

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

March 18, 1974

Mr. Howard C. Petersen  
135 South Broad Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19109

Dear Mr. Petersen,

I have been instructed by the School of Historical Studies to inform you of a series of motions passed at a meeting held on March 8 and to send copies of my letter to the other members of the Committee on Governance. In the apparent absence of a designated representative of the School of Mathematics, I will send a copy to the Executive Officer of that School.

It was moved and passed:

1. "That our representative on the Faculty-Trustees Committee on Governance inform the Committee that the School of Historical Studies wishes not to be represented on the Committee until such time as the whole Faculty can be properly represented."

In this connection it was further proposed and voted "that Professor Gilliam should add to his letter to Mr. Petersen a statement to the effect that, if there is to be a meeting of the Committee and if the Committee so wishes, Professor Gilliam will appear at the meeting and explain the reasons for the action taken by the School of Historical Studies."

2. "That the representative of the School on the Committee on Governance be instructed to convey to the Committee the hope of the School that communication between the Trustees and Faculty continue."

- 2 -

3. That "we welcome the spirit of Mr. Petersen's letter to Professor Selberg dated February 25, 1974 and hope that a full committee will soon be able to resume its meetings on the basis of the offer made in it."

Sincerely yours,

*J.F. Gilliam*

J. F. Gilliam

cc: Dean Gray  
Professor Solow  
Mr. Straus  
Professor Adler  
Professor Geertz  
Professor Harish-Chandra

## MINUTES

Meeting of the Faculty of the School of Historical Studies  
Held in the Board-Room at ten o'clock on March 8, 1974

Present: All professors of the School, Cherniss, Clagett, Elliott, Gilbert, Gilliam, Habicht, Kennan, Lavin, Meiss, Setton, Thompson, White

1. The minutes of the last previous meeting, that of February 15, 1974, were approved as formulated in the revised draft that was circulated on February 28, 1974.
- 2(a) The Executive Officer reported
  - (1) that Edward W. Bodnar, S.J., had withdrawn his name from the list of alternates for membership in the academic year 1974/75,
  - (2) that Mr. Donald Sutherland had withdrawn from the membership in the academic year 1974/75 to which he had been elected,
  - (3) that Mr. James Breckenridge has been appointed to membership in the academic year 1974/75.
- 2(b) Professor Clagett inquired whether Mr. Rose, who is now an alternate on the list of Herodotus-Memberships for 1974/75, would be considered as an alternate for regular membership if all the alternates for regular membership in that year should have been invited or have withdrawn their names; and it was agreed that in such circumstances Mr. Rose would be considered an alternate for regular membership.
- 2(c) Professor Kennan then reported that he had not yet invited Mr. John Edward Bowle to visit the Institute as he had been authorized to do by the School at the meeting of February 15, 1974 but that he would do so promptly and would inform the School of the result.
- 2(d) Professor Lavin reported that he had not yet received a reply from Dr. Ursula Schlegel concerning the visit to the Institute about which he had written to her.
- 3(a) The Executive Officer then introduced the new business on the agenda by reading two communications that had been sent to him. The first of these was a memorandum from the School of Natural Sciences announcing that School's assignments for next year to the Committee on Social Science and the Committee on Governance and its Executive Officer for next year (see Appendix A infra). The second consisted of two letters from the Executive Officer of the School of Mathematics, one confirming the fact that the representative of that School, Professor Selberg, had resigned from the Committee on Governance and the other containing an item from the minutes of the meeting of that School stating that the School

had accepted Professor Selberg's resignation from the Committee and had approved the attitude and course of action adopted by him under the circumstances (see Appendix B 1 and 2 infra). The Executive Officer supplemented this communication from the School of Mathematics by reporting that he had asked whether the School of Mathematics had taken any action to replace Professor Selberg by another representative to the Committee on Governance and that to this question he had been given an oral answer in the negative.

- 3(b) The Executive Officer then called upon Professor Gilliam, who gave a report of the meeting of the Committee on Governance held on February 23, 1974, recounting the background of that meeting and the events at it that had led to the withdrawal and resignation of Professor Selberg and summarizing the subsequent discussion in the meeting of the Committee.

