A HISTORY OF
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
1930-1950

Beatrice M. Stern

A HISTORY OF

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

1930-1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION iii

CHAPTER I

THE PREHISTORY OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY 1
NOTES 40

CHAPTER II

THE LOUIS BAMBERGER AND MRS. FELIX FULD FOUNDATION 44
NOTES 73

CHAPTER III

PLANNING THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY 78
NOTES 118

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS 121
NOTES 188

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS 197
NOTES 255

CHAPTER VI

THE SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES 260
NOTES 301

CHAPTER VII

TOO MANY GENERALS 305
NOTES 360

CHAPTER VIII

DR. FLEXNER RETIRES 366
NOTES 442

CHAPTER IX

A PERIOD FOR CONSOLIDATION 452
NOTES 520

CHAPTER X

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER 528
NOTES 580

CHAPTER XI

THE SELECTION OF A SUCCESSOR DIRECTOR 589
NOTES 623

CHAPTER XII

DR. OPPENHEIMER'S FIRST YEARS AS DIRECTOR 629
NOTES 709

APPENDIX I 716

APPENDIX II 721

APPENDIX III 724

APPENDIX IV 726

APPENDIX V 729

APPENDIX VI 733

APPENDIX VII 757

INTRODUCTION

It is safe to say that in providing for the research and writing of a history of the first twenty years of the Institute for Advanced Study the Director and the Trustees contemplated a synoptic account whose length would more closely parallel the brevity of that period in the long life hopefully anticipated for the institution. There will probably be disappointment in the length of the narrative which follows.

However, as the limited documentary materials were weighed with the numerous interviews undertaken in 1955-1957, and with the occasional published remarks on phases of the Institute's development, it became obvious to the author that the documents and correspondence must be allowed to tell the story, and to establish the facts as to some of the issues which have been heretofore enveloped in mystery or confused in conflict. Inevitably this meant a long record. Hopefully the length may be forgiven in view of the authority with which the documents speak.

With the method established, it became clear that the history would have its best use as an aid in administering the Institute, and in adapting its course to the "changing social needs and conditions" which the Founders contemplated as possibly requiring modification of the principles to which they subscribed. Moreover, the history may be used as the background for a synoptic story of the Institute which may be published.

In many critical passes, documentary information was not available in the Institute's files, or in its minutes. This was partly

due to the fact that since the main actors lived within close range of each other, they came to some important decisions in personal conversations. One must conclude that Dr. Flexner avoided recording officially decisions reached in this way (such as those taken on salary scales and retirement benefits) which went contrary to his hopes, probably in the expectation that he would later succeed in securing reversals if they were not too firmly stated. Beyond that, he revealed his fundamental view when he told the Trustees in April, 1936 that "Institutions like nations are perhaps happiest if they have no history."

The main sources of documentary materials are the early files which, aside from notes taken by Dr. Flexner during his consultations about the new Institute in 1930 and 1931, were rather complete, with some exceptions. Materials taken by Professor Veblen from those files for use in preparing a resumé for Dr. Aydelotte of Dr. Flexner's relations with the Faculty were made available, together with some other correspondence, for the history and are now in the archives. Dr. Aydelotte in course of time had taken some official files to his home, where he evidently did much after-hours work on Institute affairs. These, with much of his correspondence and personal handwritten notes and comments, were called to his attention by Mrs. Elsa Jenkins, his secretary for Rhodes Trust matters, who suggested that they should be in the Institute's files. He readily agreed, and made them available. The files of the School of Mathematics and the School of Economics and Politics had been winnowed to some effect before the research began. The opportunity to read some of Dr. Fulton's diary and correspondence served to give background information on the last six years of the period which

otherwise would have been lacking.

The history serves to tell who conceived the Institute for Advanced Study, and under what circumstances. It also shows that certain features of the plans, such as the admission of postdoctoral workers only as students, were not matters of evolution. Instead, that was established firmly by Dr. Flexner with the Founders' agreement as soon as Dr. Flexner learned that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld were not ready to finance and endow a graduate institution on their return from the West in April, 1930. Then Dr. Flexner determined to follow the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in this distinguishing feature. The history reveals something of the relations between the Institute and the University, which the first Director had held to be so important. Something of the methods by which footsteps in time are erased is also shown, and considerable in the nature of academic politics which operated in the attenuated atmosphere of the higher learning with a power lacking in the usual lay variety studied by the political scientist, as Woodrow Wilson is said to have noted when he left the presidency of Princeton University for the governorship of New Jersey,

It is not the purpose nor within the competence of this secular history to treat of the scholarly contributions to learning made by the Faculty and members. That has been done in the publication in 1955 of the Institute's Bibliography, 1930-1954, which records their works, and contains also the names of Trustees, Faculty and members with their terms through 1954.

Princeton, New Jersey
May 31, 1964

Beatrice M. Stern

CHAPTER I

THE PREHISTORY OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

In the autumn of 1929 two elderly residents of South Orange, New Jersey, were quietly searching for a philanthropy worthy to be endowed with their ample fortunes. Mr. Louis Bamberger, then in his seventy-fourth year, had been left virtually alone at the head of a great retail drygoods business bearing his name by the death of his valued partner and friend, Felix Fuld, husband of his sister, in January 1929. Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld realized that he could no longer carry the burdens of the business, though there were younger men of the family in it. And so they sold it to R. H. Macy and Company of New York. In September, 1929, when the sale was consummated, Mr. Bamberger and his sister turned to a search for the most beneficial use to which their fortunes could be put. They regarded their wealth not only as a just reward for the many years of faithful attention to the exacting business of serving the people of Newark, which they had done with signal success, but also as a trust to be devoted to the welfare of their fellow citizens.

It has been said that during Mr. Fuld's life the three, who were an intimate and close circle, had often talked about the uses of their fortunes, and that Mr. Fuld inclined toward the founding and endowing of a dental school in Newark. But his wife and brother-in-law did not favor that idea. The question was still unresolved at his death. His survivors now felt that they would like to establish and endow a medical school either in Newark or on the Fuld home estate, which

consisted of some thirty acres lying in South and East Orange on the border of Newark. And because they believed that men and women of Jewish origin were discriminated against by existing medical schools in the selection of staff and students, they favored preferential treatment of Jews in both groups.

However, they wanted assurance that such a project was feasible and could be realized with the means they intended to devote to it. They asked Mr. Samuel D. Leidesdorf, their friend of many years and their business adviser, to investigate quietly into the matter. Mr. Leidesdorf was the head of the firm of certified public accountants bearing his name. He associated with himself his friend Mr. Herbert H. Maass, senior partner in the New York law firm of Maass and Davidson. They engaged in a series of confidential consultations, and soon learned that one individual, Dr. Abraham Flexner, was recurrently mentioned as the outstanding authority in medical education. He had recently been connected with the General Education Board, the first of the Rockefeller educational foundations.[1]

One Sunday morning in mid-December Mr. Leidesdorf mentioned his mission to Dr. E. M. Bluestone, Director of Montefiore Hospital, of which Leidesdorf was a Trustee and officer. Again he heard Mr. Flexner's name. He permitted Dr. Bluestone to have made for him an appointment with Dr. Flexner.[2] Accordingly Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass called on Dr. Flexner in offices at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research which he was occupying temporarily through the courtesy of his brother, Dr. Simon Flexner, then Director of the Institute.

It was soon evident that Flexner disapproved of the proposed

medical school. Such a school, he said, should be a graduate school in a strong university, administered by the trustees of the whole institution. It must offer opportunities for training in the medical sciences. It must moreover own or control and operate a good hospital where its clinical staff could devote their full time to teaching at the bedside, to the care of patients, and to research. Newark was too close to New York with its several great medical schools to offer effective competition for staff or students. It possessed neither a university nor an available hospital. If these failings were not enough to dispose of the idea, Flexner said his experience had convinced him that men and women of the Jewish faith or origin were not being discriminated against, and that none but the highest professional standards should ever be applied in selecting the staff and students in any institution of learning. There was no ground for discrimination by other criteria, he maintained.

His claim to knowledge was well-founded. He had written the famous Bulletin No. 4 of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching which appeared in 1910 and set forth his findings after investigation of every medical school in the United States and Canada. He had reported with equal care on medical education in the countries of Western Europe. Still later, he had managed a vast sum of Rockefeller money devoted to improve medical education in this country, and had discharged his responsibilities with shrewd distinction, and substantial effect.

But Dr. Flexner was not one to leave a vacuum. Confronting him were two solid professional men representing clients with, he was given to understand, some thirty million dollars to invest in a socially

productive philanthropy. On his desk were pages of manuscript and galley proof of a book he was writing. "Have you ever dreamed a dream?" he asked, starting to fill the vacuum. His own interests and work had always been in the field of education, and latterly had been concentrated in higher education. He was engaged in writing a book to be entitled Universities: American, English, German, which represented an expansion of three lectures he had delivered at Oxford University in 1928 for the Rhodes Trust Memorial ceremony. Of this the first chapter: The Idea of a Modern University, lay ready at hand. He suggested that no better use of the money could be made in the public interest than through the endowment of such an institution as it described. His visitors, deeply impressed with his vision and his fervor, departed with a copy in hand, promising to read it and to refer it to their principals.[3]

Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld were interested. Promptly they invited their advisers and Dr. Flexner to dine with them in their suite at the Madison Hotel, their customary residence during the concert season. The evening was devoted to a discussion of their plan, and of the idea of a modern university. They recognized in Flexner an authority in medical education which caused them quickly to relinquish their own idea, for it seems that most of the time thereafter was devoted to consideration of various applications of Flexner's Idea. He had much in his favor; he was an able advocate, well informed and convincing. To them he must have been even more than that, with the prestige derived from his connection with the General Education Board, and his well-publicized management of the Rockefeller money for medical education.

Indeed, there seemed to be little difficulty in persuading

them to abandon their intention to benefit preferentially the people of any particular race or religion. When they separated, it was with plans to continue their discussions at lunch on Saturdays at the Biltmore Hotel.

An element of urgency marked their deliberations. Mr. Bamberger and his sister were leaving soon for their winter vacation in Arizona. They wanted to add codicils to their mutually-made wills to provide for the carrying out of whatever plan they decided upon should a fatal illness or accident take either or both of them during the trip. Drafts were prepared for discussion of several plans.

Dr. Flexner left in the files of the Institute for Advanced Study copies of three separate plans, each differing in important respects from the others, and all sequestered in an envelope bearing in his handwriting the legend "Legal Papers. Working Papers, Formation of the Institute."

Judging by these, the first plan to be considered contemplated financial aid to an unnamed institution to effectuate its unrealized plans for a university devoted exclusively to graduate education. The second outlined the establishment of a new university in New Jersey for graduate teaching and research only. The third embodied the basic plan for the Institute for Advanced Study. Presumably after the first was considered and rejected, the second was discussed, amended in certain particulars at the donors' request, and was incorporated in their mutually-made wills at the time. The third resulted from further negotiations in April, after the return of the donors from a vacation in the West.

By the terms of the first, the donors proposed to devote their residual estates to a beneficial purpose in education which would neither

duplicate others in existence in the United States, nor "lie in a field already supplied with funds commensurate with its purpose." (See Appendix I) This would not break new ground, however. Instead, the intent was "to extend the operation of plans already in effect which would enable some institution to carry on to a point not yet achieved in some vital educational function," defined as a "graduate college... limited in the scope and nature of the studies it proposes to teach," and free "from all the impedimenta which now surround graduate schools because of the undergraduate activities connected therewith."

But the donors were not prepared to sacrifice one other preference which was very dear to them. They had great affection for Newark, scene of their business success, which had come to appreciate their quality through the years of their service to it. Therefore, the institution was to be located there or near it, "thereby reflecting <u>in part</u> upon that City...the benefit of the results we seek to bring about." (Emphasis supplied.)

Its teachers were to be men and women of the "highest calibre;" they were to specialize as teachers "in the subjects in which they have achieved unusual proficiency." They would have "unlimited opportunity to continue study and enlarge their knowledge," and would teach only students selected because of "their qualifications and adeptness." The entire atmosphere would be such as to develop "great specialists in particular fields of the arts and sciences."

Curiously, neither standards of admission nor the degrees to be awarded were mentioned, nor was it explicitly said that undergraduate students would not be admitted. Presumably these matters were defined

in the "plans already in effect." No regard was to be given to race or creed in operating the institution. The corporation would be legally organized under the laws of New Jersey "or such State as may be best." Trustees were to be named in the codicils, but the donors might initiate the foundation should they, or one of them, survive.

Two clauses appear at the end, evidently alternatives proposed in discussion. One gave complete latitude to the trustees to select a totally different project to serve a beneficial purpose and to be administered without racial or religious discrimination. The other restricted the freedom of the governing board's choice of location by requiring the establishment of the institution in the vicinity of Newark "upon lands which we may convey or devise to it for that purpose, or failing which, upon such lands as it may acquire," and providing further "that, so far as may be commensurate with the purpose herein set forth, preference be given as students in such school to residents of the City of Newark and the State of New Jersey." There was clearly a conflict as to location.

This draft raises many questions. What were the plans already in effect? The "vital educational purpose not yet achieved?" What institution had adopted such plans, yet lacked the money to effectuate them fully? Could a graduate institution be feasibly established to function primarily or preferentially for the benefit of students of a particular community or State? If so, why might it be desirable to organize it legally in another? Why, if graduate standards were to prevail, was nothing specific said about admissions and degrees? Why was such latitude allowed those to be entrusted with carrying out the

will of the testators?

The draft was obviously the work of a legal mind. Its several alternatives were posed to reflect differing viewpoints offered in the discussions, and demanding resolution. It may be assumed that, since Mr. Maass was the only lawyer present at this stage of proceedings, it was his work. But manifestly it was outside the scope of his competence in substance, and one must look to Dr. Flexner, who was the only one to suggest plans to the donors, for this one, for which he sought help in preparing the proposals since they differed so materially, it appeared, from certain basic demands of Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld.

Light is shed by the knowledge that Flexner had over the past eight years been engaged in a mighty effort to bring about the conversion of the Johns Hopkins University to a graduate university without undergraduate students, faculty or studies. In November, 1922, he had proposed to his colleagues in the General Education Board that Rockefeller money be devoted to this purpose, but without success. (See p. 28). Later he had worked with President Frank J. Goodnow and some of the University's Trustees and faculty members to gain support for the elimination of all undergraduate students, courses, methods of work, and faculty. Dr. Goodnow won the approval of his Trustees to these objectives. In January, 1926, the University's Semicentennial, they had adopted the so-called Goodnow Plan, which the Academic Council summarized as follows in February, 1927:

1. Reorganization of the Faculty of Philosophy in such a way as to attain the following ends:
    A. Admitting to advanced work exceptional students, carefully selected by department heads, on the basis of such preparation as may be obtained ordinarily in two years of collegiate study.

B. Granting only the Doctor's and Master's degrees, on the basis of proficiency and achievement rather than on years of residence or on literal fulfillment of arbitrary academic standards.

C. Creating both for Faculty and students an atmosphere and an environment more congenial to independent study and research.

2. Elimination of the first two years of the college, at the same time that its last two years are merged in the graduate department of the University.[4]

But the plan had not been effectuated; money was lacking, in the first place, and other factors entered in. It was estimated that ten million dollars was needed to capitalize undergraduate fees and to improve the faculty for its new and greater responsibilities. Finally in April, 1930 the Council, feeling that the money was not going to be forthcoming, and "while expressing its loyal support of the Plan," in the words of Mr. P. Stewart Macauley, Provost, recommended confidentially that "until the endowment of the University is such as to enable it to abandon collegiate work, the Faculty of Philosophy [should] be organized in two distinct bodies, the University and the College..."[5]

Men in Baltimore still looked to Abraham Flexner to raise this money, as he had earlier tried to do. Some fully expected that Louis Bamberger, who was born in Baltimore and had spent his early years there, where many of his relatives still lived, would naturally wish to contribute to the University.[6]

But the donors were devoted to New Jersey, not only preferentially, it was to appear, but exclusively. The development in the one draft of the diverse geographical interests posed the question squarely for decision. Undoubtedly the Baltimore plan, which appeared

to be unfinished business for Dr. Flexner, was first in his thinking. His great love was Gilman's Hopkins, the first real American university in the European tradition, which he had attended as a youth.

The next plan was one dated the 20th January, 1930, drafted in Flexner's clear, simple style. It provided for the creation of a new university, to be established in or near Newark, and to be called after the State of New Jersey. (See Appendix II). It would be entirely free from undergraduate activities and teacher-training courses; there would be no professions, at least for the time being. Rather, it would represent graduate study, and research in the arts and sciences.

The draft said for the donors:

> It is our belief that the sum which we shall ultimately provide will be adequate to start and maintain at the highest possible intellectual level an institution devoted to the central cultural and scientific disciplines.

Only the doctorate was to be awarded, and only students qualified to work for it were to be admitted. However, this was obviously its minimal standard, for it continued:

> As conditions in the realm of advanced instruction and research improve, it is our desire that the trustees of this institution advance the ideals of the institution so that it may at all times be distinguished for quality and at no time by considerations of numbers.

The meaning of this somewhat cryptic charge upon the Trustees was to be explained in later documents, but its ambiguity was dispelled only as the Institute for Advanced Study actually prepared to open. No discrimination because of race, religion or sex in admitting students or selecting staff was to be practised. Conditions for the faculty were to be such as to attract:

men of the most distinguished standing because of the freedom and abundance of opportunities which they will enjoy in the prosecution of their own work, and in the selection and training of students, and in the maintenance of the highest possible standards in science and scholarship.

