita Kreps, former Secretary of Commerce under Carter. Marina von Neumann Whitman was suggested as a possible candidate.

M. Walzer went on to say that he thought they needed to know more about Dahrendorf's record although some faculty are of the view that the Director should be an American with American contacts. He reported that he received some comments about T. Ehrlich which were similar to those reported by Z. Stewart. The faculty held views about Rudenstine different from those expressed by others. In fact, the views of the faculty differ from each other. While some want a Director with a distinguished record as a scholar and a track record as an administrator, others push for a younger person. The name of Ken Prewitt of the Rockefeller Foundation came up. He was formerly of the University of Chicago.

The question was raised why Fred Starr's name was no longer on the list. A discussion about him resulted in his name being returned to the list.

The Chairman suggested that they now review the list dividing the names into three categories: 1) candidates about whom further information is not necessary and at the appropriate time can be approached regarding their interest; 2) those names to be removed from the list; 3) candidates to remain on the list but about whom more information is needed.

- 1) Drell, Gomory, Rosovsky and Rudenstine
- 2) Atiyah, Ehrlich, Rhodes and Rosenbluth
- 3) Capron, Dahrendorf, Deutch, Schreiffer, Shapiro, Swearer, David, Starr, Whitman and Prewitt

The Chairman asked each of the Committee members to help gather information on those candidates in category three as follows:

- Capron - Z. Stewart will check with C. Bok who works in the same area
- Dahrendorf - M. Walzer will speak with Fritz Stern
J. Wolfensohn will pursue I. Berlin
- Deutch - Z. Stewart will ask Prof. Solow
T. Bradshaw will discuss him with the chairman of MIT
- Schreiffer - D. Bell will be asked to contact Leon Cooper at Brown Univ.
- Shapiro - M. Walzer will check with faculty members at the Univ. of Michigan
- Singer - D. Straus will talk to Lewis Branscomb
J. Wolfensohn will be asked to talk to David Packard
- David - T. Bradshaw will speak to Kaufman
- Swearer - J. Scott will be asked for names to contact
- Starr - Z. Stewart will check with K. Brody and the SHS faculty
- Whitman - M. Walzer will speak to A. Hirschman
- Prewitt - T. Bradshaw will check with people at Rockefeller and
M. Walzer will talk to people at the Univ. of Chicago

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday, September 23 at 1:00 p.m. at the Chairman's office.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

July 23, 1986

2:30 p.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Zeph Stewart, James Wolfensohn, ex officio

Faculty Representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman stated that he had three topics to cover during the meeting:

- (1) Discussion of the list of candidates
- (2) Proposed New York Times article on IAS and the search for a new director.
- (3) Use of the services of AED during the search.

Z. Stewart reported that he had disappointing results in his attempts to reach those on his list of people to contact and is waiting to hear back from them.

J. Wolfensohn said that the first person he talked to was Morris Abram who enthusiastically suggested Alexander Morgan Capron, Professor of Law and Medical Ethics at the University of Southern California. Abram had met him while a member of the President's Commission for Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine of which Capron was executive director. He is in his early 40's and Abram judges him to be a fine writer and good scholar.

Wolfensohn did not reach Isaiah Berlin who is presently in Italy. H. Brown, with whom Wolfensohn consulted, recommended (1) John Deutch, provost of MIT, a member of the National Academy, former director of Office of Energy Research, a chemist by training. J. Wolfensohn knows him through Deutch's advisory role of a joint venture fund and finds him to not be shy about his views and to have a good sense of humor about himself; (2) Rochus E. Vogt, physicist and provost at Cal Tech; (3) John Baldeschwieler, Chemistry Professor at Cal Tech; (4) Cornelius J. Pings, chemical engineer and provost of the University of Southern California; (5) Henry Rosovsky and (6) Marty Feldstein, economist, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Wolfensohn reported that Fred Hechinger recommended (1) Michael T. O'Keefe, vice-president of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, (2) H. Rosovsky, (3) Fred Starr and (4) Mary McPherson, president of Bryn Mawr.