After Professor Gilliam had supplemented this report by answering some questions put to him concerning it Professor Setton moved and Professor Clagett seconded the motion "that our representative on the Faculty-Trustees Committee on Governance inform the Committee that the School of Historical Studies wishes not to be represented on the Committee until such time as the whole Faculty can be properly represented." In the discussion of this motion questions were raised and suggestions tentatively made as to when and how the Committee should be informed by the representative of the School. The chair having ruled that some of these suggestions could be considered only in the form of another motion to be made after orderly disposal of the motion before the house, Professor Clagett withdrew his second; and Professor Setton's motion died for want of a second. After some brief discussion, however, Professor Kennan moved that the original motion made by Professor Setton be approved, Professor Clagett seconded the motion, and the chair put to a vote the original motion, "that our representative on the Faculty-Trustees Committee on Governance inform the Committee that the School of Historical Studies wishes not to be represented on the Committee until such time as the whole Faculty can be properly represented". The motion was carried with seven votes in favor of it, two opposed, and two abstentions.

Professor Gilliam then raised the question of the procedure to be adopted in reporting the action taken by the School; and the several suggestions made in reply were summarized by the chair in the following formulation: "Professor Gilliam as representative of this School is instructed to send a letter to Mr. Petersen, the chairman of the Committee on Governance, stating that the School has passed this motion, and to send copies of this letter to all members of the Committee on Governance". The proposal that the procedure of information so formulated be followed was put to a vote and was unanimously approved.

-3-

Upon the motion of Professor Clagett, previously made and by ruling of the chair postponed for separate consideration, there was put to a vote the further proposal "that Professor Gilliam should add to his letter to Mr. Petersen a statement to the effect that, if there is to be a meeting of this Committee and if the Committee so wishes, Professor Gilliam will appear at the meeting and explain the reasons for the action taken by the School of Historical Studies". A unanimous vote was cast in favor of this proposal.

Professor Thompson then said that, lest the negative form of the motion passed by the School be misconstrued, he would like to see hope expressed for the resumption and continuation of the work of the Committee on Governance with proper representation; and after some discussion it was moved by Professor Kennan and duly seconded "that the representative of the School on the Committee on Governance be instructed to convey to the other members of the Committee in whatever manner seems suitable to him the hope of the Faculty of the School that the difficulties which have arisen to impede the work of the Committee may be overcome and that the Committee may soon be able to resume its labors". Professor Meiss said that, since the principal purpose intended was to introduce a "positive note", he would prefer to omit the reference to "difficulties"; and he therefore moved to amend Professor Kennan's motion by substituting for the words following "be instructed to convey" the words "to the Committee the hope of the School that communication between the Trustees and Faculty continue". This motion to amend was seconded by Professor Gilliam and, being put to a vote, was carried by eight votes in favor of it with two opposed and one abstention. Professor Kennan's motion, now amended to read "that the representative of the School on the Committee on Governance be instructed to convey to the Committee the hope of the School that communication between the Trustees and Faculty continue", was then put to a vote and was carried by ten votes in favor of it with one abstention.

Professor Elliott then moved that "we welcome the spirit of Mr. Petersen's letter<sup>1</sup> and hope that a full committee will soon be able to resume its meetings on the basis of the offer made in it". This motion having been seconded, Professor Lavin moved as an amendment the substitution of "the full committee" for the words "a full committee"; and this amendment, having been seconded by Professor Thompson, was put to a vote. The result being a tie with five votes in favor, five opposed, and one abstention, the presiding officer cast a vote against the amendment and declared it defeated. Professor Elliott's original motion was then put to a vote and was carried by

---

1. The letter from Mr. Petersen to Professor Selberg dated February 25, 1974, to which Professor Gilliam had referred in his report of the meeting of the Committee on Governance held on February 23, 1974 and of Professor Selberg's withdrawal from that meeting.



-4-

eight votes in favor of it and none opposed, three members abstaining.

Professor White then moved that the date of Mr. Petersen's letter and the name of the recipient<sup>2</sup> be included in Professor Elliott's motion just passed. This was seconded and approved by unanimous consent.

The chairman at this point asked whether the Faculty wished to recess for luncheon or to continue the meeting. It was voted to continue after a recess of five minutes.

- 3(b)-continued- After the brief recess Professor Gilliam proceeded to the second part of his report, the "Sketch for IAS Appointment Procedure for Established Schools" proposed by Professors Adler and Geertz, copies of which Professor Gilliam had sent to the members of the Faculty of the School on March 6, 1974. Professor Habicht proposed to postpone for a subsequent meeting the discussion of this sketch of procedure submitted by Professors Adler and Geertz; but, the question being put to the house, six votes were cast for immediate discussion and five for postponement. It was agreed to proceed by considering the proposed "Sketch" article by article, the chair to entertain suggestions for changes and to put them to a vote one by one with the results recorded as the preferences of the School.

There being no suggestion for a change in articles A, B, and C, it was agreed by common consent to accept them as they stand.