In the interests of promoting cordial and cooperative relations between the trustees and the faculty, the professors were to elect not more than three of their members to serve as trustees.

The trustees might offer financial aid to acceptable students who would otherwise be unable to pursue advanced studies. Acceptance of gifts found to be incompatible with the purposes of the institution was proscribed. Its capital was not to be impaired by expenditures for site, buildings or equipment. Like the first drafts, this one also provided that the donors might initiate the foundation, and contemplated their naming in the codicil the nucleus of a board of trustees.

The plan appears to have been almost wholly acceptable to Mr. Bamberger and his sister; however, they directed Flexner to make certain changes which he considered to be extremely important. These eliminated the provisions for special attractions to scholars and for financial aid to students, together with a paragraph which expressed hope that the buildings would "exercise a beneficial effect on the architectural taste of the community." (This in view of the donors' apparent intention to require that the new institution be located on a part of the thirty-acre Fuld homesite could have been taken as a gratuitous reflection on the Fuld domicile.) Substituted for these provisions was a clause giving the trustees discretion to change the purposes for which the bequests were to be used, providing that no

discrimination was to be practiced.

The amendment of the draft seems to have marked the end of conferences for the time being; the donors evidently departed for Arizona. Dr. Flexner wrote Mr. Maass next day in a confident mood:

> I have just laid my hands on a memorandum prepared seven years ago and containing the comment of President /George E./ Vincent of the Rockefeller Foundation, who like other associates of the Rockefeller boards thoroughly approved of the idea. You will notice that on page 9 I spoke of needing $50 million, but you will also note that I included the faculty of medicine. The sums we are now speaking of will therefore be ample without medicine.
>
> I shall try to get together for you in the next few days a few things which, I believe, you will be interested in reading.[7]

According to his recollection Flexner heard from the donors but once during their absence of two months or more; he answered a picture postcard from Mr. Bamberger on the 8th March in an obvious effort to keep the pot boiling:

> Thank you for the charming card which you sent me, and for your good wishes...
>
> I am working industriously in the hope of finishing my book on universities before the spring. Meanwhile, my wife and I and some friends whom we invited to share the box with us greatly enjoyed the concerts for which we are indebted to Mrs. Fuld.
>
> Under separate cover I am mailing you and Mrs. Fuld a book dealing with higher education, in which you will find (pp. 198-209) a paper by Dean /Gordon J./ Laing of the University of Chicago, which makes almost the same proposal which you and Mrs. Fuld are considering at my suggestion.[8]

Having supported his proposal by reference to so eminent an authority, Flexner perforce rested his case until the donors returned. Meanwhile, he completed Universities, writing his good friend President

Frank Aydelotte of Swarthmore College that the effort had left him "more dead than alive." He planned to have bound page proofs sent by the Oxford Press to some thirty scholars and educators here and abroad for comment and criticism, which he would receive personally during travels he had scheduled for the late spring and early summer. Then he would make his final revisions and send the book to the Press in time for publication in the autumn.[9]

Dr. Flexner carried out those plans. But when he embarked for Europe in mid-May, it was with two objectives instead of one: he was to set his consultants thinking about how best to organize an institute for higher learning in the United States. For in the few weeks between the donors' return and his departure, the plans for the Institute for Advanced Study were developed and adopted. Again Flexner authored the proposals and the substantive statements for the necessary documents. Shortly after he sailed, the "Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation" was incorporated and announced.

But before describing the birth of the Foundation, it would be well to sketch the backgrounds of its accoucheurs. For these were mature individuals of very different backgrounds and experience who were about to dedicate themselves to the realization of a common purpose, novel to each because it would be unique in American education.

Louis Bamberger was born in 1855 to Elkan and Theresa (Hutzler) Bamberger in their flat over Elkan's small dry goods store in Baltimore. Shortly afterward, Elkan sold the store and business to his wife's family, the Hutzlers, whose descendants own and operate the great depart-

ment store of the present day which extends far beyond the original small plot. Louis left school at fourteen to work for his mother's brothers, later joining his father in the jobbing business. But the younger man had an ambition to own and operate his own retail dry goods store, and later still, while he was living in New York as buyer for a San Francisco notions house, he began to study the retail dry goods business, reading everything he could find about it and the men who were successful in it, at the same time conducting his own market survey which led him to conclude that Newark offered good opportunities for a new enterprise.

In 1892, he purchased the stock of a bankrupt firm poetically named Hill and Craig, and set about selling it in a small rented store on West Broadway, then a "blighted" area. He was aided by his sister Carrie and her husband, Louis Frank, and an acquaintance named Felix Fuld, whom he had met in New York. Dr. Florence Bamberger, the donors' niece, has said that Bamberger's other sisters left Baltimore briefly to help with that sale, which they regarded as a lark. It was a success, evidently providing needed capital so that in 1893 the three men were able to open a small retail dry goods store in the same premises with their own stock. They were joined by Carrie Frank who worked as cashier until the business could dispense with her services.

The enterprise prospered steadily. The small store expanded. Mr. Frank died; his widow married Mr. Fuld. The partnership was incorporated in 1917 under the name of L. Bamberger & Company, and the two partners retained all the equity shares except for a few which they allowed several members of Bamberger's family who were employed there

to purchase, retaining the right to repossess them on stipulated terms should they later wish to do so. In 1927 the firm issued $10 million worth of 6½ per cent preferred stock, of which the original partners held $2 million, allowing senior employees to purchase shares on the installment plan. The borrowing financed an expansion of the store to afford more than one million square feet of floor space. With the growth of L. Bamberger and Company the area around it became one of the most prosperous in the city.

Newark had come long since to realize that the community had gained from the hard work and vision of the owners of the great retail business, rated as the fourth largest in the United States. Moreover, the public liked the liberal merchandising policies the partners introduced to Newark. The store returned cash for merchandise purchased and found unsatisfactory by the purchaser for whatever reason. Its public restaurant requested patrons not to tip the waitresses, as they were adequately compensated by the management. L. Bamberger and Company was also known for its liberal policies toward its employees. At the time the business was sold, Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld distributed $1 million amoung their senior helpers.

Mr. Bamberger and the Fulds came to be known as wise and generous contributors to civic programs for the health and welfare of their fellow citizens, as well as for their cultural development. Aside from regular support of community charities, they gave the City a delightful Art Museum and many objets d' art. Mr. Bamberger was a trustee of the New Jersey Historical Association, to which he gave a building. He favored placing it on the town square near the Museum,

but his colleagues preferred another location, and Mr. Bamberger accepted their decision. Time has proved that he was right; the building stands in a declining neighborhood. Mrs. Fuld is credited with bringing to Newark its first chamber music ensemble. She herself worked in some of the local charities, in addition to supporting them financially. Their generosity was not confined to institutional giving; the story is that in periods of financial crisis, Mr. Bamberger was known to offer help quietly and confidentially to worthy people faced with the loss of their homes or businesses for lack of liquid assets. L. Bamberger and Company pioneered in radio broadcasting; Station WOR was established atop the store, owned and operated by a subsidiary corporation of which Edgar S. Bamberger, a nephew, was the first president.[10]

Mr. Bamberger did not marry, and his sister had no children. The three lived together in the Fuld home, built on thirty acres of land lying on Newark's border in South and East Orange. When Mr. Fuld died, he left his interest to his widow and brother-in-law. He had supplied the driving energy and initiative which such a business demands, and Louis Bamberger complemented his talents, acting as does a "governor" on a machine, as his nephew-by-marriage, Mr. Michael Schaap, put it. Fuld's place could not be filled. Some of the younger relatives working for the firm bitterly resented the sale of the business, about which they were not consulted in advance. Mr. Edgar Bamberger was one of these.[11]

Agreement on the terms was reached in the offices of Lehman Brothers, Bankers, late in June, 1929. Mr. Maass, who represented the purchasers, handwrote the terms, which were thereupon signed. Macy's

Board of Directors approved the purchase on the 3rd of July. On the 13th of August the Stock List Committee of the New York Stock Exchange approved the listing of 146,385 additional shares of Macy's common stock, to be capitalized at the book value of L. Bamberger and Company at time of sale. The sellers received 69,210 shares directly, and the cash proceeds from the balance of 77,175 shares which were sold to Macy stockholders through subscription rights at $145 a share. The sale was consummated early in September, about six weeks before the stock market crash of the 29th of October. Macy shares reached a high for 1929 on the 3rd of September at $255.50, and fell to $110 on the 13th of November, but by June, 1932, near the nadir of price averages on the stock exchange for the depression, it sank to $17.[12]

Mr. Bamberger was Chairman of the new Bamberger's, which operated thenceforth as a fully-owned subsidiary of Macy's. He continued to occupy his favorite office on the top floor of the building even after his retirement as Chairman in 1939 in his eighty-fourth year.

Mr. Bamberger was a modest and quiet man. Small in stature, almost shy in manner, he gave an impression which was belied by his shrewd, quick mind and the firmness of his decisions. Apparently few really knew him outside the family. He listened well and kept his own counsel until the time came to act. Then he was very firm. He depended upon two friends and professional associates of long standing. One was Mr. John R. Hardin, the attorney for the business since 1893, and Mr. Bamberger's personal lawyer. The other was Samuel D. Leidesdorf, Bamberger's business adviser, and the auditor of the firm's accounts.

Mr. Hardin was a graduate and an Alumnus Trustee of Princeton

University. For many years he was an active partner in the Newark law firm of Pitney, Hardin and Skinner, becoming inactive in 1924 when he was Selected President of the Mutual Benefit Insurance Company of Newark. His son, Charles, was an active member of the law firm. Hardin senior had held various appointive and elective offices in the State. He was greatly respected for his integrity, his political sagacity, and his welfare and civic activities, in many of which Mr. Bamberger and the Fulds were also interested and active. He became very close to Mr. Bamberger over the years; they enjoyed a great mutual respect and a warm friendship.

Mr. Leidesdorf, whose relationship with the donors was equally close, was a native New Yorker. Born in 1881, he had become his mother's sole support at a very early age. He completed the four-year high school course and passed the State Regent's examinations after studying for nine months at a private school. He became a certified public accountant at nineteen years of age -- the youngest, it was said, ever licensed in the State up to that time. He declined Mr. Bamberger's offer of a permanent position with L. Bamberger and Company as controller, preferring to establish his own firm of certified public accountants, which he did in 1905. However, he sent one of his young men, Mr. Walter Farrier, to be the merchant's confidential assistant; he acted in that capacity until his employer died, then going to Bloomingdale's with Mr. Schaap. S. D. Leidesdorf and Company enjoys with its founder an enviable reputation for rectitude and competence in the business and financial community of New York.

Samuel Leidesdorf is an intelligent, tolerant and generous

man whose warm human qualities, wisdom and integrity have endeared him to the enlightened leaders in New York's business and financial circles. Like Mr. Bamberger, he is gentle in manner, while his actions are firm and decisive. He is known for his sponsorship and support of the highest professional standards within his business fraternity. His leadership in business, philanthropic, religious, charitable and other civic activities is outstanding. His name is as well known in interfaith religious works as in Jewish. In 1959 he received the gold medal award of New York's One Hundred Years Association, with extraordinarily generous expressions of respect and affection from the City's leaders. Mr. Leidesdorf has usually been regarded by the initiated as a great power in the affairs of the new institution which is the concern of these pages. He was to exercise a liberal influence on Mr. Bamberger as the Institute grew and problems of additional financing were raised. But he was also to take positions for the benefit of the Institute with which his old friend and client differed strongly. It was characteristic of the regard in which he was held, even by a querulous and aged Mr. Bamberger, that Leidesdorf continued to enjoy his respect, even though ultimately he was pitted against both Bamberger and Hardin in matters of investment policy.

Mr. Maass took his law degree at twenty-one in 1899, and soon founded his own law firm in New York. His professional, philanthropic and religious activities and interests were less broad than those of Mr. Leidesdorf. His first contact with the business and personal interests of the donors was when he helped in the negotiations with R. H. Macy and Company. Mr. Leidesdorf then brought him into the inquiries

entrusted to him by the donors for their proposed philanthropy, and Maass continued to sit in the councils. He was articulate and shrewd. He and Flexner seemed to understand each other well at their first meetings; and as will be seen later, Flexner marked the lawyer for a very high place in Institute affairs.

What of Abraham Flexner himself, who was to be the intellectual and spiritual father of a new institution in American education? What of his experience, quality and temperament upon which was based a reputation impressive enough to engage the confidence of the two cautious philanthropists in a field to which their own life experience was so foreign? He had prestige; did he have the vision, the knowledge, the strength of purpose, the patience to bring his plans to fruition?

His remarkable career shows three distinct phases; in each a consuming interest in education was dominant. Until his thirty-ninth year, Flexner taught Greek and Latin to high school boys in his native Louisville. The second phase began in 1905 when he closed the school and engaged in graduate study in education for three years, first at Harvard University and then at the University of Berlin. In 1908 he was employed by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching to examine and report upon medical education in the United States and Canada. After two more large investigations, and the production of three notable books, he joined the staff and the Board of Trustees of the General Education Board. For fifteen years (1913-1928) Flexner worked for and with the Board: as Assistant Secretary (1913-1917), as Secretary (1917-1925), and finally as Director of Studies and Medical Education (1925-1928).

The third phase began with the Rodes Trust Memorial Lectures at Oxford in 1928, which led through a series of fortutitous circumstances to his organization and direction of the Institute for Advanced Study (1930-1939).

Abraham Flexner was the sixth of nine children born to Moritz and Esther Flexner, who had migrated to the United States in the middle of the nineteenth century. His father died in 1882, in Abraham's sixteenth year, leaving the eldest son Jacob to assume his responsibilities for the family, which was close-knit and devoted. Jacob selected Abraham to be hostage to the family's future fortunes, sending him to the Johns Hopkins University in 1884 -- its eighth year. Two years later the boy graduated, just under twenty years of age, and began to teach Greek at Boys High School in his native Louisville, tutoring on the side to improve the family's finances. Four years later he opened his own preparatory school, displaying marked success in inducing even recalcitrant young men to want to study, and in preparing them well for the colleges of their choice. The school was highly remunerative. With its income he aided his brothers to prepare for their professional careers. In 1905, free now of these financial responsibilities, he closed the school, and left Louisville with his wife and first child, intending with the zeal of a true reformer to work in national educational administration.[13]

His graduate studies enabled him to enlarge on his considerable knowledge of American colleges and secondary schools, and to compare them with the German systems through first-hand studies and consultation with educators and administrators here and abroad. The comparisons were

adverse to the American institutions and experience, which were in transition and quite foreign to the settled German educational institutions of the empire. As he returned to this country he published a small, bold book entitled The American College, in which he was decidedly critical of the colleges and the preparatory schools. The following is his summary of his conclusions:

> The American college is wisely committed to a broad and flexible scheme of higher education through which each individual may hope to procure the training best calculated to realize maximum effectiveness. The scheme fails for lack of sufficient insight: in the first place, because the preparatory school routine devised by the college suppresses just what the college assumes it will develop: i.e., individual initiative; in the second place, because of the chaotic condition of the college curriculum; finally, because research has largely appropriated the resources of the college, substituting the methods and interests of highly specialized investigation for the larger objects of college teaching.
>
> The way out lies, as I see it, through the vigorous reassertion of the priority of the college such...The B.A. and not the Ph. D. is, and always has been, the college man. The college has been richly endowed...The graduate school is a late development: a proper beneficiary of the college surplus, if such there be, not the legitimate appropriator of the lion's share of its revenues.
>
> I mean neither to depreciate nor to disparage graduate work; to the extent of advocating a more exclusive treatment of its privileges, a more thorough fitness for its opportunities, I am doing just the reverse. But I insist that rapidly won distinction as research centers is no compensation for college failure. The diversion of college resources to graduate uses is defensible on the theory that college work is antiquated or superfluous, but this plea can hardly be urged at a time when the graduate schools themselves suffer from ... slighted college work.[14]

At this stage of his career Flexner was much concerned with the pedagogical aspects of secondary schools and colleges. He defended the elective system as being "catholic and democratic" as against the

dominant classical tradition of the colleges of Colonial days and the early Republic. But he criticized bitterly the administration of the system, for most of the colleges and universities failed to guide the student in the choice of electives to help him toward his chosen career, and failed also to require the secondary schools to do what was necessary in the same regard. He earned the hostility of the classicists, who had so long imposed their tastes, interests and caste upon American education, and for a long time was forced to defend vigorously his position in favor of modern languages and literature, modern mathematics and science.

These first years of his career witnessed a tremendous change in the American educational scene whose significance he was one of the first to recognize and seek to guide. The Johns Hopkins was the first American institution established primarily for graduate education. It met a great need, and was well attended in those early days by men wanting advanced study who before had been forced to seek it in Europe, unless there happened to be a Gibbs or a Peirce to work with. Within fifteen years three other universities were founded with the intent to emphasize graduate studies.[15] In those years and beyond them, many American colleges of colonial and early Republic years added graduate divisions, and called themselves universities. Confusion reigned; so diverse were their accomplishments, so varied their standards of admission and performance, that the Presidents of five of the greatest universities met in 1900 to form the Association of American Universities, which imposed standards for admission to it which gave some assurance of substantial and meritorious graduate studies in sufficiently large

groups of subjects to warrant recognition.[16]

President Daniel Coit Gilman of the Hopkins had first established departments by disciplines, so that each might be autonomous and free from interference from the others. But there was no graduate and undergraduate divisions; the same faculty taught throughout. Nor was there a dean of the graduate school. Research thrived, becoming ever narrower and deeper in the interests of advancing discovery. At the same time teaching, which even in the colleges had not succeeded in establishing itself as a profession before the Civil War, but was regarded generally as a stop-gap toward more lucrative and worthwhile endeavor, was becoming professionalized, and as it did, the "rapidly won distinction" of creditable researches became the touchstone to success in getting a teaching berth in the colleges. The result was further fragmentation of knowledge, the burgeoning of electives which enhanced the tendency toward it, and the failure of the colleges to preserve their function as places of general education to prepare the citizen for leadership, the aspirant for a profession for graduate study, and the young scholar for advanced study and researches in the arts and sciences. Moreover, disciplines, representing arbitrary divisions in knowledge, were being taught so that natural relations between them were obscured, as were the means by which they buttress each other.

