

Chinn . Setton

Absent Dasher, Balcells, Rosenthal, Gödel  
Milner . Mess Kerman

Actions taken at the meeting of the School of Historical Studies on

January 10, 1974

HS (17)  
+Hath  
unlabeled  
(4)  
NS  
accred  
It was moved that it was the sense of this meeting that the representative of the School on the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance should report to the Committee the following: (1) that the School believes that no nomination to a professorship which is not approved by the Faculty should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, and that no person who is not approved by the Faculty should be appointed to a professorship at the Institute; (2) that the School believes that only the Faculty of the Institute may determine the manner in which its approval of a nomination to a professorship shall be given. Passed unanimously.

HS 16. +  
+Hath  
(unlabeled)  
9 -  
It was moved that the School disapprove the proposals, circulated among members of the Committee and the Faculty, (1) to set up a mandatory outside Standing Committee for each School, with the function of arbitrating disputed appointments, among other things; (2) to assign a special role to academic Trustees. Passed unanimously.

HS 15  
- 2  
unlabeled  
1-7 +  
1-  
1-  
1-  
It was moved that the School was of the opinion the Sec. 15 of "Responsibilities" as formulated at present does not give the Faculty enough voice in the selection of the Director and does not make it clear that, if the Director is to be made a Professor, he needs to go through the same procedures as the other Professors of the Institute. Passed unanimously.

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

January 8, 1974

MEMORANDUM

To the Members of the Faculty:

I enclose herewith a revised draft for the Minutes of the Faculty Meeting of November 21, 1973. Comments from Professors Clagett, Elliott, Gilbert, Gödel, Kaysen, Setton and White have been noted and appreciated.

Sincerely,

*H.A.T.*

Homer A. Thompson  
Secretary

Enclosure

Professors Cherniss, Clagett, Elliott, Gilbert, Gilliam, Habicht,  
Kennan, Lavin, Meiss, Setton, White

Professors Borel, Gödel, Harish-Chandra, Langlands, Milnor, Montgomery, —  
Selberg, Weil, Whitney

Professors Adler, Bahcall, Dashen, Dyson, Regge, Rosenbluth

Professor Geertz

cc. Dr. Kaysen ✓

DRAFT MINUTES

Faculty Meeting of November 21, 1973

10:00 a.m. - Board Room

Present: Professors Adler, Clagett, Dashen, Dyson, Elliott, Geertz,  
Gilliam, Habicht, Harish-Chandra, Kaysen, Langlands,  
Lavin, Meiss, Milnor, Rosenbluth, Selberg, Setton, Thompson,  
Weil, White, Whitney

Absent: Professors Bahcall, Gilbert, Gödel, Kennan, Regge, Montgomery (illness)

Absent on Leave: Professor Borel

Chairman: Professor Cherniss

1. Chairmanship. The meeting was called by the Secretary at the written request of five members of Faculty. The name of Professor Cherniss having been proposed for the Chairmanship in writing by Professor Weil, and no other nomination having been made from the floor, Professor Cherniss took the Chair.

2. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 12, 1973) were approved (as corrected November 21, 1973).

3. The Minutes of the Meeting of January 15, 1973, as revised by a Faculty Committee (Professors Adler, Milnor and Setton) and circulated on November 12, 1973 with a subsequent correction on page 6, were approved. In a letter addressed to the Committee Professor Gödel had asked that a certain remark he had made after the meeting of January 15 about an outside letter which had been circulated too late for careful consideration in the meeting should be recorded. On a ruling by the Chair Professor Gödel's letter was ordered to be appended to the Minutes of the present meeting.

4. Appointment of Bernard Lewis. As a basis for discussion a passage was read from the memorandum on the subject circulated by the Director on November 7, 1973:

"The School of Historical Studies proposes to appoint Bernard Lewis, now Professor of the History of the Near and Middle East at London University, to a long-term membership for one term a year, beginning 1974-75, for the period of his tenure of a professorship at Princeton University. The proposal was voted in the School meeting of November 1: 8 affirmative, none opposed, 4 abstaining."