It was moved by Professor White and duly seconded that in article 1 of Procedure the period after the word "Director" in the first line be changed to a comma, that the following words, "If the Director accepts the nomination," be deleted, and that the following words, "he circulates", be changed to the words, "who circulates". The motion was adopted by a vote of ten in favor of it and none opposed with one abstention.

After discussion and various suggestions it was moved by Professor Setton and duly seconded that in article 3 of Procedure the second word in the first line, "nine", be changed to "seven". The motion was adopted by a vote of eight in favor of it and none opposed with three abstentions.

Professor Setton moved and it was duly seconded that in the "Note" to article 3 of Procedure there be added to the Standing Committee a chairman

---

2. Scil. February 25, 1974, the date, and Professor Selberg, the recipient (see note 1 supra).

-5-

elected from the Faculty at large. This motion was adopted by a vote of eight in favor of it and none opposed with two abstentions.<sup>3</sup> It was later suggested by Professor Clagett and the suggestion was accepted by unanimous consent to add at the end of the first line in the "Note" to article 3 immediately after the words "shall consist of" the words "a chairman elected from the Faculty at large and".

In passing to article 4 of Procedure the chair suggested that there first be put the question of approving the article as formulated in the "Sketch". When with the consent of the house this question was put, no vote was cast in favor of approving the article unchanged and nine votes were cast against such approval. There was one abstention, and one member was recorded as absent.

It was then moved by Professor White and duly seconded that in the third sentence of article 4 of Procedure the words, "A proposed appointment which receives fewer than five negative votes", be deleted and in their place there be inserted the words, "If a majority of the members of the Committee present and voting vote in favor of the nomination, it..." This motion was adopted by a vote of nine in favor of it and none opposed. There was one abstention, and one member was absent. The same vote was then cast in favor of the proposal made concurrently by several members to delete altogether the "Note" to article 4 and to add after the third sentence of this article, revised by the motion just adopted, the sentence: "In the event of a tie vote the chairman shall have a casting vote".

After some discussion of possible reformulations of article 5 of Procedure in the light of the revisions of article 4 just adopted Professor White moved and it was duly seconded that for the first two lines of article 5, "If a majority...with the agreement of the Director, may", there be substituted the words, "If a majority of the Committee present and voting does not approve the nomination, the nominating School may". This motion was adopted by a vote of eight in favor of it and none opposed. There was one abstention, and two members were recorded as absent.<sup>4</sup>

Professor Clagett then questioned the meaning of article 7 of Procedure, and it was agreed without formal vote that this article should be eliminated.

---

3. Before this vote was taken Professor Gilbert left the meeting to keep another appointment after he had been assured by the Executive Officer that in case the issues under consideration came up for discussion in a Faculty meeting, the members of the School were not bound by decisions made in the present meeting.

4. Professor Meiss, who left the meeting before this vote was taken, and Professor Gilbert (see note 3 supra).

-6-

Professor Setton then suggested that a new draft of the "Sketch" by Professors Adler and Geertz, altered in accordance with the proposals voted by the School, be prepared; and the Executive Officer undertook to have such a draft added as an appendix to the minutes of this meeting.<sup>5</sup>

Professor Gilliam then asked whether Professor Adler would be informed of the action taken by the School on the proposal made by him and Professor Geertz. To this question the Executive Officer replied without objection or correction from the house that Professor Gilliam as the representative of the School to the Committee on Governance could consider the actions taken by the School at this meeting in altering the "Sketch" prepared by Professors Adler and Geertz as expressions of the School's preferences to guide him in further negotiations, if there are any, with other members of the Committee and in particular to enable him to tell Professor Adler specifically what objections the School has to certain parts of the "Sketch" and how it would like to have these changed.

- 3(c) Professor Elliott then reported that he had been requested by Professor Gilbert, who had had to leave the meeting, to present for him the motion that he had prepared and had asked to have put on the agenda. With leave Professor Elliott then presented in Professor Gilbert's name the following motion: "The School of Historical Studies deplores leaks which give outsiders and the press information about discussions and decisions in Faculty meetings. If breaches of confidence should occur in the future, the School believes that a careful investigation should at once be made and if the source is traced to a member of the Faculty he should be excluded from participation in Faculty meetings and Faculty business. The members of the School of Historical Studies feel sure that the other Schools share the view that Faculty meetings are confidential and are awaiting similar declarations from the other Schools before the members of the School of Historical Studies again attend Faculty meetings." Professor Elliott then in his own name seconded this motion. Speaking to the motion, Professor White said that he very much deplored all leaks and was outraged when he saw in the New York Times the most recent report of a meeting of the Faculty, but he observed that the motion now before the house gave the impression that all past leaks had emanated from the Faculty as distinct from other branches of the

---

5. See infra Appendix C 1, the original Sketch presented by Professors Adler and Geertz, and Appendix C 2, the Sketch as altered by the action of the School at this meeting (changes of wording are underlined).