Wolfensohn is still checking on Ralf Dahrendorf and is checking with Klaus Moser regarding Gomory. He is also waiting for a list from M. Sovern.

R. Langlands reported that Herman Goldstine also recommended Gomory. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences; his area of math is applied mathematics. M. Walzer reported that he had spoken to W. Bowen about Gomory who is presently a Princeton Trustee. Bowen suggested the Committee check with N. Katzenbach. Goldstine also recommended Zilkowski, who had been on the list, as well as Gerry Neugebauer and Stuart Rice. Langlands reported that John Bachall had asked on behalf of the School of Natural Sciences to have S. Drell's name returned to the list.

J. Wolfensohn asked whether the Committee should narrow the list or increase the number of names. M. Walzer suggested that the list be narrowed to a smaller number to allow the Committee to concentrate on those names. The result was a list of 15 names. The Committee's assignment is to get as much information about these people as possible. Members are to suggest who could be asked for information about the candidates. R. Langlands noted that it is important to get impressions of the candidates in different roles. It was agreed that they need to suggest names of people capable of judging the performance of the candidates as a director.

Given a smaller list and the potential sources for information about the candidates, it was decided that it would not be necessary to hire AED to help with the search.

There was a discussion about the planned New York Times article. It was decided that J. Wolfensohn should be the person to talk to the reporter, Tony DePalma. If there is to be an article that involves the search then the committee would want to have some input, however, it is better to have one person on the Committee speak to Mr. DePalma.

A meeting for the Search Committee will be set for either August 28 or 29.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

September 23, 1986

1:00 p.m.

Members Present: James Wolfensohn, Acting Chairman, Zeph Stewart,
Donald Straus

Faculty Representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

In the absence of the Chairman, J. Wolfensohn chaired the meeting.

It was agreed that the meeting's agenda would be to pass on names of possible candidates who had come to the Committee members' attention since the last meeting and then to discuss those candidates on the August 26th list adding information that had been learned about them since that date.

Suggested names were Eugene Hotchkiss (Lake Forest), John Temple Swing (Vice President, Council on Foreign Relations), Robert Taylor, Bobby Inman, Steven Muller (suggested by Howard Swearer), Derek Bok, Bill Bowen and Francis Low. After a discussion of these names as possible candidates, the Committee went on to discuss the August 26th list.

Alex Capron

Z. Stewart reviewed the information he obtained from several people who know and worked with Capron. It was pointed out that while Capron has had no fund raising experience, he did handle a project that had a multi-million dollar budget and a large staff. M. Walzer had talked to some people at the Univ. of Wisconsin who reported that Capron had to fight with his staff which may not be surprising given the nature of the study. Z. Stewart reminded them of Callahan's comment about his being congenial and good to work with. The question remaining is his ability to run IAS since he has no direct relevant experience.

Ralf Dahrendorf

Everyone agreed that he had done a good job at LSE, but this does not immediately translate to being able to do as well on this side of the ocean. J. Wolfensohn reported that Wilfried Guth thinks that he would be the wrong choice. The faculty expressed the view that it would be better if the director had contacts with government agencies which a foreigner is not likely to have. Everyone agreed that his name should be deleted from the list.

Ed David

Professors at MIT enthusiastic about David. Highly respected in Washington DC. D. Straus believed that David's experience and reputation as well as the respect he has gained in the scientific world had great advantages. His broad perspective would bring to the Institute something it has lacked.

John Deutch

In comparing David and Deutch, those who were asked preferred David. Some thought Deutch would make a good Secretary of Defense. He is considered a good administrator and good in the political world. Robert Solow thought Deutch would be a "very risky" choice.

Sidney Drell

Langlands pointed out that Drell has had a long history with IAS. What is needed is a fresh face. A question about his chairing of the Visiting Committee had been raised at an earlier meeting of the Committee.