A discrepancy was pointed out between the Director's memorandum and the actual motion in the specification for the duration of the appointment: "for the period of his tenure of a professorship at Princeton University" according to the memorandum; "until the age of 70" according to the motion. In clarification the Director observed that it would be better if we had a commitment that matched the University's commitment, and then we both faced the question of what was done at the end of that commitment, hence it was only an issue of administrative orderliness.

- 2 -

Regret was expressed by Professors Milnor, Rosenbluth and Selberg over the joint character of the proposed appointment which in the light of previous experience in the Schools both of Mathematics and of Historical Studies might be expected, in their opinion, to prove more advantageous to the University than to the Institute. Comparison was drawn with the proposal made some years ago for dual professorships in both the University and the Institute for Messrs. Adler and Dashen. The rejection of that proposal in favor of single professorships in the Institute had worked out to the great satisfaction of the School of Natural Sciences. It was pointed out, however, that the proposed appointment for Lewis was not entirely comparable with that for Adler and Dashen inasmuch as Lewis, not being a faculty member, would not be subject to divided loyalty.

Professor Weil urged that the meeting be informed of the considerations which had led to abstentions in the vote on the motion for the appointment in the meeting of the School of Historical Studies.

Professor White, one of the abstainers, observed that he shared the opinion of Professors Clagett and Setton as to the high quality of Lewis' scholarship, and he would have been ready to vote for a Professorship but was deterred by his uneasiness about the terms now proposed for the appointment. He therefore abstained rather than voting against the proposal so as to avoid the impression that he was opposed to the man on a scholarly basis.

Referring back to the earlier reference to the proposal for dual Professorships for Adler and Dashen Professor Adler commented that the terms now proposed for the Lewis appointment were likely to obviate the most serious risk which he had envisaged in the case of the earlier proposals, viz. the almost inevitable involvement in committee work in both terms.

In order to explain his abstention Professor Cherniss called upon Professor Meiss to read the statement which he (Professor Cherniss) had made at the meeting of the School of Historical Studies on November 1, 1973: "while he would enthusiastically vote in favor of nominating Bernard Lewis for a Professorship, he could not vote for the present motion, because the indefinite term of membership proposed combined with a Professorship in Princeton University as envisaged by the proposal is in his opinion an arrangement highly undesirable for the Institute and inauspicious for its continued independence, but that he would not vote against the motion, because as one who after this academic year will not be an active member of the Faculty he would not obstruct the plans of those who thereafter will be a majority of the Faculty".

Professor Setton, as one of the sponsors of the proposal for the Lewis appointment, made some general comments.

(a) Referring to Professor Cherniss' apprehension about the relations between University and Institute he observed that although the two institutions had been very closely linked in the beginning both by strong personalities such as Veblen and Morey and by the sharing of space, the Institute has shown an increasing tendency toward independence from the University, so much so that in his opinion there is no longer any menace in that area.



- 3 -

(b) Lewis' scholarship is in itself of such high quality as to satisfy our principle of appointing only the very best people whom we can persuade to come to the Institute. His scholarly interests, moreover, are related in one way or another to those of Professors Clagett, Geertz and Setton himself.

(c) The fact that all the necessary money would come from outside sources would assure that the appointment would not financially jeopardize any existing activities at the Institute.

(d) The present proposal may indeed be viewed as something in the nature of a compromise to meet the hesitancy on the part of some colleagues in Historical Studies "to fill up the last slot" at this juncture, and the unwillingness of other colleagues to make any long-term appointment other than one at professorial level. The present proposal, it is hoped by its sponsors, will prove acceptable to Lewis and so enable the Institute to take advantage of a splendid opportunity.

Professor Geertz, in referring to earlier statements that the Institute had fared poorly from joint appointments, observed that the two instances of such appointments with which he was most familiar, those of Thomas Khun and Carl Schorske, had worked out very well, and he saw no reason to be uneasy about the present proposal even though it was for a longer period. Professor Geertz went on to emphasize the importance of the proposed appointment for the School of Social Science as well as for that of Historical Studies.

