

C O N F I D E N T I A L

To the Trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study:

Following the publication in December, 1930, of Bulletin No. 1, entitled "Organization and Purpose", I spent the better part of six months in conference with the leading scholars of America and the main European countries, seeking to elicit their critical opinion as to the value of the proposed Institute and their constructive suggestions as to the initial steps to be taken. I encountered no difference of opinion as to the importance of creating an institute of the proposed character and scope; and this, because, in the last half century, universities have everywhere undergone changes that have impaired their fundamental and essential character. The topics respecting which most discussion took place were the subjects which the Institute should first attack, the persons best qualified to lead, the conditions under which they would work most effectively, the location and ultimate character of the buildings. All these knotty questions need not be decided at once. On one or two of them my mind has become clear, as will be made plain in the course of this report; as to the others, further conference and reflection are still requisite.

I

In the interest of clarity, let me begin by recapitulating the reasons why the Institute for Advanced Study has been established and what its main characteristics should be; for only by recapitulation from time to time can we be sure that we will not be drawn or drift out of our course. Universities, being primarily intellectual in character, ought to be small and plastic; they should be havens where scholars and scientists may regard the world and its phenomena as their laboratory, without being carried off by the maelstrom; they should be simple, comfortable, quiet without being

monastic or remote; they should be afraid of no issue; yet they should be under no pressure from any side which might tend to force their scholars to be prejudiced either for or against any particular solution of the problems under study; and they should provide the facilities, the tranquillity, and the time requisite to fundamental inquiry. Now, current tendencies almost all run in the opposite direction: universities have with startling suddenness become big; having become big, they have lost plasticity; they are so big that in every direction they are pressed for funds; they have had to be organized as business is organized, which is precisely the type of organization that is inimical to the purposes for which universities exist and unpleasant to the type of person needed to promote science and scholarship; they have been dragged into the market place; they have been made to serve scores of purposes - some of them, of course, sound in themselves - which universities cannot serve without abandoning purposes which they and no other institution can serve at all. "It is the multiplicity of its purposes that makes an American university such an unhappy place for a scholar", writes one of my correspondents. Instead of limiting themselves to fundamental inquiries which may in the long run assist in the solution of complex problems, universities have almost without exception also engaged in training immature and unprepared boys and girls for practical tasks which are merely matters of the moment. Instead of providing absolute independence of speech and thought for mature men conscious of their vast responsibilities, universities have generally - though exceptions may be found - pursued two courses: emitted superficial utterances which only add to the existing Babel or avoided delicate and controversial issues, particularly in the social and economic realms. A repressive, often an unconsciously repressive influence, has emanated from trustees or executive officers. Scholarship does not prosper under the conditions I have briefly enumerated. In the entire course of my travels thus far,

I have encountered no one who felt that the present conditions of university life are favorable to sound thinking and contemplative living, though, to be sure, instances in abundance can be cited in which individuals have created or have insisted upon obtaining for themselves special terms which make their portion tolerable.

The suggestions that the Institute for Advanced Study should be small, that its staff and students or scholars should be few, that administration should be inconspicuous, inexpensive, subordinate, that members of the teaching staff, while freed from the waste of time involved in administrative work, should freely participate in decisions involving the character, quality, and direction of its activities, that living conditions should represent a marked improvement over contemporary academic conditions in America, that its subjects should be fundamental in character, and that it should develop gradually - on these suggestions there was on both sides of the Atlantic unanimous agreement.

To my request for constructive ideas, the response was different. Men knew more or less clearly what they would like or needed; but as no one had supposed that an institution of the kind described was likely to be established, no one was prepared to be definite in his immediate recommendations. In informal talk, often occupying many hours, we browsed over the whole field; frequently, before we parted, I was promised a memorandum which would embody deliberate observations as to procedure, personnel, subjects, etc. In what I now write, I am drawing upon these informal conferences, upon such notes and reflections, as I made at the time and subsequently, and upon the memoranda which have come to me from America, England, France, Germany, and Italy. I am indebted, very deeply indebted to all who gave me freely of their time, thought, and experience; and yet I should be at a loss to assign responsibility, if I were asked as to any particular item.