The position which Flexner got on his return from Europe was quite different from his expectations. He called on Dr. Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, and was asked to undertake a survey of medical education in

the United States and Canada. He accepted, and prepared for it by studying the best of the American schools -- the School of Medicine at the Hopkins. With the help of Dr. Wm. Henry Welch and his colleagues, and of his brother, Dr. Simon Flexner, then Director of Laboratories of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, he developed a series of effective but crude criteria as the basis for his personal investigation of each of the one hundred fifty-five medical schools. His report was published in 1910 as Bulletin No. 4 of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching. So important was it and is it even today that it was only recently reproduced. Of all the one hundred forty-seven American schools about a half-dozen had proper standards of admission and teaching; licensing standards of the States, poor enough anyway, were largely honored in the breach. The facts were irrefutable; a "public revulsion" swept through the country. Many of the schools employed only the didactic method; few had either laboratories or libraries; courses of lectures were short, and, delivered as they were by busy practicing physicians who used the schools as sources for supplementary income, inadequate. Few required even a high school education for admission; few previous study in medical and pre-medical science courses. Flexner became nationally known overnight. He was then sent to survey the same field in Western Europe, reporting in Bulletin No. 6 of the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching. Thereafter he conducted another survey in Europe for Mr. J. D. Rockefeller, Jr. Then in 1913, after eight years of temporary ad hoc assignments, the former schoolteacher from Louisville joined Dr. Wallace Buttrick, Secretary of the General Education Board, as Assistant Secretary, and the Board itself in 1914.[17]

There his most notable achievement was the management during the next fifteen years of nearly $50 million of special funds given by John D. Rockefeller, Sr., to aid the development of medical education. He was supported and guided throughout by the excellent advice and statesmanship of his brother and that other great pathologist, Dr. Welch. Most of the funds went for matched grants under contract with medical schools to capitalize the salaries of full-time clinicians as teachers, researchers and practitioners in charge of patients in the schools' hospitals. The full-time program had been initiated in the Hopkins School in 1913 for the first time in America, thus completing a start made by Dr. Welch in 1907 and renewed in 1911 as between Dr. Welch and Mr. Frederick Gates, philanthropic and business adviser to Mr. Rockefeller, Sr.[18] The American Medical Association, which had also fostered reforms in medical education, first approved of it heartily, but then, after hearing from the home consituency, opposed it bitterly.

The General Education Board, in part yielding to these pressures, exerted widely through the press, and in part because the Rockefeller foundations wished always to be above any hint of dictation in dispensing their patronage, modified some of those contracts where the schools wished it done, much against Flexner's will.[19] This was the first of several severe defeats suffered by the active and able Secretary of the Board. But the nearly $50 million given by Mr. Rockefeller, expended as it was in matched grants shrewdly administered throughout the East, the South and the Mid-West, in such a way as to stimulate similar improvements in areas not helped, resulted in a total

expenditure of something like $500 to $600 million to aid medical education. At the end of the movement, American medical education and medical science stood favorably in comparison with the best in Western Europe.[20]

Meanwhile the General Education Board and the Foundation spent other money on medical education and public health and hygiene. The concentration irked some of the younger men at the Foundation who were particularly anxious to aid development in the social sciences. Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick expressed this feeling thus:

> ...by 1920 the Foundation had to all intents and purposes been captured by the doctors, and while some grants were made in the following years for biology and cultural anthropology, the doors, although still ajar, were for the time being closed against practically everything except public health and medical education.[21]

Of Flexner's work in this field Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., wrote him as follows as Flexner prepared to retire from the Board:

> You have fully and many times over justified our highest hopes of what you could do for the cause of education in association with the Board. I think it would be hard to overestimate the contribution which you have made to the development of education generally in the United States and especially to the establishment of a high, strong foundation of medical education. In the fifteen years of your relationship to the General Education Board, because of the splendid background of knowledge which you brought with you and your highly trained mind, you have been able to accomplish what another could not have done in twice the time, if at all. No finer piece of constructive work has been done in any of our philantropic boards than the work which you have done.[22]

If Flexner's interests had been mainly confined to pedagogical matters earlier, his work with medical education and the stress it laid on strong graduate schools gradually caused a shift in his emphasis.

No longer would he have held that graduate work was entitled only to the surplus "if any there be" of the colleges. But he was still a severe critic of the colleges and the secondary schools, which he now classed together as "secondary" in the task of preparing students for real work at the graduate level. He joined Dean Gale of the University of Chicago in his lament that teaching responsibilities and "parental" care of graduate students laid an intolerable burden on the graduate faculty, which threatened to drive the productive man from the universities, where they belonged, to research institutes, where they could spend all their time in research.

So impressed did Flexner become that in 1922 he proposed that the General Education Board establish a real American university, since none existed in the United States because the Hopkins and the University of Chicago had yielded to the pressures of undergraduate education to an extent which stultified the graduate school.[23] Such an institution, Flexner said, might be created de novo, with only a medical school in the professors, at a cost of some $50 million, which would give it a plant and serve for its initial endowment. (See p. 12) Or the institution might be created by "suppressing" the undergraduate division of one of the two great universities created primarily for graduate work -- the University of Chicago or the Hopkins. Though he conceded it would cost more to convert the Hopkins because of its smaller endowment, he favored it, since it had not succumbed to the diversions of undergraduate life to such an extent as had Chicago. He dismissed the possibility of converting any of the universities which had superimposed the graduate school on the old college, on the ground that:

> in dominating spirit and interest they are mainly colleges still...As at Oxford and Cambridge, so at all our American universities, some advanced teaching and...work are carried on. /But/ nowhere have we assembled a homogeneous faculty of productive scientists and scholars with a homogeneous student body of mature, independent, and self-responsible workers...The two conceptions -- college and university -- are at cross purposes. Science and scholarship suffer; money is wasted; even undergraduate training is, under these conditions, less efficient than it might be...[24]

Would research institutes, relatively new in this country, meet the problem? He concluded they would not, though some scholars and scientists -- mainly the latter -- were taking refuge in them. He continued:

> But research institutions, valuable and necessary as they are, cannot alone remedy the difficulty -- first, because relatively few men are most happy and effective if their entire energies are concentrated solely upon research; second, because the number of young men who can be trained in research institutions is necessarily limited...Research institutions cannot...take the place of universities where men receive higher training...

Having suggested alternatives, he concluded:

> Decision...is not important, or even desirable, at this stage. It is, however, important to realize the confused, not to say, chaotic condition of higher education in America. Curious as it may sound, this is an encouraging, not a discouraging, situation. We have, as a matter of fact, made great progress; that is why we can accomplish something that neither Pres. Gilman nor Pres. Harper thought feasible. Our problem is one...that arises out of progress; it is not ...due to stagnation or retrogression. It is...a hopeful phenomenon that secondary and collegiate education are so widely diffused, and eminent scholars and scientists so numerous that the country is ready for the next forward step --a university which needs no feeding /undergraduate/ school of its own, because the country abounds in colleges by which it will be fed.
>
> If a university so conceived were established, it would... in all probability stimulate other institutions to reorganize. Some of them in time might drop the college; others might effect a complete differentiation between college and gradu-

> ate schools; still others might confine themselves to college work, on a more modest basis than is feasible as long as college and university aims are mingled. Higher education in the United States needs the new stimulus, the new ideal, which a genuine university would supply.[25]

Several of his colleagues agreed with his proposal; Dr. George E. Vincent, a General Education Board Trustee and President of the Rockefeller Foundation, wrote him:

> This is an admirable analysis. I should like to talk with you about the plan. I am not wholly convinced that the undergraduate department of the University of Chicago might not be gradually discontinued. It is the only institution young enough to permit such a major operation. A number of interesting possibilities occur to me which it would be interesting for me to talk to you about.[26]

The conversation had a result; the Board appropriated some $2 million to help the University of Chicago to divest itself from the first two undergraduate years, and sent its Co-Secretary, Mr. Trevor Arnett, an expert in university finance, to help Chicago's new, young, and promising President Ernest Burton. But Burton died in 1925, and with him died the hope of doing anything until Robert Hutchins became President in 1929.

Meanwhile Flexner worked on his own to bring about the suggested change in the Hopkins. The Goodnow Plan, previously mentioned(See p. 8) was an evidence of his support and interest. Indeed, four months before the Hopkins Trustees approved it, an article by Flexner appeared in the Atlantic Monthly supporting the idea of a "real university," describing the American university as "an educational department store with a kindergarten at one end and Nobel prize winners, or their equivalent, at the other."[27] Universities with endowments of $30 million or more were, he said, seven things: colleges for high school students, advanced schools

for college graduates, research institutions, professional schools, extension schools, correspondence or radio schools, and athletic and social institutions. He mentioned the plan the Hopkins Trustees were considering then; it contemplated continuing to award the bachelor's degree, and the admission of students to the last two years of undergraduate classes. If these undergraduates were to be admitted, Flexner urged, their classes should be "telescoped" into the graduate school, and only graduate degrees awarded. The Hopkins Trustees adopted his suggestion, thus making it possible to shorten the formal routine American education by two years.

Here the author voiced some misgivings: would students leave institutions where they had taken their undergraduate work for advanced study in such an institution? He answered that graduates from the eastern colleges went to the California Institute of Technology at Pasadena, attracted by its small but excellent faculty. Would the public support such an institution? Generally it was assumed that support came only to institutions identified with communities. He answered his own question cautiously:

> Men, money and facilities do not come together in such ways as to make it possible to have a nicely rounded institution at the higher level. No single acience would be completely represented anywhere; still less, all sciences; and institutions more concerned with science would almost inevitably be less adequately developed on the humanistic side -- and vice versa. This has always been the case in Germany, where these things have, on the whole, been hitherto best managed. Nor does it greatly matter; the very incompleteness of single institutions will force all real universities in the higher sense to view themselves as part of one great whole.[28]

Any hope that the General Education Board might help the Hopkins raise the $10 millions it needed to effectuate the Goodnow Plan

must have vanished when the Board announced in its Annual Report for 1924-1925 that it was abandoning its policy of giving grants to institutions "as wholes."[29] Even so, Abraham Flexner continued to hope he could raise the money. But administrative changes occurred within the University. President Goodnow became ill shortly after his plan was adopted, and asked to be retired. The Trustees deferred action on his request, appointing Dr. Joseph Ames, a physicist and former classmate of Flexner's, as Acting President in January, 1928. Ames was hostile to the Goodnow Plan, as was also Dr. Florence Bamberger, a niece of Louis Bamberger, who was made Dean of the Hopkins undergraduate college of education during his administration. Ames was appointed President on the 3rd of June, 1929, to serve until he was retired for age in 1935. Dr. Bamberger made no secret of her hope that her wealthy uncle and aunt would contribute to the endowment of her college, but they failed to do so.[30] The historian of the Hopkins made only a short, acidulous reference to the Goodnow Plan:

> The faculty was inclined to suspect that he /Goodnow/ had confidential information about prospective large gifts, assuming that he would not otherwise have ventured so drastic a recommendation, but no large gifts were forthcoming.[31]

During his early years with the General Education Board Flexner had enjoyed the confidence and support of his colleagues, and a particularly warm and rewarding friendship with the relaxed, shrewd and genial Dr. Buttrick. To Abe Flexner, brilliant, imaginative, intense, indefatigable, Buttrick's quality of ease and quiet assured power were precious. The two men complemented each other in almost every way, and each realized the value of the other's talents and

quality to himself. It was a sustaining and fruitful relationship. But Dr. Buttrick retired in 1923, and a new and quite different man, Dr. Wickliffe Rose, took his place, just as the younger men in the Foundation decided that basic changes must be made in the modus operandi. Flexner's problems multiplied. He found himself increasingly alone. He had no accord with the new officers. He was not one to hide his displeasure over new ways of handling foundation work. Thus in 1924 he delivered a paper at a conference of Rockefeller foundations staff members, in which he frankly admitted that he himself and other named officers had not been trained to do the kind of thing for which they were really responsible in foundation work. He asked for two new staff members who would be prepared as experts to handle programs in the humanities, music, etc. He spoke strongly against project financing, and urged instead the development and adequate support of "germinal ideas:"

> Progress [in foundation activities] depends in the first instance on neither money or machinery, but on ideas -- or more accurately, on men with ideas...By way of recognizing the one really vital factor which is quite independent of foundations, let me emphasize, in the first place, the overwhelming importance of ideas -- 'germinal ideas,' as Dr. Buttrick says -- fundamental ideas. One must draw a sharp distinction between ideas that, if brought to realization, bring about far-reaching changes in course of time, and projects, which are suggested by needs and lacks that are on the surface. It is with ideas rather than projects that foundations must concern themselves, and ideas cannot be advanced unless the right persons can be found.[32]

His passionate conviction that the old ways of the General Education Board were best did not impress his newer colleagues. Nor did they welcome having their fitness for their positions questioned, even if the critic included himself among those he suspected of inade-

quacy. He was near the end of the special earmarked funds for medical education. He was very doubtful that the University of Chicago was going to bring his other idea to a successful end. He was now neither officer or Trustee of the Board; he was Director of Medical Education and Studies. Toward the end of 1927 Flexner was asked to deliver the Rhodes Trust Memorial Lectures at Oxford the following May, on a subject of his own choice. For this he was to thank Dr. Frank Aydelotte, who was also American Secretary of the Trust. Flexner chose universities as his subject.

The Lectures were delivered on the 5th, the 12th and the 19th of May. In the first he expounded his Idea of a Modern University. In the second he discussed American universities, sparing neither criticism nor ridicule in describing the multiple conflicting purposes of some of the most important institutions, giving devastating examples of such things as strictly vocational and trade school activities for which credit was given toward graduate degrees. In the third lecture he examined and criticized English universities, without approval, but also without ridicule, and the German institutions, for which he had great respect, particularly as they had existed prior to the Revolution of 1919 when the "tidiness" due to class distinctions had given way.

The lectures attracted much attention in the United States -- particularly the press reports of the second one. One may imagine the quiet but deadly storm of protest from the heads of the great universities which beat upon the Trustees of the General Education Board, even though Flexner did not identify them by name. On the 24th of May the Board's Secretary announced publicly Dr. Flexner's "voluntary retire-

ment," without explanation. Dr. Flexner at Oxford ascribed his retirement to a pending reorganization of the four Rockefeller foundations for education, saying that Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., had offered him a position equal in dignity and responsibility in the new establishment, but that he had declined, with the observation that those responsible for making the new organization function would do better if he were not there.[33] The press, especially the Times, suspected that Flexner had been disciplined for speaking his mind frankly. But again the Secretary spoke, attributing the retirement to the exhaustion of the special funds for medical education, and alluding to Flexner's age; at sixty-two he was within three years of compulsory retirement.[34] As the press took off on the new scent, the reorganization, the Times editorialized on Flexner's contributions with rare praise:

> Nearly twenty years ago, (1910), there appeared a report which is recognized as one of the paramount influences of that period of reform in medical education. It was made for the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching by Dr. Abraham Flexner, and it dealt fearlessly, trenchantly and discerningly with the standards, methods and personnel of the existing American medical schools, 'mercilessly castigating' all that was sordid and unwholesome, and holding up to view the ideals toward which they should aspire. This knight errant, whose lance was at the command of those ideals, was anathematized by some who suffered from his criticisms, but, as Dr. Llewellyn F. Barker said in his recently published book on The Young Men and Medicine, 'it is now generally recognized that the thorough ventilation of the subject by the report was most timely, and that Mr. Flexner's investigations and recommendations were weighty contributions to the progress of educational reform.'
>
> This report was, however, but the preface to a chapter of effort to put into effect the recommendations made on paper. Dr. Flexner has had the advantage of having at his hand the funds with which to realize some at least of his ideals or to test their validity.

> These are but illustrations of the progress that has been made since he wrote the stirring report which looked toward improved medical education. But his knight-errantry has not been confined to the field of medical education. He has tilted not only against diploma mills but also against the opium traffic. He has dared to say what he thinks about the movies, motors and jazz. He has spoken out plainly about education in high places -- attacking certain traditional methods and disciplines, but condemning also the introduction of new courses wholly devoid of educational values just for the sake of adding to numbers or gratifying a vulgar demand. He has had the temerity even to raise the question whether we Americans really value education in spite of the amount we spend for it. He has a bright record of achievement to his credit, and though he has approached the time of official retirement, it is to be hoped that there will be an epilogue, for he is a wholesome challenging force in the world.[35]

It would appear that the timing of the Secretary's announcement, rather than the fact of Flexner's earlier resignation, was in question. Judging by the letter written him by Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., on the 9th of April, just two days before Flexner sailed to England to prepare for the lectures, he had given notice of his retirement, to be effective on the 30th of June.[36] But the suspicion persisted that he had been relieved of his position for ridiculing the practices of some of the best American universities. However, when he had left, the General Education Board's Annual Report took this notice of his departure:

> "His services in the cause of education and especially medical education, a field in which his training and experience made him eminent, were invaluable. During the fifteen years in which he was an officer of the Board he devoted himself with keen intelligence and untiring energy to its tasks. His clear insight, his wide and accurate knowledge and his ardent imagination have been most stimulating and constructive."[37]

As has been said before, Flexner spent the next two years studying further, and amplifying his lectures for publication by the Oxford Press. Universities was published in the United States in

November, 1930, creating anew the stir of 1928 for, in Flexner's words, he gave "full credit for all that was good" in American universities, but

> I riddled with facts, sarcasm, and documents the outright and shameless humbuggery that was proving profitable at teachers' colleges; in home-study courses at Columbia, Chicago, and even my own beloved Johns Hopkins; in correspondence courses competing with work on the campus; and in the absurd topics for which the Ph. D. degree was given.[38]

But he also courageously revealed his plan for the "society of scholars" which he conceived the real university to be. No brief of the plan is feasible here, but it must be said that he emphasized the importance of developing the social sciences, which were not exploited in the German and English universities, and for which he urged consideration of new methods of research and study here. He suggested the empirical methods used so successfully in the natural sciences, and urged the testing of hypotheses and generalizations, which a special committee of the Rockefeller Foundation still found lamentably wanting in a survey conducted in 1934. Moreover, he felt there was little need to emphasize future development in the natural sciences; they were doing very well and would continue to do so. The other great branch of knowledge, the humanities, he said required much greater attention than it had so far received. Foreign languages, dead and live, mediaeval and modern art, music, literature, history -- these subjects nourished values by which men live; they could also "be scientific," he believed.