Ralph Gomory

D. Straus reported on his conversation with Lew Branscomb whose job Gomory had just been appointed to. Contrary to what the Committee might think, Branscomb said that he knows that Gomory is interested in spreading out and that he may well be interested in leaving the position to which he was just appointed. R. Langlands thought perhaps the Committee might want to chose between Gomory and David since they offer the same thing. D. Straus said that if this is the kind of person the Committee is looking for then both should remain on the list.

Kenneth Prewitt

M. Walzer received good reports about him from people who know him at Chicago. He was at SSRC (Social Science Research Center) where he raised lots of money. At Rockefeller Foundation, he negotiated control of a major scientific program. Some think he might be the heir apparent at Rockefeller Foundation. He is only 50 and considered the best of the young foundation administrators. If asked to be director, he may bargain for a faculty position.

Henry Rosovsky

M. Walzer reported that his Harvard friends say that it is unimaginable that he would leave Harvard. Bok will be taking a three month leave of absence during which time Rosovsky will be acting president which may whet his appetite for the job. Z. Stewart pointed out that he deals with people outside his field and his connections are often independent of Harvard.

Neil Rudenstine

The faculty representatives said that there was resistance by the faculty to bringing someone from Princeton University.

Robert Schreiffer

In spite of his Nobel Prize, he is considered to be a limited scholar. D. Bell had spoken to Leon Cooper who had worked with Schreiffer. Cooper had never observed him as an administrator but did say that he would not stand fools and is impatient if crossed.

Harold Shapiro

Z. Stewart reported that Morton White's son, Nick, teaches at U. of Michigan and thinks well of him. He is considered a good administrator and fund raiser. He is quite low key and not impressive on first meeting. He did see U. of Michigan through a financial crisis. He has been there for many years and eight of them as president. R. Langlands believes that he was drafted into the presidency. J. Wolfensohn knows him through the Boroughs' Board and thinks he has a first class mind.

Isadore Singer

R. Langlands pointed out that while he has not had any administrative experience, he is the best scientist on the list. The fact, however, that Lew Branscomb drew a blank about him is disturbing.

Fred Starr

Z. Stewart found it hard to get a line on him. He can be described as an administrator who used to be a scholar. R. Ullman wondered if people would take him seriously. When R. Langlands asked Professor Kennon about him as a director, he showed no enthusiasm.

Howard Swearer

He does not have as strong a reputation as Shapiro. D. Bell spoke to Peter Stanley who had worked with Swearer at Carlton. Stanley felt that he had not demonstrated a significant intellectual leadership. All agree that he is a good administrator.

Marina Whitman

M. Walzer talked to Albert Hirschman who had directed her in her thesis. He and others consider her a good economist, but few had seen her in another role.

It was agreed that it would be desirable to have more information on Prewitt, that the Committee was greatly interested in Rosovsky but would be surprised if he would accept, that they had a greater interest in Shapiro than in Swearer and that David and Gomory should be considered separately.

J. Wolfensohn said he would speak with T. Bradshaw about his plans to proceed. Everyone agreed that it was now time to find out which of the candidates would be interested in accepting the position if asked. Various approaches were discussed as well as the procedure to follow with the faculty. Everyone is highly sensitive to information getting outside the Committee especially with the Times reporter talking to the faculty. R. Langlands reported that the reporter had called him saying that J. Wolfensohn had suggested that he talk to Langlands about the search. Langlands referred him back to Wolfensohn.

There was further discussion about a point that came up a number of times during the meeting - the advantage or disadvantage in offering a professorship to a director upon his retirement. It was agreed that they need to remain flexible since they may need to be able to offer a professorship. It would depend on the candidate.

J. Wolfensohn cautioned that at this point there should be no list being shown to anyone. He will be meeting with the faculty on October 9 and will use that occasion to talk to them about the search.