II

I have already reviewed the differences between existing universities and the Institute founded by Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld. Let me now draw a line between the Institute for Advanced Study, as I conceive it, and a research institute. The Institute for Advanced Study will, of course, by reason of its constitution and conception be a research institute; if the members of its staff are not contributors to the progress of knowledge and the solution of problems, there is no sufficient reason for setting it up; but they will also be teachers, men who have chosen a few competent and earnest disciples engaged in the mastery of a subject, precisely as the pupils of all the great masters of the last century - of Clerk Maxwell, Michael Foster, and Vinogradoff in England, of Claude Bernard or Halévy in France, of Helmholtz, Ludwig, and Wilamowitz in Germany - were in the first instance concerned to learn thoroughly physics, physiology, institutions, or Greek, as the case might be. Teaching should, however, be informal; for, if formal, mechanism will be devised; its burden should be light, for, if it is heavy, the teacher has too many pupils or the pupils are unfit. And the students may at times be investigators too, though not prematurely at the price of mastering their subjects.

In the so-called "research institutes" teaching is, of course, also carried on, though in somewhat different fashion. The members of a research institute are also learners, whatever else they be. And yet the emphasis is different, for the research institute is primarily concerned with problems, very specific problems, as a rule; and young men enter either as assistants to older workers or as novices to be tried out by time. The Institute for Advanced Study will be neither a current university, struggling with diverse tasks and many students, nor a research institute, devoted solely to the solution of problems. It may be pictured as a wedge inserted between the two -

a small university, in which a limited amount of teaching and a liberal amount of research are both to be found. Persons who require to be drilled or taught hard do not belong within the Institute for Advanced Study. The level of the teaching and its form mark it off sharply from college teaching, from most university teaching, from technological or professional teaching. This granted, the professor himself benefits, if for an hour or two weekly, in addition to his own research and the supervision of a few investigations, he discusses with a small thoroughly competent body a larger theme. He is thus assisted in preserving his own perspective, and he has a motive for wider reading and broader contacts.

If I may endeavor to visualize the Institute tentatively, I should think of a circle, called the Institute for Advanced Study. Within this, I should, one by one, as men and funds are available - and only then - create a series of schools or groups - a school of mathematics, a school of economics, a school of history, a school of philosophy, etc. The "schools" may change from time to time; in any event, the designations are so broad that they may readily cover one group of activities today, quite another group, as time goes on. Thus, from the outset the school of mathematics may well contain the history or philosophy of science; the school of economics, a chair of law or political theory. Each school should conduct its affairs in its own way; for neither the subjects nor the scholars will all fit into one mould. An annually changing chairman would perhaps be the only officer requisite. There should be complete academic freedom as there is in England, France, and Germany. We are, let it be remembered, dealing with seasoned and, I hope, eminent scholars, who must not be seriously or long diverted from creative work. These men know their own minds; they have their own ways; the men who have, throughout human history, meant most to themselves and to human progress have usually followed their own inner light; no organizer,

no administrator, no institution can do more than furnish conditions favorable to the restless prowling of an enlightened and informed human spirit, seeking its intellectual and spiritual prey. Standardization and organization do not aid: they are simply irksome.

III

Delicate questions arise in connection with the relations which should exist between director, staff, and trustees. Incidentally I have touched on them in saying that, as a matter of course, the staff will be made up of mature scholars, presumably conscious of the weight that should attach to their utterances and actively participating in the government of the Institute. But the subject is a difficult one, and I am not yet prepared to submit further positive recommendations, though it has received my continuous attention. I am clear that the relationship between the executive officers and the faculty is not usually in America cordial or satisfactory. On the contrary, for one reason or another, the American professorate is unhappy - and it will not enlist the country's best brains in sufficient number until the atmosphere is radically changed. I have already suggested changes of a fundamental character, among them the inclusion in the board of trustees of outside scholars as well as members of its own staff. Whether this is all that need be done to give learning its proper weight in the Institute, I am not at this moment prepared to say. I do say, however, that the Institute exists for the sake of learning and that policies and measures that are inimical to the happy and enthusiastic pursuit of learning are necessarily wrong. It has been urged that trustees should limit their activities to business matters and that faculties should govern all else. In support of this contention Germany, France, Oxford and Cambridge are cited. But none of these instances is convincing. In Germany, a powerful ministry is in constant coöperation, as it is in occasional conflict with the universities; practically the same is true in France, where,