-7-

Institute and took no consideration of the possibility that leaks might come from someone not a member of the Faculty. Professor Elliott stated that he had been distressed and embarrassed by the most recent leak, which had occurred at a highly inopportune time and might have jeopardized what his Committee and the Faculty had sought to achieve. Professor White said in reply that he recognized the justice of Professor Elliott's remarks and sympathized with his feeling about this most recent leak but objected to a motion which by implication singles out one segment of the Institute as the only possible source of such leaks; and he therefore moved as an amendment to the motion that in the first sentence after the word "leaks" and before the words "which give" there be inserted the words "on the part of any person connected with the Institute" and that everything following the first sentence be deleted from the motion.

The amendment so moved was seconded by Professor Thompson, and the chair asked whether there was discussion on the amendment. Professor Clagett said that he would vote for the amendment and for the motion so amended, for, while he deplored "leaks", he strongly objected to the punitive aspects in the second and third sentences of the original motion, about which he was willing to speak at more length later. Professor Lavin stated that in his opinion the amendment would still leave the motion uncomfortably ambiguous because some questions arise in meetings of the Faculty which it is permissible or even necessary to discuss outside of the meetings of the Faculty and such discussions could be considered "leaks" or could lead to "leaks". Professor White said that he would be willing to amend his amendment by the additional insertion of the word "confidential" before the word "information". Professor Lavin said that he would still be troubled about the meaning of "confidential" and would like to see a version in which confidential matters are clearly defined. Questions were raised concerning the minutes of the meetings of the School and of the Faculty, whether they are confidential and in what sense. Professor Kennan then spoke, saying that he questioned the use of the words "leaks" and "confidential", that these involved complicated problems which in his opinion could not be easily resolved in a meeting like the present one and to which very careful thought should be given before attempting to formulate a decision concerning them. Thereupon it was moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was carried by a vote of five in favor of it and four opposed, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:10 P.M.

Harold Cherniss,  
Executive Officer

APPENDIX A

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

Telephone-609-924-4400

SCHOOL OF NATURAL SCIENCES

March 1, 1974

Memorandum to: Executive Officers of School of Historical Studies;  
School of Mathematics, School of Social Science  
From: E. S. Gorman

The School of Natural Sciences committee assignments for  
next year are as follows:

Social Science Committee: Tullio Regge (John Bahcall - alternate)  
✓ Governance Committee: Stephen Adler (Roger Dashen - alternate)

The SNS Executive Officer for next year is Marshall Rosenbluth.

Freeman Dyson will be on sabbatical next year.

Copies to: Profs. Cherniss, Harish-Chandra, Kaysen, SNS Faculty.

APPENDIX B 1

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

March 4, 1974

Executive Officers of the Schools  
Institute for Advanced Study

Dear Colleagues:

This is to confirm that Professor Atle Selberg has resigned from  
the Committee on Governance.

Yours sincerely,

*Harish-Chandra*  
Harish-Chandra

Professors Cherniss, Regge, Geertz

APPENDIX B 2

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

March 6, 1974

Professor Harold Cherniss  
Institute for Advanced Study

Dear Harold:

The following item appears in the minutes of the meeting of the School of Mathematics held on February 25, 1974:

"Professor Selberg gave his report on the meeting of the Committee on Governance held on February 23, 1974. His resignation from the Committee was accepted and the School approved the attitude and the course of action adopted by him under the circumstances. A motion of thanks for, and approval of, his work on the Committee was passed unanimously."

Yours sincerely,

*Harish*

Harish-Chandra

HCcdu

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

SCHOOL OF HISTORICAL STUDIES

March 6, 1974

To the Faculty,  
School of Historical Studies

Stephen Adler gave copies of this proposal, in its new form as revised by Clifford Geertz and himself, to our Executive Officer and myself this morning. Our thought is that it should be presented to the School at its meeting this Friday as a related but separate item following the discussion of my report on the February 23rd meeting of the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance and immediately connected developments.

Yours sincerely,

*J. F. Gilliam*

J. F. Gilliam

enclosure



## Sketch for IAS Appointment Procedure for Established Schools

### Introduction

The following appointment procedure is intended to embody a number of principles:

A. The whole Faculty has a responsibility for maintaining the academic standards of the Institute. Accordingly, no appointment should be made to the Institute Faculty which does not have the concurrence of the Faculty.