A meeting of the Search Committee is set for the Friday, October 24th from 4:30 to 6:30 at the Institute.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

October 24, 1986

4:30 p.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Daniel Bell, Zeph Stewart, Donald Straus and James Wolfensohn

Faculty Representatives: Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman began the meeting with a report of his telephone calls to candidates inquiring of their interest in talking to the Search Committee about the Institute. Henry Rosovsky responded no. He is casting his lot for the future with Harvard. He is now a member of the Corporation and acting president of Harvard. Neil Rudenstine was not sure but would get back to the Chairman with an answer. Ken Prewitt said he would be glad to have a conversation with the Committee. Fred Rhodes said that the rumor about his leaving Cornell resulted from his considering the Mellon Foundation presidency which he consequently turned down. He would, however, be willing to talk to the Committee. Ralph Gomory responded enthusiastically yes. The Chairman has called Harold Shapiro but they have not been able to reach each other.

The Chairman also reported on a conversation he had with Howard Kaufman about Ed David. Kaufman did not feel that David would be right for the Institute. There was a discussion about the weight which should be given to one opinion. M. Walzer suggested that perhaps John Deutch should be added to the "A" list based on the endorsement he had received from Howard Johnson and others.

J. Wolfensohn commented that in the case of Gomory, someone should let John Akers know that Gomory was being considered before the conversations go much further.

A question was asked about Prewitt's willingness to leave Rockefeller Foundation. The Chairman noted that he had been told that Prewitt came to RF with the expectation of becoming President of it. D. Bell added that while he is a first rate administrator with good judgment, he was not a major intellectual figure. The appointment of such a person would be a signal which the Committee must recognize that it is giving. J. Wolfensohn pointed out that in getting to know the Institute better he has realized that the ability of the Institute to attract first class people lies with the individual schools. A Director who can help make it a better financed Institute will help make it a first class intellectual Institute. He therefore does not think it is necessary for the Director to be a major intellectual figure.

D. Straus asked about the vision for the future, whether a Director would be expected to cause a rejuvenation or to be a care taker. A Director is needed to orchestrate the faculty and to do so one need not be an intellectual figure.

M. Walzer pointed out that this discussion needs to be addressed to the individual candidates. It is too late to reopen the topic of what should be the characteristics of a Director.

D Straus emphasized the need to look to leadership ability and, while the candidate must be bright, it is not necessary that he be an intellectual figure. He thinks Prewitt has an advantage of being young and would want to build an identity with the Institute.

R. Langlands asked that someone compare Shapiro and Prewitt since he did not know either of them well. J. Wolfensohn on record favors Shapiro although Prewitt is probably a better political scientist than Shapiro is an economist.

D. Bell noted that Prewitt has a proven track record with institutions in trouble. He made the Social Science Research Council a viable institution.

T. Bradshaw added that Elizabeth McCormick thinks Shapiro is a good candidate and J. Wolfensohn reported that Michael Blumenthal finds him first class. T. Bradshaw also noted that he has seen Shapiro in action with other university presidents among whom he is an accepted leader.

It was agreed to look again at the "B" list to see if anyone on it should be moved to the "A" list. D. Bell asked if any consideration had been given to Gerry Edelman. J. Wolfensohn finds it hard to believe that he would leave his active scientific work at Rockefeller University.

All of the comments on John Deutch were reviewed resulting in the decision that there was enough in his favor to compel the Committee to talk to him. T. Bradshaw will call him to open the door. Capron, Schreiffer, Singer, Starr and Whitman were discussed briefly and it was agreed to leave them on the "B" list.

R. Langlands raised the question of the kind of instructions that the Board will give to a new Director. He questioned the idea of a Director leading the faculty, an expression J. Wolfensohn had used when he spoke to the faculty a few weeks ago. J. Wolfensohn responded that he finds this an accurate description since there must be someone out there to take all the individual things that are going on in the Institute and to give them an institution feel.

The topic turned to the procedure from here on. The first step would be an informal meeting with the candidate and T. Bradshaw, J. Wolfensohn and one of the faculty representatives. This group of five, possibly six, candidates would be narrowed to three. The Committee would then meet with the two faculty representatives and a representative from each of the School of Natural Sciences and the School of Historical Studies to discuss the candidates. If the Committee has at this point agreed on one candidate, they will recommend this candidate and have him meet with the two faculty representatives and two additional faculty members. If they do not have one candidate to recommend or the four faculty members do not accept this recommendation, then the four faculty members will meet with the other two candidates. When there is an agreed upon candidate, he will be asked to meet with a significant number of faculty members.