He pleaded for "creative activity, productive and critical inquiry," in the modern university: for minds which could specialize, as was necessary for research, and also "minds which can both specialize

and generalize." For, he said,

> The philosophical intelligence must be at work, trying new patterns, trying, however vainly, to see things in the large...And this process should go on in the university more effectively than anywhere else, just because the university is the active center of investigation and reflection, and because it brings together within its framework every type of fundamental intelligence.[39]

Flexner was not sure he could persuade Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld to make possible such an institution. But he hoped that he could set up any plan they would accept in such a way that capital other than theirs might be attracted to finance a really significant departure from the pragmatic values common in most American institutions of higher learning.

The challenge offered by their attentive interest in his proposal was inspiring. Just as the Louisville schoolteacher of the turn of the century gave little promise of the bold, imaginative and constructive executive of the middle years, so now those qualities, strong as they undoubtedly were under the stimulus of his recent defeats, and the general protestations in self-justification from the universities, would necessarily be subserved to accomplish a task requiring more patience and even greater persuasions, if he succeeded in arousing again their interest when they returned. For it seemed clear that the accord reached in January was concededly subject to review should they return safely.

Flexner was a man of great energy and strong convictions, animated by high ideals. Eagerly he sought an opportunity tc start afresh at sixty-two with a new enterprise in a new setting, when most men are more or less secure at the end of their careers in surroundings and with

reasonable certainties they have learned and feel they have earned. This man was high-strung and impatient, inflexible in his standards. He had shown himself to prefer defeat to compromise in matters of high principle. Here was a possible chance to crown his career in education. Hopefully it would be given him to do. Would he be equal to it?

CHAPTER I - NOTES

The source of all citations and references to correspondence and documents is the files of the Institute for Advanced Study, unless otherwise specified in the individual note.

1. Interview with Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass. Leidesdorf to Hardin, 8/8/44. Hardin papers.

2. See E. M. Bluestone to Flexner, copy, 10/2/56. This put the time of his conference with Leidesdorf at December 19, 1929, a Sunday. The date fell instead on Thursday.

3. Statement made by Maass at luncheon commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Institute.

4. P. Stewart Macauley to author, 11/28/56, with copy of the Resolution of the Academic Council, February, 1927, and the recommendations of the Academic Council, April, 1930.

5. Ibid.

6. Interview with Arthur O. Lovejoy. Conversation with Alfred Hutzler.

7. Flexner to Maass, 1/21/30.

8. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/8/30. See Gordon J. Laing, Standards of Graduate Work, in Problems in Education, Western Reserve University Press, 1927, pp. 198-209. Laing, Dean of the Graduate School at University of Chicago, urged the removal of the first two years of the college to a junior college, and advocated separation of the last two undergraduate years from the graduate school. This would, he hoped, help to cancel from the University "the infection of lesson-learning." The American system of education placed an intolerable burden on the faculty of a university, whose members should be required to teach no more than one hour a day, if that. He feared lest research men leave the universities, where in his judgment they belonged, to become sequestered in research institutes.
The Dean was very critical of graduate work in this country. Despite the efforts of the A.A.U., the master's degree was little more than "a gild-edged teacher's certificate," and though better results were observable with the doctorate, the scholarship of those who won that degree was very uneven.
Laing had just attended the Semicentennial of the Hopkins. He commented on the Goodnow Plan, which he likened to the systems in Germany and France, where the graduates of the gymnasium and the lycée enter the university with preparation equivalent to that of the

third-year college student in this country. When and if the money appeared to put the Plan in operation, "there would be at least one real university in America," he wrote.

9. Flexner to Aydelotte, 4/9/30. See Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German. The Oxford Press, 1930, p. vii.

10. Interview with Mrs. Barnett Warner.

11. Interview with Walter Farrier.

12. Moody's.

13. Abraham Flexner, An Autobiography, Simon and Schuster, 1960, pp. 3-62, passim.

14. Abraham Flexner, The American College, Century Co., 1908, pp. 215-217.

15. The Hopkins opened in 1876. The University of Chicago was founded in 1890, and Clark University and Catholic University in Worcester, Mass., and Washington, D.C., respectively, were founded in 1887. The last two were founded for graduate work exclusively, but both later added undergraduate departments. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., founder of Chicago, and Frederick Gates, who persuaded him to this first of his many educational philanthropies, wanted the University of Chicago to be a college. But according to Chicago's historian, Thos. W. Goodspeed, its first President, Wm. Rainey Harper, was primarily interested in promoting investigation, and secondarily in teaching. (Thos. W. Goodspeed, A History of the University of Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1916, pp. 144-145.)

16. The Presidents of the Universities of California, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard and Johns Hopkins formed the A.A.U., which, curiously enough, Dr. Flexner never mentions in any of his books, though in the absence of any federal standards in graduate or other education, it was the single semi-official agency considered as authoritative within its orbit both here and abroad.
An idea of the burgeoning of educational institutions with some pretensions, was given by Dr. Wallace Buttrick's finding on investigation in 1902 for the General Education Board that there were then over 700 institutions in the United States, exclusive of technical and theological schools, which called themselves colleges and universities. Ohio for instance, with a population of 5 million, had 40, twice as many as the German Empire with its 65 million people. (Abraham Flexner, Funds and Foundations, Harper & Bros., 1952, p. 47.)

17. An Autobiography, Chapters 6 to 13.

18. Simon Flexner and James Flower Flexner, William Henry Welch and the Heroic Age of American Medicine, Viking Press, 1941, pp. 309 ff. This account reveals that when Dr. Welch sought to persuade Mr. Gates to finance the capitalization of full-time services of clinicians for the Hopkins, Gates pleaded fatigue, and said he could not go forward with the plan, in which he was much interested. Abraham Flexner was then "borrowed" from the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, and carried the negotiations to a successful conclusion in 1913. This account is more detailed than that given by Abraham Flexner in his Autobiography. (See pp. 109 ff.)

19. Raymond B. Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, pp. 93-103. Mr. Fosdick precedes his account of the intramural differences here with a description of Flexner as having "that keen, razorlike mind that characterized that remarkable family. The boldness of his thinking, and the tenacity of his opinions frequently created antagonism, but he had an intellectual energy and drive that were to have profound consequences on contemporary medicine." (pp. 93-94.)
Then Fosdick quotes Dr. Alan Gregg, later Director of Medical Education at the Rockefeller Foundation, as praising that influence in contemporary and future medicine. (p. 103)
An Autobiography, p. 115.

20. Funds and Foundations, p. 56.

21. Fosdick, op. cit., p. 193.

22. An Autobiography, pp. 223-224, quoting a letter to him from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., dated the 9th of April, 1928.

23. Abraham Flexner, A Proposal to Establish an American University. Memorandum, November, 1922. Flexner papers.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid.

26. George E. Vincent to Flexner, 11/22/22. Aydelotte papers.

27. Abraham Flexner, The American University, in Atlantic Monthly for October, 1925, Vol. 136: 530-541.

28. Ibid.

29. General Education Board, Annual Report, 1924-1925, pp. 5-6.

30. Interview with Dr. Florence Bamberger. Macauley to author, 11/28/56.

31. John C. French, A History of the University Founded by Johns Hopkins, the Johns Hopkins Press, p. 195.

32. Abraham Flexner, Memorandum, Foundations -- Ours and Others, 1/3/24. Flexner papers.

33. New York Times, 5/26/28.

34. Ibid., 5/28/28/

35. Ibid.

36. See Simon and J. F. Flexner, op. cit., p. 432.

37. General Education Board, Annual Report, 1928-1929,

38. An Autobiography, pp. 230-231.

39. Universities, pp. 23-24.

CHAPTER II

THE LOUIS BAMBERGER AND MRS. FELIX FULD FOUNDATION

Dr. Flexner apparently lost no time in resuming conversations with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld when they returned to the East, probably early in April, refreshed and rested. For as he finished his manuscript of Universities, that work which really had its beginnings in 1922, Flexner could not refrain from thinking how glorious it would be to have publication of the book related in time to the announcement that a new institution of higher learning was being established in the United States.

What happened seemed to indicate that the donors, alive and well after the journey home, were less inclined to initiate the university. Any such reluctance could certainly be excused by a look at the economy, which was settling into a state of paralysis. True, their fortunes were now liquid, but the wise investment of some $11 million which they had received in cash, and their probable reinvestment of the amount involved in nearly 70,000 shares of Macy common -- for Mr. Bamberger was a conservative investor -- was a serious problem when markets in stocks and bonds were well started on their long decline without an end in sight. Moreover, they might be forgiven if they took a less serious view of the necessity to inaugurate a new type of American university. For if they had been able to read the proofsheets of Flexner's chapter on American institutions, they would have found one hundred seventy-seven printed pages of facts and highly critical comment about the curricula and the administration, and the waste of money, effort and

men with which he charged a few Eastern and mid-Western universities -- all with the general admission that the strides made by graduate education in the last fifty-five years since Gilman had introduced it in the United States had really been phenomenal.

It was not until the 23rd of April that Flexner prepared the first draft document of this second period of negotiation. The creation of a university was no longer being considered; the donors had made clear that they were willing to give a modest first contribution. The sum was $5 million. That Gilman had launched the Johns Hopkins on a bequest of $3.5 million Flexner knew, but he also was aware that each of Gilman's dollars in 1876 was worth five of his in 1930. Moreover, he knew well how rigorously economical Gilman had been, even though he faced much less luxuriously branched fields of knowledge than Flexner did.

But the educator also understood how the persuasions of necessity acted when pride was involved in a philanthropic venture. The senior Rockefeller, for instance, had been persuaded by Mr. Gates to give $600,000 to help found the University of Chicago in 1890, and had done so with the belief that this was his first and last gift for the purpose. But Mr. Rockefeller was named the founder of the University of Chicago, and twenty years later, he had been led, complaining bitterly the while, to invest some $34 million in the University.[1] So might it be with Mr. Bamberger.

The third "working paper" preserved by Dr. Flexner was a copy of the draft of the 20th of January as it had been amended, with many further emendations made by pencil in Flexner's handwriting in which

the date, the 23rd of April, was also inscribed. The scissors were liberally used. The resulting draft was copied and sent or handed to Mr. Bamberger, who on the 24th of April sent a copy to Mr. Hardin with the request that he meet the writer and Dr. Flexner on the following Monday, the 28th of April. In form the draft was no longer a codicil; instead, it was a letter to trustees from the founders of a new institution. (See Appendix III) The preamble stated their intention to establish an Institute of Higher Learning or Advanced Studies, "to the endowment of which we propose...ultimately to devote our residual estates, to be situated in the State of New Jersey." No reference was made to Newark, or to naming the institution after the State.

The word "university" was conspicuously absent. No definition of the scope of the institution was given, except that there were to be no undergraduate activities, no professional schools for the present, and no teacher-training courses. Only the doctorate or its equivalent was to be awarded, and the trustees were still admonished "to advance the ideals" of the institution as before. Requirement of the collegiate degree for admission might be relaxed in exceptional cases in the discretion of the faculty and the trustees. Certain members of the faculty might "ultimately be chosen" to be trustees. No mention was made of their election by the faculty, or of special conditions to attract outstanding scholars to the faculty, or of financial aid to worthy students. Latitude for changes in details only was left to the Board.

This was a barren statement, seemingly reflecting all that remained by way of commitment on Mr. Bamberger's part after he consented to move. It was characteristic of Flexner that he would accept such condi-

tions in the hope that better days would see braver deeds. By the time the three men met to confer, Flexner was prepared to clothe the bare bones with flesh. He had made the transition in his own mind from a small university to a special kind of institute in which the expansion of knowledge through the researches of a small, distinguished faculty would proceed hand-in-hand with the guidance of well-prepared students in advanced studies. One can almost see the point of change as it is reflected in Universities. He had lavished much thought on his Idea of a Modern University, advocating a true society of scholars, both students and arrivées, working under the simplest conditions for the glory of discovery. In discussing American universities he had patiently exposed all the conditions which, in his opinion, operated in them to defeat the efforts of devoted scholars and scientists to research and investigate and to train advanced students. Then quite suddenly, at the end of one hundred seventy-five pages of detailed and sometimes picturesque examples of the obstacles in the path of the universities, the author appeared abruptly to lose hope:

> I have said that almost anything can be accomplished in America if intelligence, effort, and resources are combined; that is just what we so rarely bring about. We have intelligence alone -- and it is stalled; effort alone -- and we are jumpy, feverish, aimless; resources alone -- and we are wasteful. No sound or consistent philosophy, thesis, or principle lies beneath the American University today.
>
> What with the pressure of numbers, the craving for knowledge, real or diluted, the lack of any general respect for intellectual standards, the intrusion of politics here and of religion somewhere else, the absurd notion that ideals are 'aristocratic,' while a free-for-all scramble which distresses the able and intelligent is 'democratic,' there is no possibility of a summary solution of the problem of higher education in America -- or, for the matter of

> that, of education at any level; we lack teachers, facilities, standards, comprehension and the willingness to accept differences. In the hurly-burly which exists, excellent work will go on...scholars and scientists...have never been defeated -- not by war or poverty or persecution, and they will not be defeated...
>
> It has, however, become a question whether the term 'university' can be saved or is even worth saving. Why should it not continue to be used in order to indicate the formless and incongruous activities -- good, bad, and indifferent -- which I have described in this chapter?...
>
> It is, in any case, clear that no uniform, country-wide and thoroughgoing revolution is feasible.[2]

After suggesting a few changes which might improve Harvard, Columbia and Chicago, he launched rather abruptly into description of an institute of higher learning, thus closing the chapter on American universities.

> Progress might be greatly assisted by the outright creation of a school or institute of higher learning, a university in the post-graduate sense of the word. It should be a free society of scholars -- free, because mature persons, animated by intellectual purposes, must be left to pursue their own ends in their own way. Administration should be slight and inexpensive.* Scholars and scientists should participate in its government; the president should come down from his pedestal. The term 'organization' should be banned. The institution should be open to persons, competent and cultivated, who do not need and would abhor spoon-feeding -- be they college graduates or not. It should furnish simple surroundings -- books, laboratories, and above all, tranquillity -- absence of distraction either by worldly concerns or by parental responsibility for an immature student body. Provision should be made for the amenities of life in the institution and in the private life of the staff. It need not be complete or symmetrical: if a chair could not be admirably filled, it should be left vacant. There exists in America no university in this sense -- no institution, no seat of learning devoted to higher teaching and research. Everywhere the pressure of undergraduate and vocational activities hampers the serious objects for which universities exist. Thus science and scholarship suffer; money is wasted; even undergraduate training is less efficient than it might be, if left to itself.

What could be expected, if a modern American university were thus established? The ablest scholars and scientists would be attracted to its faculty; the most earnest students would be attracted to its laboratories and seminars. It would be small, as Gilman's Johns Hopkins was small; but its propulsive power would be momentous out of all proportion to its size. It would, like a lens, focus rays that now scatter. The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research is limited in scope; its hospital contains only sixty-five beds. But its uncompromising standards of activity and publication have given it influence in America and Europe throughout the entire field of medical education and research. A university or a school of higher learning at the level I have indicated would do as much for other disciplines and might thus in time assist the general reorganization of secondary and higher education.

*A Harvard professor writes me as follows: 'I think it is tremendously important at the present time to oppose the tendencies of administrative usurpation of certain academic functions which can only be properly performed by scholars. It has often seemed to me that we might profitably go back, at least in part, to the system which has long and successfully functioned in Germany -- namely, to have the purely house-keeping and financial work of educational institutions carried out by business men and clerks, with deans and rectors appointed from the older men of the faculty for periods of one or two years, relieving them for the time from their purely teaching duties and having them concern themselves during their administrations with the guidance of educational policy in consultation with a committee of their colleagues.'[3]

With these words Flexner finished the chapter on American universities. The proposal does not seem to be a logical conclusion to what he had just written. The Idea of a Modern University already had outlined the characteristics of the "modern university" suggested above, and they stood as a yardstick against which the revelations of practices in American universities were graphically measured. Moreover, to cite the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research as an example seemed forced, for it really represented the research institute which he had deplored because it usually removed men of genius and fine

talent from the universities, where they belonged in his judgment, because of their greater influence on the young and on the stream of cultural development.