however, the bureaucratic habit is stronger; Oxford and Cambridge do indeed govern themselves, but on three occasions in the last half century Parliament has intervened through Royal Commissions in order to cure some of the defects due to government by exclusively academic bodies. The results of the last Royal Commission were so unsatisfactory that a voluntary commission composed of scholars and laymen has now undertaken the study of the entire problem and has published the first of its reports. Both lay trustees, alone, and teachers, alone, are liable to be one-sided. When the president is the sole link or channel of communication between the staff or trustees, he tends to be autocratic and is unlikely to be widely informed. Our American experience shows the consequences. On the other hand, faculty government would distract scholars and might lead to internal and factional difficulties. We have, as I have said, tried to correct these weaknesses by constituting the Board of Trustees of the Institute out of laymen, academic personages not members of the Institute, and persons chosen from the Institute staff. Thus every relevant point of view should get a hearing. At present, this arrangement will, I believe, suffice. Further steps can be taken, if problems arise, for the solution of which this simple organization is inadequate. I fear, however, that mere organization and rules will not alone achieve our purpose - that of creating a genuine seat of learning. Sympathy, helpfulness, and mutual respect, involving director, trustees, and faculty are all requisite to create an atmosphere free of tension, attractive to men of high attainments and to students of unusual ability.

The schools composing the Institute should each select and admit its own students; no registration office is needed, for under existing academic conditions in America the possession of a diploma or degree does not indicate whether its owner is fit or unfit for advanced study. They must be discovered by any means calculated to locate them. Such students do indeed exist in

America in considerable numbers; but they are not easily found, for already universities bid against each other for them either by offering fellowships freely or by offering part-time employment. I am sure that employment as assistant at this stage of the student's progress is wrong: in a recent report the President of Harvard deplors the fact that of the graduate students of Harvard University 56% are now "part-time". I should urge that students be as a rule full-time, though I can conceive of circumstances and conditions which may justify the admission of a thoroughly competent and highly advanced student also otherwise engaged, that fellowships, grants, or more often loans be available for persons of distinctly unusual gifts and promise who cannot otherwise pursue their studies under proper conditions, and that reasonable fees be charged in other cases. The budget and the program should be so carefully controlled that the Institute will for some years at least be independent of receipts from fees. The precise manner of making the annual budget can be determined somewhat later; I am clear that the Institute should not annually spend its entire income, that it should undertake nothing involving a deficit, a procedure that is all too common and with disastrous results. Tentatively each school may work out its budget, and the several budgets can perhaps be harmonized in conferences between the director and the several schools, in preparation for consideration, first, by a budget committee of the Board of Trustees, consisting, perhaps, as at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, of three scholars and two laymen, and finally by the Board as a whole.

IV

No requirements are needed as to the maximum or minimum number of hours or years that the student must or may work, neither as to majors or minors requisite to the attainment of a degree, and we can determine experimentally problems such as the length and arrangement of terms. There will be excellent students who will work in one way; equally excellent students who

will work quite differently. Subjects or fields do not have to be "covered" - cannot be, at a high level. In his own time, the student may show that he has mastered his subject, without which mastery the Institute should give him no mark of approval. He may perhaps, in addition thereto, have done what the Germans call an "Arbeit"; if so, he can be further distinguished. But in any case the numbers will be so small that professor and students will know one another intimately; machinery will be superfluous; arrangements should vary from man to man, from year to year, from subject to subject. The highest possible standard of both general and special education should be insisted on: so much the founders proposed in their first letter to the Trustees.

V

In this connection I wish to guard against a misinterpretation of the term, "schools". I have said that it is to be loosely interpreted. I may now add that it involves no particular theory as to how knowledge is to be advanced. In America, one is told time and again that knowledge must be "correlated", that "team-work" is essential. Now there is no question that scholars rely upon one another, as they rely upon the long history of which they are endeavoring to forge a new link. But great scholars, scientists, and philosophers may be mentioned, who, while leaning upon the past, did their fundamental thinking alone - Kant, Newton, Faraday, Darwin, Henry, and more recently Einstein, who has latterly said:

"I am a horse for single harness, not cut out for tandem or team work; for well I know that in order to attain any definite goal, it is imperative that one person should do the thinking and commanding and carry most of the responsibility. But those that are led should not be driven, and they should be allowed to choose their leader."