B. The best judges of the academic qualifications of a proposed candidate for a professorship are his intellectual peers, specifically the Faculty members of the School which proposes to invite him.

C. The calling in question of the judgment of a particular School by other members of the Faculty is itself a grave step and should be taken only for strong reasons. It may be the case, of course, that a particular nomination raises questions other than those of academic merit, which directly affect the nature and operations of the Institute. In such cases, Faculty discussion is justified independently of questions of academic merit.

### Procedure

1. A School nominates a candidate to the Director. If the Director accepts the nomination, he circulates to the Faculty the usual documentation, e.g. curriculum vitae, bibliography, appreciation of the candidate's work, and supporting letters.

2. The Faculty may give its consent to the appointment by silence, i.e., if there is no call for discussion after a stated interval (at present three weeks) the Faculty shall be deemed to have concurred in the nomination.

3. If nine or more members of the Faculty call for additional review of the appointment, it shall be referred to a Standing Committee on Appointments.

Note: The Standing Committee shall consist of two members from each School, who shall be designated by the School in April of the preceding academic year.

4. The Standing Committee shall be empowered to seek any additional outside information on the proposed appointment which its members feel is needed to reach a decision. Within eight weeks after receiving the request for review, the Standing Committee shall meet to vote on the proposal. A proposed appointment which receives fewer than five negative votes shall be deemed to have Faculty concurrence, and shall be forwarded to the Director for presentation to the Trustees.

Note: In keeping with principle C above, abstentions on the votes are construed with the benefit of the doubt going to the proposing School. An absolute negative majority of the Committee is required to block an appointment.

5. If a majority of the Committee opposes the nomination, the nominating School, with the agreement of the Director, may appeal the decision at a meeting of the full Faculty. If a majority of those present vote to override the Standing Committee decision, the appointment may proceed to the Director for presentation to the Trustees.

6. No nomination shall be forwarded by the Director to the Trustees unless the Faculty has concurred in it, in accordance with the above procedure.

7. Any changes in these procedures shall require the approval of a majority of the Faculty and of three of the four existing Schools.

March 4, 1974

## APPENDIX C 2

### Sketch for IAS Appointment Procedure for Established Schools as amended by the School of Historical Studies at its Meeting, March 8, 1974

#### Introduction

The following appointment procedure is intended to embody a number of principles:

A. The whole Faculty has a responsibility for maintaining the academic standards of the Institute. Accordingly, no appointment should be made to the Institute Faculty which does not have the concurrence of the Faculty.

B. The best judges of the academic qualifications of a proposed candidate for a professorship are his intellectual peers, specifically the Faculty members of the School which proposes to invite him.

C. The calling in question of the judgment of a particular School by other members of the Faculty is itself a grave step and should be taken only for strong reasons. It may be the case, of course, that a particular nomination raises questions other than those of academic merit, which directly affect the nature and operations of the Institute. In such cases, Faculty discussion is justified independently of questions of academic merit.

#### Procedure

1. A School nominates a candidate to the Director, who circulates to the Faculty the usual documentation, e.g. curriculum vitae, bibliography, appreciation of the candidate's work, and supporting letters.

2. The Faculty may give its consent to the appointment by silence, i.e., if there is no call for discussion after a stated interval (at present three weeks) the Faculty shall be deemed to have concurred in the nomination.

3. If seven or more members of the Faculty call for additional review of the appointment, it shall be referred to a Standing Committee on Appointments.

Note: The Standing Committee shall consist of a chairman elected from the Faculty at large and two members from each School, who shall be designated by the School in April of the preceding academic year.

-2-

4. The Standing Committee shall be empowered to seek any additional outside information on the proposed appointment which its members feel is needed to reach a decision. Within eight weeks after receiving the request for review, the Standing Committee shall meet to vote on the proposal. If a majority of the members of the Committee present and voting vote in favor of the nomination, it shall be deemed to have Faculty concurrence, and shall be forwarded to the Director for presentation to the Trustees. In the event of a tie vote the chairman shall have a casting vote.

5. If a majority of the Committee present and voting does not approve the nomination, the nominating School may appeal the decision at a meeting of the Full Faculty. If a majority of those present vote to override the Standing Committee decision, the appointment may proceed to the Director for presentation to the Trustees.

6. No nomination shall be forwarded by the Director to the Trustees unless the Faculty has concurred in it, in accordance with the above procedure.

March 4, 1974