But the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research was known by medical scientists the world over; particularly was it a bright star in the firmament of the donors, and particularly because of its Director, Simon Flexner. Perhaps his brother emphasized it here because of one of its firm policies, stated by Simon in the biography of Wm. Henry Welch: the Institute might have made more rapid progress had it called eminent men from abroad. Instead, it was satisfied with a slower pace, preferring to make its mark on American medical science through the achievements of American men of science.[4]

Again no record remains of the discussion between the donor, his trusted counsel Mr. Hardin, and Dr. Flexner. But it seems that Mr. Hardin liked Flexner's plan, and felt great confidence in the man himself. Two days later, Mr. Charles R. Hardin, who was to do the actual drafting of legal documents for his father, sent Flexner a cordial letter enclosing a skeleton of a certificate of incorporation and certain information about New Jersey law on the formation of non-profit educational associations, asking him to supply the statements of substance. Meanwhile Flexner had already prepared those statements, which he dispatched to Charles Hardin, suggesting that on certain points he intended to ask the advice of Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass, who were in Mr. Bamberger's confidence in these matters, and whom he wanted also to attend the next conference.[5] Flexner's draft statements make clear that he had already been asked informally to organize and direct the new institution.

He wrote:

> I am sending you herewith material with which to fill out the blanks in the Certificate of Incorporation. I shall show your letter this afternoon to Mr. Maass and Mr. Leidesdorf, who have been in Mr. Bamberger's confidence, and ask them to communicate with you regarding details which I am not in a position to settle...

The enclosure read as follows:

> First: The name or title by which this corporation is to be known in law is the Institute of Higher Learning or the Institute for Advanced Studies to be situated at or near the City of Newark. The Institute shall have a faculty or staff headed by a Director, whose functions will be defined by the By-Laws to be hereafter adopted.
>
> Second: The purpose for which this corporation is formed is the promotion of knowledge in all fields and the training of advanced workers for and beyond the Ph. D. degree and similar professional degrees of equal standing. The conditions under which such degrees will be awarded will be at least equal to those demanded by the most exacting educational institutions in the United States.
>
> Fourth: The corporation shall be managed by a Board of not to exceed fifteen Trustees who shall be divided into five equal classes serving respectively for one, two, three, four, and five years, and vacancies due to the expiration of term, resignation, death, or other cause shall be filled by the remaining Trustees in accordance with the By-Laws which will be adopted.[6]

As the drafts were being perfected, Mr. Bamberger asked Mr. Hardin to schedule a meeting for the 5th of May. Again speed was essential: Dr. Flexner was due to sail for Europe in mid-May. Somewhat defensively Hardin replied that he and his son were to attend the American Bar Association meetings in Washington during that week; the twelfth would do equally well, he thought. Drafting was well in hand, and all pending matters could be disposed of at one further meeting. But before he left Hardin prepared for Bamberger the following letter to Dr. Flexner, leaving blank the compensation. Mr. Bamberger sent

the proposed letter to Flexner on the 5th of May, with an addendum allowing the Director to employ a private secretary. The letter follows:

> Just these few lines to express the deep appreciation of Mrs. Fuld and myself for the invaluable counsel and assistance you have rendered us in formulating plans for the establishment of an 'institution for higher learning' in fulfillment of our ambitions to devote our respective fortunes to some worthy philanthropic purpose.
>
> You have been so helpful and the thoughts to which we are about to give concrete expression are so largely your own that we are exceedingly anxious to enlist the continuance of your services in directing the Institute and placing it in a position where it can successfully function in accordance with our ideas. Such being the case, I am writing to inquire whether you will accept the appointment as Director as soon as the 'institute' is established and thereafter devote your time exclusively to its management, to the end that it may become the outstanding success which we are all so desirous of achieving. We recognize that the position will be one of great responsibility which may entail considerable travel on your part to make the desired contacts, and, if agreeable to you, I would be glad to have you indicate your acceptance of the appointment herewith tendered upon the following basis, to wit...
>
> Please be assured that your acceptance of the appointment will, in the opinion of Mrs. Fuld and myself, launch our enterprise with the preconceived assurance of its success...[7]

Dr. Flexner accepted in a letter dated the 9th of May:

> I am profoundly touched and gratified by your kind letter of May 5. I need not assure you that I am deeply sensible of the honor and confidence which you and Mrs. Fuld repose in me, and in accepting your suggestion that I be the initial Director of the Institute for Advanced Study I wish to express my personal gratitude and my profound appreciation of the great responsibility which I am undertaking.
>
> You and Mrs. Fuld are making possible a new step upward in American education -- a step that ought in history to count with the founding of the Johns Hopkins University and Medical School and the establishment of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. I can only promise you that I shall spare no effort to make the institution

worthy of your beneficent idealism.

> We cannot look for quick results, for time and patience must be spent in the choice of those whose work is to bring distinction to the institution which you are establishing, but I shall give my entire thought and soul to the effort, and I hope that you may both live long to enjoy the great good which you have undertaken to accomplish. Certainly nothing could be finer than the unselfish spirit which you and Mrs. Fuld have manifested at every moment since the suggestion came under discussion.
>
> With all good wishes and very high regard...[8]

By the time the 12th of May came, the draft of the letter to the Trustees was presumably perfected for the time being, probably in the early conference with Mr. Hardin and perhaps in later talks between Flexner and the donors. It had become a thing of grace and cordiality, of imagination and high ideals.

Meanwhile Flexner had been negotiating with Mr. Bamberger on the membership of the Board of Trustees. He was experienced in working with an impersonal group of Trustees at the General Education Board, most of them his peers in the field of education. Though Mr. Rockefeller, Sr., had been named a Trustee at the beginning, he had never attended. He was content to have Mr. Gates represent his interests. Flexner had hoped that he might work under the same conditions here, and had prepared a list of names with that object and others in view. First he wanted academic experience which would serve to check and guide his own plans. Of the fourteen men he suggested, two were veterans in the field with whom he had served on the General Education Board, and six others were in academic life. Two others were strong in their financial position. The remaining men were prominent in literature, diplomacy and government. He suggested the name of no man who had worked

in these negotiations to date.[9]

But the donors had other ideas about the Board of Trustees. First, they intended to serve on it, and wanted their four advisers with them: Messrs. Flexner, Hardin, Leidesdorf and Maass. Then Mr. Bamberger accepted five persons named by Flexner: Messrs. Frank Aydelotte, Alanson B. Houghton, Herbert Lehman, and Lewis H. Weed, and Dr. Florence R. Sabin. Next, Dr. Alexis Carrel and Dr. Julius Friedenwald were suggested by Flexner and accepted by Mr. Bamberger. The last two names had not been selected when the group met on the 12th of April, and it was decided to take two from Dr. Flexner's list to make up the fifteen: Mr. Dwight Morrow and Dr. George E. Vincent. Flexner signed the Certificate of Incorporation with Mr. Maass and the donors on the 13th of May, and then departed for Europe. Whether the two last-named Trustees were contacted by others and declined, or whether Mr. Bamberger had a change of heart, does not appear, but for their names were substituted two of his own choice: his nephew, Mr. Edgar S. Bamberger, and his business associate at Bamberger's, Mr. Percy Selden Straus. Thereafter new copies of the Certificate were made, and on the 20th of May signed by the Founders, and Messrs. Hardin, Leidesdorf and Maass. Mr. Charles Hardin legally authenticated the signatures, as he had the earlier ones.[10]

The Certificate followed approved lines; the fifteen chosen names appeared as those of Members of the Corporation who should elect the Trustees. (See Appendix IV) In the interest of keeping the two bodies identical, it was provided that any Trustee who ceased to be a Member also ceased to be a Trustee.[11] The Trustees were to be respon-

sible for the conduct of the business of the corporation, for making the rules and regulations governing the institution, its staff and faculty, the admission and discipline of its students, and the granting of degrees and diplomas, including honorary degrees. Two rules of substance were included: one -- proscribing discrimination on account of race, religion or sex, and the other forbidding the acceptance of gifts from any source other than the donors, if they were accompanied by conditions deemed to be incompatible with the purposes of the Institute. In the interests of simplicity Mr. Hardin had amended the language suggested by Flexner to eliminate irrelevant material from the statement of purposes.

The legal title of the Foundation and the Institute were "Institute for Advanced Study -- Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation." The purpose was stated as follows:

> The purpose for which this corporation is formed is the establishment, at or in the vicinity of Newark, N. J., of an institute for advanced study, and for the promotion of knowledge in all fields, and for the training of advanced students and workers for and beyond the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and other professional degrees of equal standing.

The Founders' Letter to the Trustees was a document now of high purpose and spirit, expressed entirely in terms of the Founders' wishes, which were to become law to their Trustees. (See Appendix V). The following were the essential statements:

> The primary purpose is the pursuit of advanced learning and exploration in fields of pure science and high scholarship to the utmost degree that the facilities of the institution and the ability of the faculty and students will permit.

The faculty would

> consist exclusively of men and women of the highest standing in their respective fields of learning, attracted to this institution through its appeal as an opportunity for the serious pursuit of advanced study and because of the detachment it is hoped to secure from outside distractions....
>
> While the institution will devote itself to the teaching of qualified advanced students, it is our desire that those who are assembled in the faculty...may enjoy the most favorable opportunities for continuing research or investigations in their particular field or specialty, and that the utmost liberty of action shall be afforded the...faculty...to that end.

Students and workers might be financially assisted:

> In endowing this institution we recognize that many worthy and capable persons are unable for financial reasons to pursue study or research to the extent justified by their capacities. It is expected, therefore, that the Institute will supply means whereby through scholarships or fellowships such workers may be supported during the course of their work or research, to the end that facilities of the institution may be available to any man or woman otherwise acceptable possessing the necessary mental and moral equipment.

Students and "workers" were to be admitted on the basis of their ability to undertake advanced study; the baccalaureate degree would usually be required of those seeking admission, but exceptions could be made in the discretion of trustees and faculty. The minimal purpose appeared to be, as far as the training of students was concerned, to accommodate candidates for the doctoral degree; beyond that lay the charge to the Trustees to "advance the ideals of the institution," a statement which now took meaning from the declaration of purpose expressed in the Certificate; i.e., to train students and workers "for and beyond" the doctoral degree. The prominence thus given to

the intent to train and guide students and workers precludes any assumption that the Institute was to be devoted solely to research.

Since Dr. Flexner would be in Europe, it was decided that Mr. Ivy Lee, public relations counselor to Mr. Rockefeller, would be asked to handle the public announcement. He would give the press a brief story with copies of the documents, and warned Mr. Bamberger that the reporters would inevitably want more than was given, and that some one in Mr. Bamberger's office should be prepared to answer questions. The release was delayed for several days, while Mr. Hardin observed the political amenities by informing the State Board of Education of the coming event. Mr. Lee then prepared to give the news to the afternoon papers of Friday, the 6th of June. Meanwhile he submitted the whole dossier of news story and documents to Messrs. Bamberger and Hardin for final approval.[12] Mr. Bamberger suggested several changes. He qualified the story to say that in addition to the initial endowment of $5 million, the donors would give "additions to an extent which <u>they hope</u> will provide adequately for the purposes of the Institute." (Emphasis supplied.) Another insertion was the following: "The Institute will be located in Newark or vicinity." In the brief discussion of the beginnings, disavowing any elaborate physical preparations to house the new Institute, the text said, pursuant to the instructions Mr. Lee received:

> Because they have for many years resided in Newark, N. J., it is the intention of the Founders to make available to the Trustees a portion of the thirty acres of wooded park land in which their home is situated at Center Street, South Orange, N. J., in the event that the Trustees shall consider this site as most useful for the purposes of the Institute.

He was now requested by Mr. Hardin, "in deference to Mrs. Fuld's very positive feeling, [to omit] the specific reference to the use of the home site for the permanent location of the institution." A final change corrected language which might have been construed as a pledge on the donors' part to aid financially acceptable students who needed it.[13]

And so the statements were made ready for the public eye. Just then Mr. Lee received notice that Mr. Rockefeller intended to release to the afternoon papers of the 6th of June news of his gift of $10 million to the City of New York for a park and museum in Washington Heights. Fearing this would prejudice the Newark news in the metropolitan papers, Lee suggested notice of the Institute be deferred until Monday morning, when news was usually scarce, and it would probably receive more attention. But Mr. Bamberger was loyal to the Newark News, an afternoon paper, and so the story appeared on Saturday afternoon.

The Newark News reviewed in detail the many generous civic, cultural and philanthropic activities of Mr. Bamberger and the Fulds, and carried glowing tributes to them from prominent citizens. The Institute for Advanced Study as it appeared in the Certificate and the Founders' Letter was fully described.. Community pride in the distinction of having the new Institute located in or near Newark was marked. Said an editorial:

> [The Institute's] intellectual and social possibilities are not now to be calculated. They cannot fail to be both broad and deep in their effect upon American life and thought if the ideals set forth by the founders are realized. That they will be, both the principles upon which the first exclusively postgraduate college in this country is launched and the calibre of those to whom their application is

committed as trustees give promise....

> Whether this institution shall rise, physically, in this city or in its environs, it cannot fail to bring to the area over which Newark's influence extends an intellectual stimulation, the effect of which will be incalculable...
>
> This institution at its inception receives something far more useful to the scholar than money. This is the untrammeled opportunity to follow intuition and experiment into the unknown, where lie fields of knowledge useful to man, but still locked against him.
>
> In endowing their foundation with that opportunity Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld have given it more than their millions. Under the direction of men like Flexner, Carrel and Weed, and women like Dr. Florence Sabin, it is bound to be well used. This gift...puts this community more and more under obligation to the generosity and vision of the Bamberger-Fuld families.[14]

The New York Times was generous in its coverage, quoting the entire Letter of the Founders to the Trustees, and giving additional details. The Founders and the Director were commended for the deliberateness with which this unique institution was to be developed. It would be the first and only one of its kind in the country. When Dr. Flexner returned from Europe he "would undertake to enlist outstanding teachers in their respective fields as members of the faculty." The Institute would be coeducational, accepting on an equal footing people of all races and creeds meeting its high standards. The laudable purpose to establish an institution exclusively post-graduate in its activities was warmly approved. The story continued:

> At the Bamberger offices it was said that temporary quarters ...could be obtained without using any of the $5 million endowment. It was also explained that the initial endowment would be augmented from time to time to provide for such expansion as might become necessary. For the present no medical department will be operated, but it is expected that such a department may be added eventually.[15]

Meanwhile Dr. Flexner in Europe discussed with his consultants on Universities how best to begin the Institute. Most of them, he reported later, were unable to give him their advice without first reflecting at some length; nevertheless, he received some immediate counsel which impressed him as valuable. He returned to the United States early in July, visiting the Founders before going to his summer home in the Canadian woods to prepare Universities for publication. It was agreed that the organization meeting of the Trustees would take place early in October; before then, Dr. Flexner would prepare his proposals for the by-laws and submit them to Mr. Bamberger and Mr. Hardin in time for full discussion and changes, if necessary, before they went to the Board. These plans were fulfilled. Universities was finally dispatched to the Oxford Press in September, to be issued late in November in the United States. Dr. Flexner sent his draft of the by-laws, concerned with substance rather than legal formalities, to Mr. Bamberger on September 17th.[16] The following week they met with Mr. Hardin to consider them, and to decide on the order of business and the slate of officers.

Changes of substantial import were made in Flexner's proposals before a draft was ready for submission to the Trustees. These will be discussed later in relating the Board's action. Mr. Hardin sent one of the preliminary redrafts to Flexner with a brief note which seemed to indicate that he sympathized with the Director and sought to salve his feelings. The new draft, he said, "would harmonize with the New Jersey requirements, and...I hope you will find [it] in sufficient correspondence with your own draft to pass muster with you. Do not hesitate to

criticize freely in whole or in part." Apparently further changes were required; finally on the 2nd of October, Hardin sent a draft which presumably represented the last word in this pre-Board consideration. Without comment Flexner asked Hardin to send copies to the Trustees so that they might have time to study the proposed by-laws before the meeting, scheduled to follow a luncheon tendered by the Founders on the 10th of October at the Uptown Club, on East 42nd Street in New York.[17] Hardin complied, sending the draft to the Trustees on the 7th of October, "at Dr. Flexner's request."[18] The promptness with which Mr. Maass presented nine questions to Hardin by letter before the meeting makes it difficult to escape the conclusion that Flexner had told him of certain misgivings about the draft. Hardin had no time in which to reply by letter; his comments on the margin of Maass' letter indicated his general attitude: let it be so for the time being.[19]

All but one of the Trustees appeared for the meeting. Mr. Lehman was successfully compaigning for re-election as Lieutenant-Governor, and could not be present. The Board members exhibited a variety of interests and experience. Flexner's care to have a considerable number of educators represented was less than productive; he and Dr. Frank Aydelotte were the only two. True, there were three medical scientists -- Drs. Carrel, Sabin and Weed -- two of whom had taught. But weight was in the presence of the three merchants -- the two Bambergers and Mr. Straus -- and the three professional men -- Hardin, Leidesdorf and Maass -- while the remaining three -- Mr. Houghton, Governor Lehman and Mrs. Fuld -- supplied an element of diplomacy. It is not unlikely that the question of the ages of the various

Trustees had caused some speculation, whether or not it was discussed at the time. For three -- Mr. Bamberger, Mrs. Fuld and Mr. Hardin -- were in their seventies; three in their sixties -- Flexner, Friedenwald and Houghton; six -- Aydelotte, Carrel, Lehman, Maass, Sabin and Straus -- were in their fifties, and the remaining three -- Edgar Bamberger, Leidesdorf and Weed -- were in the forties. Certainly an age limit for professors was discussed then as will appear later.[20]

The Board exhibited strength in several directions. Dr. Aydelotte had won distinction as a progressive college President -- the first to introduce the English system of working for honors to America, thus pioneering in breaking what he called the academic lockstep. Flexner stood forth as the most articulate critic of American institutions of higher learning; the academic community was well aware of his strength in assembling and delivering the materials of thought-provoking analysis and criticism. He was highly conscious of the difference between his former role and the one he now assumed; the heavy burden of construction now rested on his shoulders, and he had to prove himself in the eyes of those whom he had criticized most vigorously.