Professor Dashen asked whether the outside money referred to in the Director's memorandum is specifically tied to the proposal now under discussion or whether it could be used to support one-half or two-thirds of another Professorship in the School. The Director replied that the money is indeed tied to Lewis. He had begun to explore the possibility of obtaining the (much larger) sum of money needed for a professorship, but before he had found an answer it became clear that a professorship was not likely in any case to be offered. The man with whom the question was raised was ready to commit himself, and has committed himself, to the amount involved in the present proposal. But the Director could not say with similar certainty whether the larger sum needed for a Professorship would be forthcoming. In reply to a query from Professor Milnor the Director observed that the difference in the amounts of money involved in the present proposal and in a professorship is more than a factor of two, but the whole problem is more complex.

Professor Langlands raised two questions:

- (1) Would the present proposal as an alternative to a professorship reduce the possibility of Lewis' coming?
- (2) Has any commitment been made to the University in this matter that cannot now be revoked?

The Director replied that not having been in correspondence with Lewis he could not respond to the first question. As to the second question he affirmed that in his discussion with Professor Udovitch, Chairman of the Department of Near Eastern Studies in the University, no commitment had been made in the name of the Institute.

To Professor Langland's further enquiry as to whether the Institute now or at a later date could change the proposed membership to a professorship, Professor Clagett replied that this would be stabbing the University in the back; the Director concurred.

On Professor Weil's expressing persistent uneasiness over the possibility of premature commitments on the part of the Director, Professor Setton explained that as far as he knew the Director's part had been largely confined to the raising of money; the proposal had been initiated by Professors Clagett and Setton and the negotiations with Professor Udovitch had been conducted by them.

Professor Meiss observed that with Lewis coming at age 58 for a duration of only ten or twelve years, the Institute would probably not be disposed subsequently to change the terms of the appointment in view of the complexity of the commitments involved in a professorship.

Professor Milnor, reiterating his regret over the proposed arrangement, felt that the Institute would get better value by sharing Lewis with the University on a professorial level. To this Professor Setton replied that the money in any case was coming from outside, and that it was available only for Lewis; furthermore, the School of Historical Studies had already expressed its opposition to a professorial appointment for Lewis within the School.

Professor White asked whether negotiations with the University had gone so far as to make it impossible for us without embarrassment to change the proposal from its present form to the offer of a professorship in the Institute. Professor Clagett replied that he wouldn't be embarrassed at all; Professor Setton thought it would be quite embarrassing.

Professor Habicht could see in the proposed appointment attractions that might appeal to Lewis; the opportunity to teach in one term and the freedom from professorial duties in the other.

Professor Weil asked of the Social Scientists whether, in view of the wide applicability of the term "social change", Lewis could not be regarded as a student of that subject. In reply Professor Geertz insisted that in his view Lewis was not a social scientist but an historian, an historian however of the sort that could be helpful to the social scientists in their study of social change. The Director added that Lewis regarded himself primarily as an historian.

Professor Dashen, in recording his support for the proposed appointment, emphasized its good value: the Institute had much to gain, nothing to lose.

Professor Setton and Professor Geertz insisted again that Lewis is primarily an historian rather than a social scientist.

To Professor Milnor's question whether Lewis in his term at the Institute might not keep to himself in his study Professor Elliott, from his first-hand knowledge of Lewis, replied that Lewis would undoubtedly wish to take an active part in the informal life of the Institute.

- 5 -

Professor Selberg, while favorably impressed both by Lewis' personality and by his scholarly record, indicated his preference for a professorial appointment, and expressed puzzlement over the rigidity with which the School of Historical Studies was guarding "the last slot". To this Professor Setton replied that there is a strong feeling within the School, based on a good deal of deliberation, in favor of reserving that slot for an appointment in classical studies following on the now imminent retirement of Professor Cherniss.

Professors Adler and Dashen saw no reason to interfere with the proceedings of the Historians since there was no question about scholarly quality.