If there are no objections and if the candidate is still interested, he will be offered the position of Director. The Committee will then suggest that he will want to visit the Institute and meet with all of the faculty before he decides to accept or reject the offer.

There was an emphasis on the timing of the process and the need to begin immediately. It is hoped that the search will be completed by the end of this year and that a new Director will begin July 1, 1987.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

December 18, 1986

10:00 a.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Zeph Stewart, Donald Straus and James Wolfensohn

Faculty Representatives: John Bahcall, Giles Constable, Robert Langlands and Michael Walzer

Secretary: Donna Manning

The Chairman reviewed the work of the Search Committee to date. A long list of names was compiled with the help of the faculty and people outside the Institute who were consulted by the Committee members. This list was narrowed to 15 which was discussed with the faculty and Trustees. There was one name added to the 15 which may or may not be known to the faculty. The Trustees agreed that if any one candidate from the list of 15 were chosen to be the next Director that he would be acceptable to the Trustees. This list was then reduced to six candidates, four of whom have met with the Chairman, J. Wolfensohn and one of the two faculty representatives. If the Committee agrees to move forward with any candidates and those candidates are interested in proceeding to the next step, they will be asked to meet with the two additional faculty representatives and the remaining members of the Search Committee. At the point that the Committee narrows the list of candidates to one, arrangements will be made to have him meet with the entire faculty. At this point the Committee would be committed to his candidacy, but the candidate could still withdraw. The burden would be on him at this point.

The Chairman reviewed the six candidates and their present status. Each person who had met with these candidates was asked to give his view. The conversation centered around Harold Shapiro and Kenneth Prewitt. J. Wolfensohn emphasized that the Institute needs a leader who can lead with the the faculty feeling that he is doing so with their authority. He believes that either of these men would be an effective leader. In response to D. Straus' question whether either of these two men are interested in the position, the Chairman responded that he thought they were and added further that the Committee was catching Shapiro at a point of change in his life. He had been at Michigan 10 years, seven as the president. J. Wolfensohn found him to be balanced about his role as an administrator and his intellectual attainments. He continued to work in his area of expertise and to keep up with the literature in his field. He regards himself as a decent scholar even a first rate scholar, but one who has been running a university for some time.

J. Bahcall asked if the Chairman were suggesting that the Committee returns to the list of 15 at this point. He replied no since there are two candidates yet to be seen by the Committee. R. Langlands inquired if they were going to lose something by a delay. The Chairman responded that they needed to carry out the process with both those the Committee had met with and those they have not.

J. Bachall asked if there were anything in particular Shapiro would like to do at IAS which would motivate him to take the job of Director. J. Wolfensohn reported that although his ideas were based on a limited knowledge of the Institute, he seems to understand the dynamics of the faculty and the creative tension that exists. He believes IAS to be of the highest quality with good schools. He talked of the possibility of exploring new directions or reconfirming the present ones. He would hope to have interaction with the faculty. The Chairman added that Shapiro also recognized the possible opportunities for programs that would cut across the Schools.

There was some discussion about the Director as scholar. The Chairman pointed out that he need not be in competition with the faculty. These two particular candidates prefer to be the Director not a faculty member. The Institute is greater than an individual professor. M. Walzer pointed out that Shapiro expressed the thought that he found fulfillment in other people's scholarly work.

R. Langlands pointed out that the Committee needs to move and not delay since a delay could result in a loss. Also they need to inform the Faculty as to their progress. M. Walzer and J. Bahcall agreed that they needed to give some information to the Faculty.

A further discussion of the process took place. G. Constable summarized it as proceeding on two fronts. Inform faculty within limits. Pursue Shapiro and Prewitt and continue on with those whom they have not yet met with.

What it went through whole process with Shapiro and decided he was the man could you cut off the other two candidates?