While, therefore, I am of the opinion that the Institute as a teaching body can probably best function if the representatives of a given subject meet and discuss their common interests as a school, I should also allow every

individual and every school or group to pursue the methods that seem to him or to them best. Between men of first-rate ability collaboration or team work cannot be arranged or forced; on the other hand, collaboration and discussion will take place, where a relatively small group of scholars have abundant opportunity to discuss with one another either their own individual problems or problems that lie on the border line.

In course of time, the buildings may be so conceived and executed as to facilitate intercourse of this type. I have in mind the evolution that in the process of centuries has taken place at All Souls College, Oxford, where, as in the proposed Institute, there are no undergraduate students, and where advanced students and the older Fellows live under ideal conditions, whether for their individual work or for collaboration and cooperation. No one planned all this. It grew up because scholars were left free to work out their own salvation. It cannot be imitated or taken over; but it is there, as evidence that the thing can be done, if the pace is not forced and if the hand of the executive and administrator touches but lightly the growing organism. There is a school of mathematics, let us say, made up of mathematicians; but the mathematicians will lunch, smoke, chat, walk, or play golf with the physicists; can any possible form of organization give the flexibility, the intimacy, the informality, the stimulus thus attainable? No "director" or "departmental head" or "executive" needs to worry for fear that independent or water-tight groups, ignorant of one another, will form or not form. If the spirit of learning animates the Institute - and without that there is no reason for its existence - men will talk together and work together, because they live together, have their recreation together, meet on the same humane social level, and have a single goal.

VI

In my opinion, every step taken in forming the Institute should be

viewed as experimental. And this will be easy, if the Institute is kept small and if its quality is securely guarded. To the question of what subjects or schools to start with I have given much attention; and I have profited by judgment and advice obtained from many sources. I assume at the outset that no subject will be chosen or continued unless the right man or men can be found. Subject to this reservation, never to be forgotten, a very vague statement is contained in Bulletin No. 1. I can be somewhat more definite now, though retaining liberty to change up to the very moment when action is resolved upon. The decision not to begin with the physical or biological sciences has become stronger; they are already better done than other subjects; moreover, they are creating problems with which universities are not now dealing competently. Finally, they are not at the very foundation of modern science. That foundation is mathematics; and it happens that mathematics is not a subject in which at present many American universities are eminent. Mathematics is the severest of all disciplines, antecedent, on the one hand, to science, on the other, to philosophy and economics and thus to other social disciplines. With all its abstractness and indifference both pure and applied scientific and philosophic progress of recent years has been closely bound up with new types and methods of sheer mathematical thinking.

In behalf of mathematics, other things are to be said in addition to the fact that it is both fundamental and severe. It has, to be sure, uses, as all the higher activities of the human mind have uses, if the word, "use", is broadly and deeply understood. But its devotees are singularly unconcerned with use, most of all with immediate use, and this state of mind and spirit, it seems to me, ought to dominate the new Institute. Nothing is more likely to defeat itself, nothing is on the whole less productive in the long run than immediacy in the realm of research, reflection, and contemplation. The men who have moved the world have usually been men who have followed the will o' the

wisp of their own intellectual and spiritual curiosity. If we can make the Institute a congenial home for those who are curious in this sense, it will have its effect. On the other hand, there exists the precisely opposite type of mind - the mind that derives its initial stimulus from a practical need or problem. Lavoisier, the founder of modern chemistry, is said to have been started on his road by the need of improving the lighting of the streets of Paris; and Justice Holmes has shown that a great political philosopher can find his text and starting point in purely practical problems that arise in administering the law. Pasteur, Lister, Koch, Ehrlich, and an unending row of physicists and chemists have their feet in both worlds - the world of practice and the world of theory. Minds that are fundamental in their searching, whatever the spring that moves them - curiosity, pity, imagination, or practical sense - all belong in an institute for advanced study.

Now mathematics is singularly well suited to our beginning. Mathematicians deal with intellectual concepts which they follow out for their own sake, but they stimulate scientists, philosophers, economists, poets, musicians, though without being at all conscious of any need or responsibility to do so. Moreover, it is no small, though an accidental and incidental advantage, at a time when we wish to retain plasticity and postpone acts and decisions that will bind us, that mathematics is the simplest of subjects to begin with. It requires little - a few men, a few students, a few rooms, books, blackboard, chalk, paper, and pencils. Let us endeavor, therefore, to bring together a fertile mathematical group; let us provide for them ideal conditions of work. In due course, provision can be made for mathematical physics, and the door thus opened for another step forward when conditions are ripe; and for statistics, which will open a door on the other side.