Dr. Alexis Carrel, Member of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research since 1906, was a Nobel Laureate, having won the prize in 1912 for his surgical success in suturing blook vessels and in transplanting organs. Dr. Sabin had become a Member of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research after twenty-three years of teaching and research at the Hopkins; her work on the lymphatic system, on tuberculosis, on studies of the brain, and on diseases of the blood had won her great distinction.

Mr. Houghton was an elder statesman. He had been president of the Corning Glass Company, his family's enterprise, when he decided to enter the public service. He served two terms in Congress, after which he became American Ambassador to Germany (1922-1925) as President Harding's appointee, and to England (1925-1929) as President Coolidge's. He and Dr. Flexner had met in Germany and England; they were warm friends.

Governor Lehman was a partner in Lehman Brothers, Bankers. He went into politics and was elected Democratic Lieutenant-Governor of New York in 1928. He was re-elected in 1930, and then elected Governor for four years (1932-1936), which were followed by years of distinguished service in the United States Senate.

Mr. Straus, whose career was entirely with R. H. Macy and Company, was trustee of New York University and the New York Public Library. He was President of Bamberger's.

Despite the differences in the interests, ages, qualities and pursuits of this group, they were knit together by a strong common purpose -- to help the Director in every way possible to achieve a great success in his effort to create optimum conditions for advanced study. Nevertheless, Flexner had reason to feel that the burden was his to an uncomfortable extent. His imagination, which had not failed him during his years with the General Education Board, was still lively. Now, however, he had no Gates to breathe fire into his reports to the Trustees, or to influence the donors with confident support. There was no Buttrick, with his humor and his sense of timing, who dared to believe and to say that "his only policy was to have no policy." Nor did he have the benefit of the academic judgment which had weighed, considered and

spoken on Flexner's proposals with all the mature judgment of an Eliot, an Angel, a Vincent, a Howland. Indeed, he faced at all times a healthy skepticism in Mr. Bamberger, and that, as he was to tell a colleague later, caused him to devote himself to winning Bamberger's confidence with all his considerable powers.

One senses from something he wrote well after he left the directorship how he would have had these first years go. A poignant note crept into his remarks about Daniel Coit Gilman as he passed muster with the Hopkins Trustees in 1874 and accepted the presidency of the University:

> Thus in his 44th year, -- the very prime of life -- Gilman's greatest opportunity came to him and he was ready for it... No other American of his day had a comparable equipment in knowledge of coming educational change or in experience with innovation. Suddenly abundant resources and a clean slate were offered to him in Baltimore, and he knew precisely what he wanted to do. A single meeting with the Hopkins Trustees convinced them that he was the man of the hour. And he was...[21]

About the Organiztion Meeting of the Trustees little is known. The social hour of the luncheon passed pleasantly, and the meeting opened with a brief address by Mr. Bamberger in which he thanked the Trustees for their willingness to help in guiding the Foundation established by himself and his sister. Then at his request Mr. Hardin took the chair temporarily, and called on the Director to explain the purposes of the Institute.

Flexner opened his remarks with a warm tribute to the Founders for their generosity and "farsightedness," and impressed the Trustees with his feeling that "new foundations, starting as this one does with a clean sheet, without commitments and without traditions," were rare

even in America. He pledged himself to do his best, and charged the Trustees to do theirs, and particularly to be observant to see that he himself was successfully discharging his great responsibility. But, he said, it was on the faculty that the success of the Institute depended. He must find "men and women of genius, of unusual talent" to come to the Institute. It would not be easy; academic life had lost many through poor conditions for work, poor pay and lack of security. He asked the cooperation of the Trustees in his effort to offer conditions which would make the lot of the faculty members of the Institute more attractive than was the usual academic appointment. He could not say with what subjects the Institute might begin: it might be the physical sciences, including biology, or the humanities, which he construed to cover all the activities of man. Whatever it was to be, it depended on the availability of the right men and women for the faculty. The students, he said, would have "left behind all the ordinary steps in education and discipline. Some may already have achieved independence; some may require a certain amount of guidance." But none would be immature or "uncertain," nor would their total number be large.[22]

The proposed by-laws next received the Board's attention. Most of them were unexceptionable; it is the few which involved crucial points which will be described here, and that without benefit of any knowledge of the discussions, either in the pre-Board conferences or during the meeting. The legislative history of the by-laws is established only by the availability of the copy of Dr. Flexner's proposals of the 17th of September, fortunately preserved in Mr. Hardin's papers, and a copy of the proposals sent to each Trustee on the 7th of October

by Mr. Hardin, remaining in Mr. Aydelotte's files. These, compared with the By-Laws adopted by the Board and incorporated in the minutes, and afterward printed in Bulletin No. 1 , show the thinking of the Director, Mr. Bamberger and the Trustees.

Evidently the location of the Institute was cause for a muted but active conflict between Mr. Bamberger and Dr. Flexner. The Director had specified only the State of New Jersey; Mr. Bamberger narrowed this to the County of Essex, which embraced Newark and the two Oranges; the Trustees were given the responsibility for deciding where in the County the Institute should be placed. The Board eliminated reference to the County; the Institute would be located "at or in the vicinity of Newark, at such place as the Trustees may determine." This left the way open to the logic of necessity to solve the problem.

The question of faculty participation in the management of academic affairs caused many differences. The draft of the 23rd of April had eliminated the possibility of the faculty's electing its own Trustees. Dr. Flexner had suggested in September that not more than five of the fifteen Trustees might be faculty members at any one time, to be elected by the Members of the Corporation, as were all other Trustees. Terms for the individual Trustees would be decided by lot at the first annual meeting, with three groups to serve for three, four, and five years respectively, and thereafter the regular term would be five years. The subject had become a tender one as Mr. Bamberger again overruled the Director. Flexner's proposal was reduced to an absurdity by cutting the total number of Trustees to twelve, to serve from one to five years as by lot it was decided, although the Board might increase

the number to the fifteen provided in the Certificate. As a practical matter, the Trustees could readily see that they were confronted by a loss of three at the April meeting. When the faculty was appointed, its contingent might account for five-twelfths of the Board, with the resulting loss of five more of the present Trustees. The Board, confronted by this dilemma, restored the number to fifteen, of whom not more than three at any one time might be elected Trustees by the Members of the Corporation. The first Trustees were to be divided by lot into five classes, to serve from one to five years respectively. After that the regular term would be five years.

Again the issue of faculty participation arose as Dr. Flexner proposed a Committee on Educational Policy, to consist of three Trustees, the President and the Vice-President, the Director, and three members of the faculty to be nominated by the faculty. Again Mr. Bamberger refrained from crossing the Director overtly. The proposal as the Board considered it provided that the faculty members of the Committee might vote only if they were also Trustees. Flexner's draft gave the Committee "power to make recommendations [on educational policies] to the Trustees through the Director, who shall be Chairman." Mr. Bamberger required the Committee to advise the Trustees not only on educational policies but on "the conduct of the corporation." The Board decided that the faculty members of the Committee should be appointed as were all other committee members (except those designated by office in the By-Laws): i.e., by the President, removed the condition on voting rights, and required the Committee to review and report also on appointments. In the event, the Committee never materialized; the provision for it was eliminated immediately after

the first faculty appointments were made.

The Director so far had displayed considerable ingenuity in devising ways of providing for collective faculty action. Mr. Bamberger had prevailed so far, but had latterly seemed unwilling to reverse the Director too often. Therefore he managed to insert additional conditions which made it necessary for the Board to cut the knot. In each case the Board's decision removed the need for collective faculty action. It would be interesting to know whether in this session there was any frank discussion to show the various points of view. It would seem unlikely, considering that the climax of the conflict between Mr. Bamberger and Dr. Flexner occurred over the sixth Article, which created the directorship and its powers and responsibilities; these were decided in the pre-Board conferences, and were not changed by the Board.[23]

Flexner's draft made the Director responsible for the "final formulation of policies to be presented to Trustees and faculty" only after consultation with the President and the faculty. He recommended that seventy years should be the normal retiring age for professors, and apparently presumed that it would also be for the Director. But the tenure of any individual might be extended a year at a time by a two-thirds vote of the Trustees. In case of a vacancy in his office, a special committee of Trustees must consult with the faculty as well as with outsiders before making its report and recommendation for a successor to the Board. The Director was to be ex officio a member of the Board, and was authorized to attend all committee meetings. He must make the budget and submit an annual report which, with the annual reports of the President and the Treasurer, must be published each year.

Mr. Bamberger's proposal gave the Director greater power than could be rationally exercised, at the same time establishing his tenure for one year at a time. Subject only to the supervision of the Trustees, he should "be responsible...for the administration and current educational conduct of the Institute..." He was to be a Trustee, and to have the right to attend all committee meetings. He must "establish the courses of study and/or research...and set up rules and regulations" governing students. His authority to make appointments to the faculty was subject only to the Board; the constructive omission of any reference to consultation with the faculty was a constructive proscription of the collective faculty. Any committee of Trustees appointed to recommend a successor to the director was free to consult itself only; it was not permitted to consult the faculty, nor required to seek outside advice. Though the Director was responsible for submitting an annual report to the Board, publication of any report -- from President, Treasurer or Director -- was omitted as a requirement. Thus another constructive prohibition was established, probably without the Board's ever being aware of it. In short, Mr. Bamberger was unwilling to sanction any relationship between the Director and the collected faculty, and equally unwilling to consider that the public had any right to knowledge of the affairs of the public trust he and his sister were creating.

One might well ask why Dr. Flexner was willing to assume the dictatorial powers thrust upon him, and to shoulder the responsibility himself without at least allowing the Trustees to have an inkling of his differences with Mr. Bamberger. His answer would probably have been that which he was to give his critics -- the same Mr. Hardin gave to Mr. Maass --

let it to be so now, in the hope that with experience would inevitably come reason and change. In Universities Flexner had decried the arbitrary actions of American lay boards of trustees, and had advocated close consultative relations between trustees and faculties, pointing out that certain grievous mistakes which harmed the institutions in which they occurred would have been avoided had such a relation existed. He said also that university presidents tended to become "bottlenecks" between the two groups in interest, capable of representing the views of neither completely to the other. Thorstein Veblen had called them "Captains of Erudition!"

There were other conflicts in the pre-Board conferences. Flexner urged that the President and Vice-President should be members ex-officio of all four standing committees -- Executive, Finance, Education and Nominations. Mr. Bamberger insisted on making the President statutory Chairman of the important Executive Committee, and the Vice-President and Director statutory members. Flexner opposed the limitation put upon expenditures through the provision that the Treasurer must sign every check, and the President must countersign it if he were available and able to do so. The Board added that in the President's absence any member of the Finance Committee could countersign. One further point: though the President was to preside over meetings of the Members of the Corporation, which met always in April to elect Trustees, and could amend by majority vote the By-Laws,[24] Mr. Bamberger insisted that he have the responsibility for appointing the committees of the Board of Trustees, over whose meetings the Chairman was to preside. The Vice-President was to perform the duties of the President in his absence or disability; no

Vice-Chairman was provided for.

The Board at its first meeting elected the following officers:

Mr. Louis Bamberger, President
Mrs. Felix Fuld, Vice-President
Mr. Aydelotte, Secretary
Mr. Leidesdorf, Treasurer
Mr. Alanson B. Houghton, Chairman
Mrs. Esther Bailey, Assistant Secretary
Mr. Abraham Flexner, Director[25]

It authorized the President to rent a small suite of offices at 100 East 42nd Street, and, with the approval of the President, gave the Director authority to procure needed supplies.

The Director was to take up his duties formally on the 1st of December. Meanwhile he suggested certain appointments to the Executive Committee to Mr. Bamberger, who declined to be persuaded that he and his sister should be members ex officio, and that Messrs. Hardin, Leidesdorf, Aydelotte and Miss Sabin would represent a proper academic-lay balance and could probably muster a quorum at any time.[26] Mr. Bamberger was Chairman, and appointed Governor Lehman in place of Miss Sabin. Since the Governor could not leave Albany often enough to attend Board or committee meetings, it meant that the Committee was always one short.

Shortly after the Organization meeting, the donors made their first deposit toward the initial endowment, completing it in January, 1932. The data are as follows:

November 19, 1930	
10,000 shares Macy & Company common @ $107	$1,070,000.00
Cash	10,000.00
	$1,080,000.00
July 1, 1931	
1,000 shares L. Bamberger & Company 6½% pfd.@$103.	$ 103,000.00
500 shares National Essex and Newark Banking Co. capital stock @ $260	130,000.00
Various bonds at market with accrued interest. . .	1,312,417.06
	$1,545,417.06

October 9, 1931	
Cash	$ 500,000.00
January 7, 1932	
Bonds	2,199,449.39
Total	$5,324,866.45[27]

CHAPTER II - NOTES

1. Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 10, 291.

2. Universities, pp. 213-214.

3. Ibid., pp. 217-218.

4. Simon Flexner and J. T. Flexner, op. cit., p. 299.

5. Charles R. Hardin to Flexner, 4/30/30. Flexner to Charles Hardin, 5/1/30; 5/2/30.

6. Ibid.

7. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 5/5/30. The salary was $20,000.

8. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 5/9/30.

9. Dr. Flexner's list of names: (Hardin papers)
   Edwin Alderman, President, University of Virginia
   Frank Aydelotte, President, Swarthmore College
   Florence Sabin, Member, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research
   Joseph R. Swan, President, The Guaranty Company
   George Vincent, former President, The Rockefeller Foundation
   Edward M. Earle, Professor of History, Columbia University
   Edward Capps, Professor of Classics, Princeton University; Adviser to Rockefeller Foundation
   James Truslow Adams, author, essayist, publicist
   A. B. Houghton, former American Ambassador to Germany and to England
   Dwight W. Morrow, American Ambassador to Mexico
   John Livingston Lowes, Professor of English, Harvard University
   Lewis H, Weed, Dean, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University
   Felix M. Warburg
   Herbert H. Lehman

10. See copies, Hardin papers.

11. J. R. Hardin to Maass, 5/7/30. Hardin to Flexner, 4/5/33. Hardin papers.

12. Ivy Lee to L. Bamberger, 6/3/30, Hardin papers.

13. J. R. Hardin to Lee, 6/4/30, Hardin papers.

14. Newark News, 6/7/30.

15. New York Times, 6/8/30.

16. Flexner to J. R. Hardin, 9/17/30, Hardin papers.

17. J. R. Hardin to Flexner, 9/29/30. Flexner to Hardin, 10/3/30, Hardin papers.

18. J. R. Hardin to Aydelotte, 10/7/30, Aydelotte papers.

19. Maass to J. R. Hardin, 5/9/30, Hardin papers. Mr. Maass raised several questions of merit. One concerned the requirement that all checks on Institute depositaries must be drawn by the Treasurer and countersigned by the President, the Vice-President, or a member of the Finance Committee. Maass suggested that the By-Laws might better provide that such signatures should be prescribed by the Board from time to time. Mr. Hardin's marginal note said: "Always easy to change." Another point concerned the powers given the Director:"Do you not think a great many of the powers you have conferred on the Director should be subject to approval either of the Board or of the several committees? Such, for instance as the organization of the faculty...?" And finally: "Do you deem it advisable to add an article covering the meeting of the faculty and the action to be taken at such meetings?"
There seems to be little doubt that Dr. Flexner, dismayed by both the unwanted powers given him, and the lack of Trustees qualified in academic matters, such as he had had access to at the General Education Board, must have consulted Mr. Maass before returning Mr. Hardin's draft for duplication and mailing to each Trustee. Probably Mr. Maass felt it was necessary to send his letter raising questions to Mr. Hardin as a normal courtesy before bringing the questions before the Board.

20. Dr. Flexner supplied Mr. Hardin with a copy of the amended By-Laws of both the General Education Board and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, during the drafting stage. The General Education Board had amended its laws on the 23rd of May, 1929 to provide that no trustee should be elected or re-elected who had attained the age of sixty-five years.

21. Abraham Flexner, President Daniel Coit Gilman, Simon & Schuster, 1946, pp. 52-53.

22. Bulletin No. 1, pp. 7-14, passim.

23. The following is Dr. Flexner's proposed Article VI, providing for the office of Director:
The Director shall be responsible for the final formulation of policies to be presented to Trustees and Faculty and the current educational conduct of the Institute.

He shall, after conference with the President, the Faculty, and the Committee on Educational Policy, make recommendations as to policies and nominations to teaching posts. Appointments shall be made on the vote of the Board for a term not exceeding the period specified: they may be indefinite, in which case, they shall terminate at seventy years of age, to be extended for one year at a time when the recommendation of the Director is approved by a two-thirds vote of those members of the Board present, or definite, for a term to be specified in each instance.

The Director shall submit not later than the stated meeting in April a budget of the proposed expenditures for the next academic year.

The Director shall be ex-officio a trustee of the Institute and shall be authorized to attend committee meetings. In case of a vacancy in the directorship, a special committee shall be created, which, after conferences with the faculty and outside authorities, shall report to the Board of Trustees.

The Director shall prepare and submit to the Board an annual report, which, together with reports of the President and Treasurer, shall be published and distributed.