To Professor Rosenbluth's question whether consideration had been given to the possibility of a professorship for Lewis to be divided between the Schools of Historical Studies and of Social Science, Professor Geertz replied in the negative, saying that the initiative in the whole matter had been taken by the School of Historical Studies, and that he as a member of the sister School had not thought it necessary to go beyond indicating his happiness with the idea as put forward by the Historians.

Professor Milnor asked whether the slight financial difference between the proposed membership and half a professorship would not be more than compensated for by the better value that the School would derive from an appointment of the latter kind. The Director, admitting that the difference in cost would not be great in absolute terms, explained that the present proposal was designed to meet the opposition of the Faculty to joint professorships as demonstrated not many years ago by an overwhelming vote.

In response to a question as to library facilities for Lewis, Professor Clagett observed that Lewis had a very remarkable private library which he would presumably keep in his study at the Institute, supplementing it with occasional visits to the University library.

In the course of further discussion over the pros and cons of a membership vs. a professorship the Director reminded the Faculty of a precedent for the present proposal, viz. the permanent membership held by Kurt Weizmann in the Institute from 1945 to 1970 while at the same time he held a professorship in the University. It was pointed out by Professors Clagett and Meiss that the present proposal would assure the Institute of a greater share in the physical presence of Lewis than it had enjoyed in the case of Weizmann.

Professor Lavin, while favoring the appointment of Lewis in principle, expressed misgivings on two scores: (1) would not the present proposal involve the risk of creating a "second-class citizenship" at the Institute?, and (2) might not embarrassment arise in the choice of visiting members to be associated with a long-term membership of this nature? Professor Setton pointed out in reply that Lewis would have no prescriptive right to the selection of annual visitors, a right that is not enjoyed even by the regular members of the Faculty.



- 6 -

Professor Dashen observed that the questions raised by Professor Lavin concerned exclusively the School of Historical Studies and not the rest of the Faculty.

After some discussion over how best to record the consensus arrived at in these deliberations, Professor Weil reviewed the history of the procedure for nominating professors at the Institute and then moved that

"The Faculty takes note of the proposal of the School of Historical Studies concerning Bernard Lewis as forwarded to it in the letter of the Director and will welcome the presence of Bernard Lewis at the Institute."

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

5. Report of Faculty representatives on the Governance Committee. The four Faculty members (Professors Adler, Geertz, Gilliam, Selberg) were invited to report informally on the proceedings of the Committee.

Professor Adler reported that the Faculty members, after an informal discussion among themselves, met with the Trustee members for the first time on November 3rd. The initiative was taken by the Faculty representatives who proceeded to raise a number of points, starting with those that might be expected to prove the least controversial:

(a) Procedure for selecting a new Director. Item 15 of the statement prepared by the Faculty in 1972 on "Responsibilities of the Faculty in the Governance of the Institute", has been revised in such a way as to be acceptable to the Trustees; a copy is to be circulated and discussed within the Schools.

(b) Choosing the "Academic Trustees". The Board already includes Trustees with qualifications relevant to the Schools of Historical Studies and of Social Science. Members have still to be chosen for Mathematics and Natural Sciences, preferably within the current year, the names to be submitted in time for consideration by the Trustees at their May meeting. It was agreed that the selection should be made through discussions between the Nominating Committee of the Trustees and the School in question, the proceedings to be initiated by Mr. Forrestal, the Chairman of the Committee.

(c) Voting rights of the Director. Clarification was sought for Item 4 of the "Six Points" issued by the Trustees in April, 1973: "The Director is a Professor but shall not sit or vote as a Professor in a School or in the whole Faculty while serving as Director". The academic Trustees, Mrs. Gray and Mr. Solow, were emphatic in support of the view that the Director should not vote at a Faculty meeting even if he were not in the Chair. On the other hand, it was felt that in its original wording the clause had gone too far in excluding the Director from attendance at Faculty meetings. To meet this objection Professor Adler had prepared the following revision for circulation within the Committee: "When the Director is a professor he shall not vote as a professor in a School or in the full Faculty while serving as the Director. He may attend the meeting of any School on the invitation of that School as extended through its Executive Officer, and may attend all Faculty meetings including those convened on Faculty initiative".