At the same time, assuming that funds are adequate and that the right persons can be secured, I am now inclined to include economics. It is, as I

have intimated, linked to mathematics by statistics. In other respects, it seems to be everything that mathematics is not, for it is obviously of the world of action, rather than the world of sheer thought. But there are grave reasons for this choice. There is no more important subject than the evolution of the social organism, and the social organism is developing now as never before under the pressure of economic forces. Before our very eyes, mankind is conducting portentous social-economic experiments. Science and philosophy are creating new means and new goals; the economist must have something to say as to their value and feasibility. Almost half a century ago, while still a Massachusetts judge, Justice Holmes declared: "The man of the future is the man of statistics and the master of economics." But where does the economist enjoy the independence and the leisure which have for a century been enjoyed by the philosopher and the physicist? Where is the economist who is by turns a student of practice and a thinker - in touch with the realities, yet never their slave? At present, economists too often live from day to day, from hand to mouth; a professor, a journalist, a handyman for banks and business men. Economics, hard pressed by the tasks of the day, has not usually enlisted minds willing to work in leisurely and philosophic fashion. Hence, in part, its failures and disappointments. Half-baked ideas, experiments, recommendations flood the world; economists are simultaneously expected to be investigators, journalists, advisers, forecasters, and what not. Not infrequently, the source of their income may impair the soundness or reliability of their judgment. Nowhere does a group of economists enjoy the conditions which Pasteur enjoyed, when he was working out the foundations of preventive medicine, or Helmholtz, Clerk Maxwell, and Rowland, when they were working out the foundations of modern physics.

Time was, when Europe was exposed to ravage by typhus or bubonic plague. Their origin and progress were shrouded in mystery; but the veil has

now been lifted; these plagues will not recur, because their causes and methods of distribution are understood; they can be prevented or stopped. But from social and economic plagues the world is not yet immune. They continue to come and go mysteriously. We cannot any longer sit helpless before these social and economic plagues, which, once well under way, ravage the world, as our present economic and social perplexities and sufferings show. The very conquests which science has wrought - increased production and easier distribution, which ought to be blessings - have drawn in their wake curses that may or may not be connected with them. On these intricate and recondite matters I have no opinion; but clear it is that nowhere in the world does the subject of economics enjoy the attention that it deserves - economics in the broad sense, inclusive of political theory, ethics, and other subjects that are involved therein. The Institute for Advanced Study has here a pressing opportunity; and assuredly at no time in the world's history have phenomena more important to study presented themselves. For the plague is upon us, and one cannot well study plagues after they have run their course; for with the progress of time it is increasingly difficult to recover data, and memory is, alas, short and treacherous.

Thus I conceive a group of economists and their associates, financially independent, unhurried, and disinterested, in closest possible contact with the phenomena of business and government and at this high level endeavoring to understand the novel phenomena taking place before our eyes. The mathematician is in a sense secure from immediacy; the economist must be made so. He has at times to mingle in the stream of life; we must make it safe for him to do so. He must be enabled to take the same attitude towards social phenomena that the medical scientist has now been enabled to take towards disease. Not even the practical man need be concerned as to the good of this sort of work. The late Professor Starling, discussing discovery and research, said wisely:

"The preparation of insulin by Banting and Best, an admirable piece of work, is but the last step of an arduous journey, in which hundreds of workers have taken part. There is no need to be concerned about 'discoveries'. It is only necessary to ensure that the growing tree of knowledge is dug round and pruned and watered."