The following is Article VI as presented to the Trustees, and passed. The only change made was in line 10; for became of

Sec. 1. The Trustees, at their annual meeting, shall appoint a Director of the Institute, who shall be responsible, under the supervision of the Trustees and/or the Executive Committee, for the administration and current educational conduct of the Institute, in accordance with its purposes as declared in the charter of the Corporation. The Director shall be a Member and Trustee of the Corporation and shall have the right to attend all meetings of the committees of the Trustees. He shall organize the faculty of the Institute, establish courses of study and/or research to be pursued therein, and set up governing rules and regulations for the admission and discipline of students and workers, and exercise general supervision over the Institute in respect to its educational phases. He shall have authority, with the approval of the Board and/or of the Executive Committee, to make appointments to the faculty for indefinite terms or for limited periods. He shall submit, not later than the stated meeting of the Trustees in April, the budget of expenditures proposed for the next academic year. In case of a vacancy in the directorship a special committee shall be created to consider the appointment of a successor. No action shall be taken for

the election of a successor until after the report of such committee. The Director shall prepare and submit to the Board of Trustees an annual report which shall fully cover the year's work and accomplishment.

24. Article X put some kind of a premium on the importance of meetings of the Members of the Corporation, by providing that a majority of all Members present could amend the By-Laws, while saying that a majority of the whole number of Trustees was needed to do the same thing. Earlier the article had provided for a two-thirds vote of either.

25. Since officers were to be elected at the annual meetings, Dr. Flexner at first considered himself an officer. At the annual meeting of 1932 (the first held) the Director's re-appointment was effected.

26. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 10/21/30.

27. Treasurer's Reports.

CHAPTER III

PLANNING THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

The sober conditions of the opportunities and the limitations in his position were quite clear to Dr. Flexner as he reviewed the happenings of 1930 and faced the task of outlining the unique institution described in the organization documents. He knew now that Mr. Bamberger, seriously disturbed by the economic conditions of the period, was concerned now not with taking care of a contingency should a physical disaster strike him and Mrs. Fuld, but instead with limiting their contributions to the new Institute to just what would suffice for it.

The Director knew that $5 million was a small initial endowment for the thing he wanted to do. For only a dramatic success in the opening moves would impress the lay and academic public, and hence the Founders. And since it was well known by those familiar with philanthropists that institutions named after their founders rarely attracted gifts from others, the need was very great for such an impressive showing. If little could be accomplished with $5 million, and much more would be needed, Flexner was quite aware that it would have to come from Mr. Bamberger and his sister, although he was to try to raise outside money for several purposes, but with surprisingly little effect, as will appear.

Another fact stood out clearly: the Founders were determined to share with Newark any glory or benefits which might derive from the enterprise. The Director had studied carefully this question of loca-

tion, and knew that it would be impossible for a small Institute to sustain itself in Newark, a commercial and industrial city possessing no other institution for advanced education or learning. He was to write impressively in Universities of Friedrich Althoff, leading spirit of the Cultus Ministerium of Prussia (1882-1907) as he developed his Idea of a Modern University. He learned that Althoff had made a great effort to staff and equip the Prussian universities for the highest possible development of medical science, only to find that the few men of genius he needed, who might have served in them, must be protected from even moderate teaching responsibilities. And so, wrote Flexner, Althoff

> was...led to plan a series of institutions in which the most fertile minds might be devoted to research in fields in which fundamental progress had already been made -- fields in which the basic sciences had already attained definiteness and solidity, in which problems, theoretic as well as substantive, could be clearly formulated, in which personnel of high quality had already been trained..... But so specific is the research institute that its particular activities depend on an individual or a small group. Whatever the institute be called, its energies center about a person. The important things are not subjects, but persons; when the person goes, the subject goes....The research institute does not have to include all subjects within a definite field; it can demobilize as readily as mobilize...[1]

Flexner disapproved of research institutes, mainly because they did not provide for the training of the next generation of scientists and scholars as did the university. Though he outlined small, flexible modern universities with a minimum of formal organization, he disavowed any intention to favor the research institute:

> The emphasis which I have placed upon thinking and research may create the impression that I am really discussing institutes of research rather than universities. Such is not the case...The research institute stands or falls by its success

> in research, whereas, in projecting the modern university, I have been careful to associate training with research.[2]

He was also aware, though he did not mention it in these pages, that the geniuses and the men of great talent were needed within the university and that in any generation they were scarce enough to make the defection of one or two a deprivation to their associates in the university, and to the students. In summing up his position, he remarked that "in the complexity of modern science there is no telling from what source the magic fact...or conception will come." The very breadth of the university, he wrote, increased the probabilities of fertility. Althoff's biographer had written that the Prussian education authorities were so strongly convinced of the soundness of the university that "all the most recent [research] organizations" were more or less intimately connected with universities by design. This led Flexner to write that

> A research institute, set up within or in connection with a modern university, might escape some of the limitations to which the isolated institute is exposed.[3]

How much of this he actually wrote with the Institute for Advanced Study in mind is a question. But it is likely not much, for the burden of the lectures was an attack on the American university for its multifarious activities, many of which, he asserted, were not associated remotely with cultural advance or real learning. Inevitably what he had concluded now applied to the new institute which he was planning. It seemed to him that its chance for success, to say nothing of life, depended on placing it near a university. How could he reconcile that knowledge with what he had learned of the Founders' attitude? How could he supply suitable buildings in Newark? Certainly he did not want to

see Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld become interested in such things then -- that would spell death for his effort to "get brains," as he was to put it. Not blindly had he persuaded them to proscribe use of capital for such things. He knew that Princeton would welcome the Institute to its community; conversations with President John Grier Hibben had assured him of that, and even of the possibility that should he begin with mathematics, the Institute might temporarily share with the Department of Mathematics space in the new Fine Hall which was even then being built.

But Flexner had evidently spoken so frankly on this subject that he was precluded from returning to it in discussions with the Founders. And so he waited for "something to turn up," meanwhile studying his problem, particularly through the reading of everything he could from the hands of his old gods, Gilman and Eliot. As he reported to the Trustees in January, 1931,

> The situation is a more complex one than at any previous time in the world's history. When...Mr. Gilman organized the Johns Hopkins University he could appoint a professor of history, a professor of mathematics, a professor of economics, or a professor of physiology. But any one of these subjects and indeed all subjects have so developed that it would require a small faculty to represent any of them adequately in all its aspects.
>
> Progress is likely to be made by selecting a crucial or strategic point, and then by procuring a scholar or a scientist who will push his investigations from that point forward ...We must ascertain the subjects which, though of fundamental importance, are not at present productively cultivated in this country at a high level, and we must undertake to discover the persons who may be relied on to forge ahead, but in order to come to decisions on such points and to make choices of this character one must possess a sound knowledge of the status and outlook of each of the major branches of learning. Towards this end I have been working.[4]

Outlining this truly stupendous undertaking had the virtue of explaining

a delay in action. The Board could readily appreciate its magnitude, and authorized the Director to travel here and abroad to secure advice. Because he might not return before the date of the first annual meeting, scheduled for April, it was agreed to postpone the meeting. In the event, it was not held at all, for when he came back from Europe at the end of May, Flexner was not ready to report.

Before going abroad, the Director visited various men at the Hopkins, Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Columbia, and Chicago during January and February. He discussed economics with Justices Holmes and Brandeis, history with authorities at the Library of Congress, and talked with some of his old friends at Brookings. He wrote the Founders and Mr. Maass that his welcome was warm everywhere, and that the idea of the institute was enthusiastically received.[5]

The thing most on his mind, however, was brought up by Dr. Aydelotte in a letter shortly after his return. The writer had visited Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld recently, and reported:

> They had it very much in mind that their place in South Orange should be used for the Institute buildings. I repeated my suggestion that a larger tract of land was desirable, and had the feeling that they might eventually come to realize this, especially if things do not move too fast.[6]

Flexner's reply was revealing in its obliquity:

> I am glad you touched on the subject of site with Mr. Bamberger. I have myself not done it because I have not yet let my mind play on that aspect of our problem, but I share your views, though I think it best not to quote me...I don't want to divert my attention to site and buildings while I am seeking to clarify my ideas. (Emphasis his)[7]

But with Mr. Maass he was quite candid:

In view of our conversation at lunch today, do you think that the language in Mr. Bamberger's letter and the charter would apply to the possible location which we considered, or would it be well to ask Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld to join in a letter saying that the vicinity of Newark can be interpreted by the Trustees, in their discretion, to mean Northern or Central New Jersey?[8]

Maass replied:

...I am frank to admit that, after our luncheon conference yesterday, I have been giving some consideration to the question of location which we discussed, and while I consider it an ideal move, I would be reluctant to assume that we could undertake to construe the founders' letter as giving authority to select this location. In other words, I am clearly of the opinion that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld so clearly intended Newark and its immediate environment that I would hesitate to adopt any other view unless they first modified their letter.[9]

Flexner was impatient, thinking dangerously, even willing to take advantage of a poor technicality which might have alienated Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld. Or perhaps he was trying to impress Mr. Maass with the idea that his state of mind was desperate. He asked Maass for a further clarification of his views, saying that if the Board had power to amend the Certificate of Incorporation he would say nothing further on the subject for the present; otherwise, he seemed inclined to ask Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld for a letter stating their willingness to construe their stated intention broadly. But Maass was equal to the occasion; he said simply that he had no doubt about the Founders' wishes and intentions, and that nothing should be done until and unless they changed their views.[10]

The extremity of the Director's disquiet seemed to have been the signal for some remedial work on the part of Mr. Leidesdorf. Flexner wrote him the following letter which implies an understanding:

> I have finished the second draft of a report which I shall send around to the members of the Board in advance of the autumn meeting, and I find my ideas are even more sharply crystallized than I have permitted myself to say, but the truth is that I do not wish to put anything on paper which will make it difficult for me or for the Board to change, if in the course of the next months we get further light...
>
> I am trying in my mind to devise ways of starting which will commit us as little as possible financially and otherwise so that over a period of years we can regard the Institute experimentally, profiting by our experience and changing without getting too deeply involved to do so.

And as he wrote, he gave evidence of a certain relaxation; he dared to be humorous about himself, and to show a confidence and friendliness rare with him these days:

> I am amused, as I write, to observe how different it is to criticize what another fellow is doing, on the one hand, and, on the other, to undertake to do something yourself. At bottom, there is nothing in this document that is not implied in what I have previously written and said, and yet, when it comes to the doing of it, a great many questions arise to which as a critic one gives very little attention.[11]

During this period he was inviting and receiving criticism and comment from several of his academic friends on copies of his drafts. Some of these will be reviewed later in this chapter. The final draft of his Confidential Memorandum to the Trustees was dated the 26th of September, 1931, when he sent it for their consideration in preparation for the meeting of the 13th of October. It will appear that by that time Mr. Leidesdorf or Mr. Maass was able to assure him that some solution to the problem of location might be worked out.

The Memorandum consisted of about six thousand words, divided into a short preface and ten sections which were numbered but not titled. The reason for that was that his treatment was not strictly topical; he

slipped in persuasions wherever they promised to do the most good. He raised for consideration every aspect of the new institution, whether it had been dealt with positively in the Certificate, the Founders' Letter to the Trustees, or decided by Mr. Bamberger in the course of reviewing these documents or in framing the By-Laws. Though liberal use is made of the text here, it is deemed desirable to present the whole of it in Appendix VI. The following pages set forth its main points, paraphrased wherever it is possible to convey Flexner's meaning and strategy, and quoted elsewhere.

He had spent six months traveling and interviewing scholars in America and the "main European countries," asking for their critical opinion and constructive suggestions. No one, he said, doubted the importance of creating "an institute of the proposed character and scope," because "in the last half-century, universitities have everywhere undergone changes that have impaired their...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...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. (Emphasis his)[12]

In preparing his Memorandum he had worked with copious notes taken during his travels, letters, documents, etc. But he would make no specific attributions.

In a manner which was to become quite familiar, the Director set forth the reasons for the creation of the Institute and its main characteristics, identifying it first with universities which he described in their ideal state as follows:

> 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.

But universities commonly exemplified quite different characteristics; they were too big, too highly organized; they had "been dragged into the market place," and made to serve "scores of purposes." They provided little freedom of spirit or speech for their faculties in the social and economic realms, because "repressive influences have emanated from trustees and executives," although, he felt, these were frequently "unconscious influences." There were exceptions to these conditions, but they were individual, and not generally characteristic of American universities.

On both sides of the Atlantic he had encountered agreement with these 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...

If the Institute were to differ from universities in these respects, how was it to be distinguished from a research institute? "By reason of its constitution and conception it would 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 should also be teachers, choosing "a few competent and earnest disciples engaged in mastery of a subject," although the students might be researchers also. In the typical research institute, teaching was also carried on, but the emphasis was different for such institutes were primarily engaged with the effort to settle problems, and the younger men were considered to be "novices" or assistants, rather than students. Continuing his distinctions, Flexner wrote:

> The Institute 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....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...

Next the academic organization was sketched as Flexner visualized it in a flexible and imaginative plan:

> 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 philosphy 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 or 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...

Thus before he raised formally the question of faculty participation in decisions affecting academic policies, Flexner had twice suggested -- indeed, presupposed -- a collective faculty, first in summarizing the views he had received during his travels, and now in academic organization, and the official voice of the faculty in it. The organization itself was an ingenious concept in its avoidance of strict departmentalization, which had proved to be so rigid in universities and so unrealistic in the colleges. His next remarks were calculated to introduce his formal discussion of the faculty's place in academic decisions. He reminded the Trustees that they would be dealing "with seasoned and eminent scholars, who must not be seriously or long diverted from creative work." And he continued:

> These men know their own minds, they have their own ways; the men who have, throughout human history, meant more 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...

Flexner then brought up and left with the Trustees the whole problem of the faculty's role in academic government, apparently without having told any of his colleagues, except possibly Mr. Maass, of Mr. Bamberger's attitude. He assumed that the schools would be consulted by the Director in making the annual budget, which the By-Laws

had left to him alone. Then he continued:

> Delicate questions arise in connection with the relations which should exist between the 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 professoriate 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 cooperation, 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....
>
> 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 and trustees, he tends to become 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 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....
>
> Tentatively, each school may work out its own 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. (Emphasis his)

Each school would select and admit its own students. Worthy students would be hard to find; universities competed for them, offering them jobs and fellowships. But Flexner opposed part-time students, convinced "that employment as assistant at this stage of the student's progress is wrong." Some students might require loans or grants, while others might pay an admission fee. Neither admission requirements nor methods of study should be formalized. The student should be the judge of his readiness for the "mark of approval" of the Institute. His work was to be individually carried on; since the number of professors and students would be few, "professor and students would know one another intimately;" machinery would be superfluous; arrangements will vary from man to man, from year to year, from subject to subject.

Nor would "teamwork" be expected of the faculty. Collaboration and discussion would naturally take place; there would be abundant oppor-

tunity for men to talk over their own problems and those which lie on the borderline between them. This speculation led Flexner to sketch what he hoped would be the physical attributes of the Institute.

> 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...touches but lightly the growing organism...No 'director'...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.

The Director was now ready to propose the subjects with which the Institute should begin. Prefacing his recommendations with the caution that in his opinion "every step taken in forming the Institute should be viewed as experimental" and that "no subject will be chosen or continued unless the right man or men can be found," he suggested that mathematics, and, assuming that funds were adequate and the right persons could be secured, economics, should be the first. Mathematics lay at the "very foundation of modern science." Not many American universities were eminent in the field. It was "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." Although mathematical thinking was usually indifferent to use, both pure and

applied science, and progress in philosophy had in recent years been "bound up with new types and methods of sheer mathematical thinking." In its indifference to practical results, mathematics seemed to Flexner to epitomize the function of the Institute, for, he said, "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." But he cited with approval Pasteur, Koch, Lister and other physicists and chemists who "had their feet in both worlds -- the world of practice and the world of theory." What he wanted was "minds that are fundamental in their searching, whatever the spring that moves them..."

Mathematics commended itself on practical grounds also. It was peculiarly fitted for present purposes because it would allow a start and yet commit the Institute to little at a time "when we wish to retain placticity and postpone acts and decisions which will bind us." It required only a few men, a few students, a few rooms, books, blackboards, chalk, paper and pencils. Clearly Flexner intended that only a minor portion of his resources need be devoted to mathematics.

When he launched into his justification of economics the enthusiasm with which he had urged development of the social sciences in Universities again became evident. He noted that it was linked to mathematics by statistics -- a concern which, it will be seen, was more than incidental in his thinking. Aside from that, it was very different from mathematics: "it seems to be everything that mathematics is not, for it obviously is of the world of action, rather than of sheer thought." There were, he said, "grave reasons for this choice," and continued:

> 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....
>
> 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 realities, yet never their slave?...Economics, hard pressed by the tasks of the day, has not usually enlisted minds willing to work in leisurely and philosphic fashion...Nowhere does a group of economists enjoy the conditions which Pasteur enjoyed, when he was working out the foundations of preventive medicine...

Physical plagues had been largely eradicated by medical science. But economic plagues, like the one which then was paralyzing the world, continued their periodic ravages for reasons not understood. "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..." He spoke of economics, he said, in the broad sense, "inclusive of political theory, ethics and other subjects that are involved therein." His vision:

> 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 with 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 toward disease...

Beyond these two subjects, Flexner suggested that in the future

it might be decided that schools in literature, music or science could be added, if money and men were available. But he favored a conservative course, preferring a surplus to a deficit. This would enable the Institute to pursue a policy:

> analogous to that of the Collége 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 ' en, since the Institute is not 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 Collége de France has proved of incalculable value. It has pioneered in every direction....
>
> Under such circumstances, growth will be slow and unsymmetrical, as it should be;...we shall learn much from experience -- much that will be helpful in reshaping such schools as we start, much that will be useful in shaping others...If the Institute is unsymmetrical, it can the more readily remain elastic and highly vitalized.