Useful for Committee to be available after candidates meet with faculty.

Got everyone's schedule.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

MEETING OF THE SEARCH COMMITTEE

January 30, 1987

3:00 p.m.

Members Present: Thornton Bradshaw, Chairman, Zeph Stewart, Donald Straus and James Wolfensohn

Faculty Representatives: John Bahcall and Giles Constable

Secretary: Donna Manning

In answer to a question about his opportunity to meet with Harold Shapiro in London, J. Wolfensohn reported that he did see him but did not have a chance to discuss the Institute's directorship with him. Shapiro said he would call Wolfensohn on his return to New York next week.

The Chairman reported on the meeting with Frank Rhodes. He believes that door to be shut and that Rhodes is committed to Cornell and will finish his career there. However, the Chairman went on to say that Rhodes was very blunt in his meeting with them and that his message was that the Institute had a grand reputation in the past. Recent memory was Carl Kaysen's years and ten years of non leadership, keeping heads down. Rhodes questioned whether the number of professors was significant. The image to the outsider is that the professors are a recalcitrant group. The Chairman wondered if what Rhodes was saying is what others are thinking resulting in their not going forward to the second stage with the Committee.

There were reports on the outcomes of the meetings with Ken Prewitt and John Deutch. Prewitt asked to have his name withdrawn. Deutch will be in touch with the Chairman in a couple of weeks.

Professor Constable noted that as a student of institutes, he believes that it is important to have a director who believes in the Institute, who finds it to be unique in the country, indeed the world. When Wolfensohn noted that they had heard the stories and impressions of those outside, Constable reminded him that until recently he was an outsider.

Professor Bahcall said it was important for him and Constable to report to the Committee the concerns of the faculty expressed at the faculty meeting. After a description of the procedures, there was an open discussion. (1) Their first concern is schedule and the impact of not finding someone in time to fill the vacancy. (2) They wanted to convey their willingness to do everything in their power to move the search along including dispensing with rules and being flexible. They are even willing to deal with the possibility of one candidate being presented. (3) Concerned with why candidates were turning the Institute down. (4) Concerned that there was enough attention to the intellectual quality not just administrative quality of the candidates. (5) What thoughts has there been to an interim director. The faculty was especially worried about the possibility of having to appoint an interim

director before a permanent director was appointed.

J. Wolfensohn said that Jacob Rothschild had suggested two names to him while he was in London - Tony Quinton, Master of Trinity College, Oxford and Ronny Dworkin, Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford and Harvard.

Professor Bell had sent along three names which were the result of conversations with people at Harvard - Jeremy Knowles and John Dowling of Harvard and Lloyd Morrisett, president of the Markle Foundation.

There was a discussion of the procedure from here. Return to the list of names, gather new names. If the latter what to look for.

The faculty representatives urged J. Wolfensohn to meet with the faculty and let them talk about what was on their minds. He will be at the Institute on February 11 and asked that a faculty meeting be set up.

Professor Bahcall suggested that in the interest of time that the first stage meetings can be with either the Chairman or J. Wolfensohn.

Institute for Advanced Study

Search Committee Meeting

March 6, 1987

Agenda

1. Introduce two new representatives
Armand Borel - School of Mathematics
Clifford Gertz - School of Social Science
2. Reports on conversations with Shapiro, Drell and Schreifer
3. Procedure for the continuation of the work of the Search Committee
 - a. review earlier list of names
 - b. consult with a new list of people
 - c. generate additional names in other ways

Once there are additional names what is the procedure to follow?
(There is a strong feeling in the faculty that things must move quickly therefore if it is not possible to schedule a meeting with a candidate at which both you and Jim are present, use one of the Committee members. It may not be necessary for you to make the initial phone calls to a candidate. You be the one to suggest these shortcuts because if you don't the representatives will.)

4. Interim Director
(the representatives have a suggestion)
5. Schedule two additional meetings between now and the Board Meeting
(suggest week of March 23rd and April 13) Keep in mind term ends April 3.