- 7 -

(d) Method of making academic appointments. Only a beginning was made on the discussion of this more difficult problem. It was agreed that Professors Adler and Selberg should each put down on paper and circulate among the Faculty proposals which they had worked out individually.

(e) Interrelationships among Trustees, Director and Faculty. This subject was broached but not discussed.

In commenting on Professor Adler's report Professor Milnor suggested that the draft of the revised version of the procedure for the selection of a new Director should be circulated and discussed at the next meeting of the whole Faculty. Professor Adler agreed.

Professor Geertz reported strong sentiment within the Governance Committee against its activities becoming open-ended and in favor of its winding up its business within the current year.

Professor Gilliam emphasized that at the first meeting of the Committee the initiative had rested entirely with the Faculty representatives, and he expressed the wish of those representatives to receive from their Faculty colleagues suggestions of topics to be considered at the next meeting of the Committee to be held on December 8th.

In response to a question from Professor Clagett regarding procedure to be followed in choosing academic trustees, Professor Selberg stated as his understanding that the particular School should discuss the matter and propose a name which would then be transmitted to the Nominating Committee of the Trustees. Mr. Petersen had suggested in the meeting that the proposal be conveyed through informal contact between the Committee and the School, and Mr. Forrestal, Chairman of the Committee, has in fact already been active and the School of Mathematics has already considered names.

Professor Selberg went on to say that the idea of the Committee finishing its assignment within the year was more of a pious hope than a real expectation.


Professor Weil reminded the meeting that the "Six Points" of last May, although the statement followed on lengthy negotiations between Trustees and Faculty, was in fact a unilateral declaration by the Trustees and was not something mutually agreed upon. With regard to academic trustees Professor Weil enquired about the role played by the School of Historical Studies in the selection of Mrs. Gray as a member of the Board. From the recollections of various members of that School it emerged that Mrs. Gray's name had been considered informally and not unfavorably at a meeting of the School, but that no vote had been taken.

A motion to proceed to the discussion of specific issues raised by the report on the meeting of the Governance Committee was defeated.

- 8 -

Professor Habicht raised the question as to whether during the existence of the Governance Committee individual members of the Faculty should agree to communicate with the Faculty as a whole and with the Trustees only through that Committee. Professors Selberg and Weil demurred and the point was not pressed.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "H.A. Thompson", with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke at the end.

Homer A. Thompson  
Secretary

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY  
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

November 21, 1973

Professor John Milnor  
Institute for Advanced Study

Dear Professor Milnor:

In the second version of the minutes of the Faculty meeting of January 15, 1973 prepared by Mrs. Bortell the following appears after my remark ending on page 4A, line 1 (page 7, line 6 from below of the latest version):

"After the meeting Professor Gödel commented that his misgivings about the proof of Bellah's sociological assertions had been confirmed to a considerable extent by Professor Diamond's letter."

I think that this observation is important and therefore request that this letter be appended to the minutes.

Sincerely yours,

*Kurt Gödel*

Kurt Gödel

KGcdu

December 13, 1973

Dear Homer:

Thanks for your draft of the Minutes. I see that you are again at the task of making order out of chaos.

I have only one comment referring to page 5, 4th paragraph, In reporting Milnor's question. Milnor must have been referring to half a professorship rather than a professorship, since it is these two which are nearly equivalent in financial value. It was certainly to that comparison that I made my response.

Cordially,

Carl Kaysen

Professor Homer A. Thompson  
Institute for Advanced Study



THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

Telephone-609-924-4400

THE DIRECTOR

January 7, 1974

Memorandum to the Trustees Members of the Committee on Governance

This is to remind you that the Committee will meet again on the 19th of January. Professor Adler has circulated the attached to the Faculty since our last meeting. It will be discussed at a Faculty meeting on the 15th of January, and I will be reporting to you probably by telephone on the outcome of that discussion.



Carl Kaysen

Mr. H. C. Petersen, Chairman  
Mrs. H. H. Gray  
Professor R. M. Solow  
Mr. D. B. Straus

Enclosure