Beyond these two schools, I do not now look, though it is obvious how readily history and other schools - literature, music, or science - can be added when money, men, and ideas are available. I am opposed to making a "small beginning" in other subjects that will soon create a deficit on the theory - mistaken, as I think - that, if the pressure becomes acute enough, funds can somehow be obtained for necessary expansion. Experience shows that under such conditions the head of an institution must become a money-getter and that the university itself may lose its freedom in certain directions. I favor, as I have already said, financial, administrative, and educational methods that will leave a surplus, not create a deficit. Thus the Institute will be enabled to pursue a policy analogous to that of the Collège de France, viz., to take advantage of surprises by creating from time to time a chair for a new subject or an unexpected person. By the same token, not being concerned with subjects or degrees in the ordinary sense, chairs that have served their purpose can be discontinued. In these respects the stimulating influence of the Collège de France has proved of incalculable value. It has pioneered in every direction, even in medicine, in which, while never attempting the formation of a faculty, it has furnished chairs and laboratories for some of the greatest of medical scientists. Under such circumstances, growth will be slow and unsymmetrical, as it should be; for, if growth is slow, we shall learn much from experience - much that will be helpful in reshaping such schools as we start, much that will be helpful in shaping others; and, if the Institute is unsymmetrical, it can the more readily remain elastic and highly vitalized.

VII

Scholarly groups such as I have described are not readily procurable. The war destroyed many persons who would have been eligible; the unsatisfactory economic status of teaching surely deters others. None the less, the conditions to be offered will, I believe, attract some American scholars of high rank; they will certainly attract, for varying, but always sufficiently long periods, distinguished foreigners. Foreigners often find it so difficult to accommodate themselves to our usual type of academic organization that they are hardly more than decorative. I suspect that, in the Institute, as above described, they will feel themselves "at home". In the great days of the early Hopkins, President Gilman "borrowed" and recommended "borrowing". I am hopeful that "borrowing" for periods long enough to be telling may become a recognized feature of the new Institute. Because of the increased cost of living and travel, students, unless financed by outside agencies, can no longer wander as freely as they did half a century ago; it may be at times easier to reverse the process by bringing the professor to the students rather than to send the students to the professor. It is, however, also important that the director and the staff should from time to time visit other institutions in this country and Europe. Foreign scholars and scientists, living, as they do, in easy reach, know one another personally. The American scholar or scientist travels relatively little; neither he nor his university can afford the expense. Yet nothing is more stimulating - or in the long run more economical - than personal contacts. How can the head of a university judge wisely, if he has not for a generation been in touch with scholars and scientists, if he does not keep in close and constant contact with scholars and scientists, on the one hand, and with the real world, on the other? Business men know better; they are constant first-hand students of their competitors; on this point an institute for advanced study can certainly learn something important from industry.

VIII

I have from the start insisted that in nothing can the new Institute do a better service or exert a more wholesome influence than by placing its staff on a sound economic basis. The professor is not in competition with professional or business life; the income of a busy lawyer or doctor or business man would harm, not help, him. He must be so devoted to learning that he would be willing for its sake to endure hardship and deprivation. All too frequently he has done and is doing so. But it does not follow that, because riches may harm him, comparative poverty aids him. His needs are relatively simple, though, such as they reasonably are, they should be amply satisfied; and a contributory pension scheme should be open to all connected with the Institute. It does not help the clarity or concentration of a man's thinking, if he is oppressed by the fear of a needy or precarious old age, if on retirement his scale of living, already none too lavish, has to be suddenly reduced, if his wife is compelled to forgo domestic help, if his children are deprived of liberal educational opportunities, if he lives in cramped quarters, if he lacks privacy, books, music, or travel, if he is led either to marry for money or to forgo the raising of a family, if a gap - social or financial - exists between the administrative and executive heads, on the one hand, and the scholar, on the other. Nor is the university assisted, if a low scale of remuneration draws to its staff mainly mediocre or part-time workers, forced to increase their income by splitting their energy and attention. Younger men, still on trial, may be decently remunerated without danger, provided their terms of service are definitely limited. We shall open a new era in education, if our salaries indicate that, whatever his importance, not the administrator, but the faculty, creates a university. Surely the nation which has built palaces for libraries, laboratories, and students will not permanently ignore the professor who is in truth the university itself. For, as life becomes more complicated, the university

becomes more and more important; into its chairs an ever larger share of brains and devotion must be drawn. Under what conditions will this take place? It is our duty to ascertain them and to meet them. But such a scale of remuneration is not a one-sided affair; it pledges the professor to devote his whole time to the university and to avoid gainful activities. Should this policy be accepted, as in my opinion it must, the entire faculty of an American institution will thus be placed on a full-time basis; real academic freedom - the freedom to work unworried and unhampered - will be attained. Under such circumstances, the professor of economics may elect to study thorny and contentious financial, business, or social problems; he can take his time in so doing; whatever his conclusions, his intellectual integrity is not likely to be impaired or impugned. On this basis alone can a university or an institute be in the world and of the world, as far as any individual may desire, and yet preserve its absolute independence and freedom of thought and speech.

IX

The success of the Institute will in the slow processes of time be measured by the development of its staff, the students that it trains, and the additions that it makes to the world's fund of knowledge and experience. For the future of its students it need take little thought; their number will be limited; they will find their level. Additions to knowledge take the form of papers, books, and occasional addresses. Many American universities maintain their own presses. They may in some cases be justified in so doing; but the Institute for Advanced Study needs no press. A university press is a business; if possible, it must pay a profit - at least, it must endeavor to carry itself. In either event, it usually publishes what will sell - sometimes worth-while books and pamphlets, often books and pamphlets that had far better remain unprinted; it shrinks from publications that appeal to a small circle of readers and students, though from a university point of view such publications may be

of prime importance. I favor a strict policy in respect to publication. "Viel arbeiten, wenig publizieren", Ehrlich used to say. Let us hold to a high standard of performance as to both form and content. When a paper deserves publication, there will usually be a place for it; if a larger work merits printing, it can easily be handled, provided the actual outlay is underwritten. Thus university organization will be simplified; money will be saved; distribution will be more skilfully managed. Publicity need not be sought: if the Institute succeeds, the real problem will be how to avoid or restrict it.

I have said nothing definite thus far as to buildings and site, and that because despite their crucial importance these things come second. Nevertheless, they cannot be ignored. A group of scholars should not be isolated; they need access to libraries, museums, collections, and other scholars - the more so, because a slow development is contemplated. If the life of the academic body is to be normal and wholesome, the accessories of civilization must be obtainable with such means as they possess - I mean schools, physicians, friends, and domestic aid. "Association with other men like themselves", writes one who has thought deeply about the project, "will be agreeable and informed by the interests and graces of the mind. Life will be intensely active, but leisurely at the same time, as scholars and wise men know how to make life leisurely. When I contemplate the possibilities of leading life under such circumstances, I am filled with a deep enthusiasm and a vast yearning. If I am so moved, I cannot doubt that there must be countless other men who are moved by the same desires." It is not, in the first instance, a question of erecting buildings; for the subjects, with which I propose that we begin, any kind of buildings may be made to answer. In time, certain conditions affecting the site will require consideration. It should be large enough to be forever protected against the noise and bustle of urban or commercial life. But I have come to no conclusion on these points; I have merely been analyzing the problems in order to separate

the various factors. I shall suggest the appointment of a small committee which may make a preliminary study of this question with a view to general discussion by the Board later.

Certain topics I have purposely omitted in this report. I have said nothing, for example, of the duties of the director. These are described in general terms in the By-Laws; to this description, nothing needs at this moment be added. For the same reason I have not touched on details of business management; for the present they can continue to be carried by coöperation between the treasurer and the assistant secretary. Many persons raise the problem of a library; but the library problem depends partly on location; partly it will be solved by equipping with books the several schools; out of these, by the mere process of addition, the Institute library will ultimately grow. I have proposed nothing definite as to fees or the terms on which degrees will be conferred: both subjects ought to be discussed by the Committee on Education which cannot be formed until the first staff appointments are made.

In closing, let me say that I am not unaware of the fact that I have sketched an educational Utopia. I have deliberately hitched the Institute to a star; it would be wrong to begin with any other ambition or aspiration. On the other hand, I have been careful to keep within the realm of the practical. But I do not deceive myself; it will not be easy even to begin on any such basis; it will be harder, as the years pass, to keep to this standard. We shall find ourselves dealing with men and women, not with angels or super-men. Difficulties will arise; disappointments will occur. But we shall be helped, not harmed, by the high level at which we have pledged ourselves to act. In any case, unless we attempted something much higher than is now attained, there would be little reason to attempt anything at all.

X

For the present, I ask no final action on this report. I hope only that it may be freely discussed. On several important matters, I desire to seek further counsel. When the time is ripe, I shall ask the Board for authority to proceed. Meanwhile, I wish to feel free to alter it in the light of such further knowledge as I may obtain.

Abraham Flexner

Sept. 26, 1931.