It would not be easy to gather a group of scholars, but proper conditions would, he believed, attract some American scholars, and would certainly bring distinguished foreigners for varying periods. Salaries must be generous enough to afford gracious living, and a contributory insurance system should remove the fear of retirement without enough to live on. His idea of salary standards was given substance when he implied that there should be no difference between his own liberal compensation and that of the permanent faculty, while "younger men, still on trial, may be decently rewarded without danger, provided their terms of service are definitely limited." So critical was this matter, he said, that "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." However, in return for such remuneration, professors must give their full time to their work at the Institute. Only

thus, in controversial fields such as economics, the professor could take the necessary time for thorough study, and speak without fear that his integrity might be 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.

Though the Director said in his preface that location, site and buildings were matters on which he had asked advice, he now discussed them without mention of the word "location." Yet he comprehended the subject completely in the following:

> 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....
>
> 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.[13]

There were miscellaneous matters. He favored travel funds for scholars. Business men knew how important to their interests were personal contacts. Scholars in Europe enjoyed frequent contacts with one another because of the shortness of distances, but the American scholar

had all too little of it. He had been advised to create an Institute press. He opposed this as unnecessary since worthy articles would be published anyway, and books would be published if the expense was underwritten. The importance of a library (on which Flexner had expatiated at length and favorably to American organizations in Universities), had likewise been urged. The solution of that problem depended partly on the location of the Institute, and partly on providing necessary books for the several schools.

He noted particularly that he was saying nothing about the duties of the Director; they were described in the By-Laws, and "nothing needs, at this moment, to be added." Further on matters not discussed, he wrote: "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." Routine administrative affairs should continue to be handled by the Board's Assistant Secretary Mrs. Esther S. Bailey, and the Treasurer's office.

The Institute's success would be measured "in the slow process of time 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." He closed on a prophetic note:

> 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 to begin on any such basis; it will be harder, as the years pass, to keep this standard. We shall find ourselves dealing with men and

> women, not with angels or supermen. 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.

No action should be taken then on his report; he hoped the Trustees would discuss it freely. Meanwhile, he would seek further counsel on "several important matters." He would ask for action when the time was ripe; he wished "to feel free to alter it in the light of such further information as I may obtain."

On the 5th of November Mr. Bamberger appointed a Committee on Site, consisting of Mr. Maass, Chairman, and Messrs. Aydelotte, Edgar Bamberger, and Weed. He and his sister were members ex officio. Dr. Flexner begged off; he was pressed by other duties, he said, but would be happy to serve as member ex officio, and to help in any way possible. The Committee's first and only meeting took place on the 7th of December, 1931, and lasted three hours. Only the briefest minutes were kept, but they show that the Director was asked to prepare a series of questions to be approved by the Committee and sent to a number of academic people "for suggestions derived from their own experience in this country and abroad as to the physical and other conditions, including contacts and environment, which would tend to facilitate the purposes of the Institute, and also [to ascertain] what obstacles we should, if possible, avoid."[14] The letter was sent by the Director to about forty scholars and educators in this country. As the answers were received, copies were made and sent to the Committee members. None recommended Newark

as a location; the majority advised close proximity to a university and held ready access to a library to be essential. The Director again visited President Hibben of Princeton, talking this time also to the Dean of the Graduate School.

So far had the sentiment for locating at Princeton gone that before he and his sister left for their winter vacation in the West, Mr. Bamberger had been in touch with a Princeton real estate agent. At the end of February Messrs. Edgar Bamberger, Leidesdorf and Maass visited various sites in the Borough and Township, and Flexner, who had just come from the Founders in the West, wrote them of the fact, and said they found plenty of land available and considered the location good, but that of course, no action would be taken in the Founders' absence and without their approval.[15] Meanwhile, the information was closely guarded.

Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld were in a delicate position; it was less than two years since their home community had so enthusiastically welcomed the news that the Institute would be established there. Just before the April, 1932, meeting of the Trustees, Mr. Straus wrote Flexner, perhaps disingenuously, that he hoped the Board would soon make it possible for the Institute to be associated with a university; he believed it was better for an institute for economic research, or for one of higher learning, to be so associated. To this Flexner, replied with revealing asperity that he did not understand just what Straus meant:

> If you mean neighborly, intimate, personal, inorganic relations, I should think that both parties would profit greatly. This has been the experience of the Royal Institution and the Lister Institute in London...If a formal, definite, legal, organic association is contemplated, I should think that the Institute would be absolutely destroyed. It would

> inevitably sink both in personnel and in spirit to the level of the graduate school of the larger institution which would really absorb it.
>
> We want and need neighbors, but we want absolutely to preserve our identity, and this is not only my view but the view of both President Hibben and Dr. Trowbridge, Dean of the Princeton Graduate School, with whom I have had a confidential talk...[16]

At the April meeting, Mr. Maass reported that the Committee, guided by the patent needs for ready access to a library, for opportunities for social and educational contacts with other learned men, for sufficient land for building and recreational activities for both students and faculty, and for "the development of an institutional atmosphere and spirit," had decided that, if "satisfactory arrangements for cooperation could be worked out with Princeton University," Princeton would offer the proper environment for the Institute. Mr. Maass complimented the donors on their foresight. Northern New Jersey "offers many of the desirable features we have stressed, namely, convenience of commutation with New York, Philadelphia and other large centers without the disturbing influences of a large city, together with all the attractions of quiet, scholarly surroundings and other desiderata which our correspondents have uniformly mentioned." However, he cautioned, the Committee had not reached this tentative conclusion without giving serious attention to the advantages of Washington, D.C., which also offered rich resources. But the wishes of the Founders had prevailed; the Institute would, as they had hoped, be located "in the vicinity of Newark."[17] It was not until the October meeting, however, that the formal decision was made and announced.

Meanwhile, in January 1932, the Director told the Trustees that nothing had caused him to change his mind about the plans embodied in his Confidential Memorandum of the 26th of September, 1931. He recapitulated its main points briefly, and moved its adoption by the Board. The Trustees approved it "in principle."[18]

The Director expressed the hope that he would be able to present the first nomination at the annual meeting. Ironically, the By-Laws were amended at this meeting to eliminate entirely the provision for faculty Trustees. Instead, three members of the faculty would be chosen to sit with and advise the Board, without voting, each to serve not more than three years. This was the untoward result of an effort Flexner made to provide for an increase in the number of Trustees to accomodate three faculty members to be elected by the Members of the Corporation when the faculty had been recruited.[19] But the Director did not accept this amendment as a permanent settlement of the matter; he secured its repeal in April 1933, and the reinstatement of the provision for faculty members without number as voting Trustees.[20]

Though none of the memorandums or letters carrying advices which Flexner had solicited during his travels is available, having probably been left at Magnetawan where he prepared his Confidential Memorandum for the Trustees, there is some correspondence available in comment on the first Bulletin issued, and on the drafts of the Confidential Memorandum, as well as some in answer to the letters of inquiry sent out at the direction of the Committee on Site. A sampling of these advices and comments may prove to be interesting. In this correspondence

the Director was sometimes under necessity to defend a position, or even to argue a bit in the interests of developing ideas fully.

Throughout he observed a self-imposed rule: he was strictly impersonal, and at all times accepted full responsibility for all that had been decided, whether he was in sympathy with it or not. It spoke volumes for his prestige, and the power which men were willing to concede to him, that not one of his correspondents ever seemed to think that he was not completely responsible for every idea or policy involved. He defended each point of doctrine or policy as though he were, even to the powers and responsibilities given the Director in the By-Laws, with which he was not at all pleased or comfortable. Some of his critics took it ill that he bore with apparent equanimity the barbs directed at him. It gave an appearance of cocksureness and self-confidence which irritated them. Perhaps some of them suspected that Flexner was making no confidants of those whose criticism he invited. And some men in particular were not prepared to face that supposition. A brief review of some of the correspondence will prove revealing.

It was felt that the Director was too determined to detach scholars, particularly those in the social sciences, from life outside the Institute. Dr. Arnold Toynbee noted this tendency, he thought, in Flexner's remarks in the Bulletin, and feared it might lead to sterility. Though it might be difficult to arrange, Toynbee suggested alternating periods of outside activity and detached reflection. It would help humanists to relate to their times. And if some of the Institute's staff should come from the world of affairs, great care should be taken not "to cut their roots," he warned. Moreover, if the men of the

Institute were not required to teach, they should be required to write, for otherwise, like some scholars at Oxford, they might become too self-critical, and produce nothing. Toynbee ventured the opinion that "the closest precedents for your Institute are the academies which were instituted by enlightened monarchs of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In these there was the fruitful contact between study and affairs which I believe would be the ideal conditions for work in your Institute, at any rate in the field of human studies." But the historian was most favorably impressed by Flexner's purpose to overcome two of the age's besetting sins: the craving for quick returns, and "tribal exclusiveness."[21]

Dr. Aydelotte volunteered somewhat the same advice, commenting on All Souls and its contribution to both scholarship and public life. Speaking of social scientists particularly he said: "I believe that some kind of arrangement which brought men back from time to time as they come back to All Souls might add a great deal to the character and effectiveness of the Institute."[22]

Dr. George E. Vincent reacted sharply against Flexner's continued assumption that graduate faculties were harmed by their contacts with the outside world, and by the internal conditions of their work. He observed at Chicago, he said, that the great men in the upper reaches seemed fairly happy, and capable of fruitful research and teaching "in the maelstrom."[23]

From a slightly different point of view Dr. Oswald Veblen of Princeton University also favored All Souls, primarily because it was a residence for the faculty.

> If students were admitted, they should come in gradually, and as junior members, so as not to disturb the atmosphere too much. There should also be a sufficient number of college houses and apartments for married members. But the use of the facilities should be voluntary. If each member were entitled to a certain number of free rooms and meals, there would be no doubt of their being used.

Veblen admitted a liking for the amenities at Oxford, particularly the high table. He thought that there would be many bachelors who would prefer to eat there regularly, and the "married men would come over once or twice a week if the meals were good and cheap."[24]

Dr. Weed and Dr. Charles Rufus Morey of Princeton University believed that such designs for group living would produce little except artificial and meaningless contacts. Morey wrote:

> To me, the essential thing is that they [students] should have a place where they can work together, and a place where they can work with their teachers, not in the formal and sometimes stiff relations established by a class or seminar meeting only for reports, but in the intimate contact established by mutual assistance in the search for information and material.[25]

Obviously he was thinking more of the students than of the faculty, who were Flexner's main concern.

There was something like a consensus on the subject to be undertaken first as disclosed by three academic members of the Board of Trustees who answered a series of questions sent them by the Director on the 11th of December, 1930. All took the position that the humanities should be first. Drs. Aydelotte and Weed felt that scientific research was generally emphasized at the expense of the humanities. Dr. Aydelotte suggested foreign languages and literatures, the social sciences, especially economics and government, mediaeval and modern history, and philosophy, though he did not foreclose theoretical physics

and the natural sciences.[26] Surprisingly, Dr. Weed recommended that the Institute devote itself initially to history as "the one subject to be undertaken immediately: history in the broadest possible interpretation as the story of mankind," dealing with the political, the social, the linguistic, enthnological and other aspects. "Philosophy, science, and other apparently distantly related subjects should be brought into a harmonious discipline." He was interested in seeing the history of science developed from the standpoint of biological hypotheses and concepts. He would support any other humanity, but would exclude archaeology.[27] Dr. Sabin also recommended history as the first subject, with mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology and economics following in order.[28]

Dr. Charles A. Beard, the historian, favored a study of civilization

> from primitive times to the latest hour, combining economics, politics, science, letters, and the arts. Within a few years a group of first rate scholars, each a specialist, working together around a common center, could produce results of the highest significance...Dissertations could be grouped around the central problems...The same cause could be advanced by another process: the organization of a school dealing with what I call the philosophy of the application of the arts and sciences to civilization. This would mean specialists in law, medicine, engineering, etc., engaged in exploring the potentialities of their disciplines in relation to the good life...

But Dr. Flexner recoiled from the idea of directed or organized research. His idea was that if first-rate scholars were brought together and left to their own devices, "something would happen." Beard took sharp issue with this. He had, he said, been trying to discover how to relate the scholar to his times; in his own thinking nothing seemed so likely to fail as Flexner's idea. "Something indeed might

happen -- death -- intellectual death -- the end of many a well-appointed monastery in the Middle Ages," he declared. Beard and Flexner were to argue during the whole summer and come no nearer an agreement than that. Beard insisted that he favored study which had as its method and inspiration the conviction which had grown upon him: "the more I study the more I am convinced of the unity of all things and the necessity of trying to see the complex steadily and as a whole in the effort to attain living truth." Specialization

> is necessary, but its whole tendency is sterilizing. That is partly responsibile for our present intellectual paralysis in the presence of a national and world crisis....I should drive at the heart of things in an effort to make an institution of learning that would draw fragmentary learnings together rather than encourage the intense specialization which produces sterility.

Leave the highly specialized sciences to the research laboratories, and concentrate on the study of civilization, he urged again: the forces which drive it, its structures and forms, its national and world implications, its noblest ideals, its diseases and destructive tendencies.

> Politics is rubbish without economics; economics is futile without politics; literature that does not reflect immense movements of the human spirit is dead at birth; the applications of science without ethics are unthinkable. I should, therefore, gather scholars who are thinking outward in their specialties and inward toward the common center of unity... I should choose scholars who are thinking centripitally, encourage them to work individually and collectively.[29]

Thus far Dr. Beard had assumed, as did most of Flexner's correspondents, that the Institute would be a small university. When Flexner sent him a preliminary draft of the Confidential Memorandum, he was bitterly critical. "It is one thing to throw off ideas in a book, and something else to make them live in an institution," he said. Unless the

men chosen were drawn together around some common standard of the function of higher learning, "they may be specialists only, and vegetate." Moreover, Flexner's memorandum was "too long": the story of creation was told in six hundred words. Why not give the Trustees "brass tacks" on academic relations, teaching and research, remuneration for scholars, and the other factors? As to the intention to begin with mathematics, this was to take the easiest way, an "admission of defeat at the outset." He said:

> Mathematics can be taught 'safely' in Moscow, Berlin, Rome and Washington. In urging that mathematics stimulates philosophy, poetry, music, and the other humanities, you strain your hand. Bertrand Russell gave up mathematics on account of its intellectual futility with respect to everything else, save applications...
>
> Chuck mathematics and take economics. Then you begin with the hardest subject. It is as mathematical and statistical as anyone wants to make it, but it is more. It is a far more 'severe' discipline than mathematics, because it deals with the inexact. In teaching it you come smack up against the whole business of academic freedom and propriety. We have no good schools of higher economics in this land of business schools, and you could make a ten-strike for learning by establishing one. There are good men to get or borrow....[30]

Dr. Flexner was not willing to say what his strategem was in preparing the memorandum as he had done. He was as direct a speaker as the best, but "brass tacks" was what he could hardly give the Founders on academic relations. The written argument died down in prospect of a personal visit in the fall, and another in the following spring.

This exchange of views was more exhaustive than most. Others took positions less philosophical than Beard's, but akin in feeling. Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, asked why not devote the Institute to the development of knowledge in fields

which the universities were not pursuing freely and effectively?[31] Dr. Vincent asked why cultivate two such unrelated disciplines as mathematics and economics? If the decision was firm as to mathematics, then choose astronomy or physics to go with it. Graduate students preferred to specialize in related subjects.[32] Dr. Paul Hanus of Harvard raised the same question and suggested politics to team with economics.[33]

Professor Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School seemed to be in accord with Flexner in the choice of subjects, writing:

> I am entirely persuaded by what you say in support of making those beginnings. Only two minor statements jar me a bit. I know it is often said that the foundation of modern knowledge is mathematics and I think I know what is meant by it, but it doesn't seem to me a truly critical or scientific observation. It is certainly not the foundation of the modern humanities, and I even wonder whether as to the physical and biological sciences mathematics is the foundation, rather than one of the fruits. In any event, it seems to me a futile piece of dogmatism and needless hierarchical designation. Also, it seems to me needless to say that mathematics is not a subject in which at present many American universities are eminent. At least four are eminent...to my meager knowledge, and I dare say more....[34]

With the attacks of Beard and Frankfurter Flexner changed his claims for mathematics to more moderate terms.

Several men were much concerned with the Institute's viability. How could the survival of so small an institution be assured? Dr. Alan Gregg of the Rockefeller Foundation said that its life would be short if it were organized, as it appeared to him to be, in protest to the universities. If the universities improved, what would the Institute's function be? He suggested greater emphasis on flexibility: the freedom to seize on new subjects for new schools, and new people, after the example of the Collége de France. This was the function which would always be inhibited

and laborious in a university.[35]

Dr. Hans Zinsser of the Harvard Medical School, in the course of a long and brilliant answer to the inquiry of the Committee on Site, wrote:

> While I do not feel capable of making any constructive suggestions as to how you can carry out your plan, yet I feel quite sure that it cannot be carried out in a separate institute of pure research. This might succeed for a few years or perhaps a decade, but for permanent consecutive intellectual strength I believe that an institution must be tightly interwoven with the web of national education and with the scholarship of the country as a whole....[36]

Most essential in his judgment was the association of such an institution with a university. "I would make no attempt whatever to establish such an institution in Newark or in any other place as remote from the current of university life as this," he wrote.

Dr. Veblen offered the following in answer to a request from Flexner on the occasion of a visit to Princeton in the winter of 1931:

> The location of your Institute should be such that your group of scholars would be one of several cultural groups. It should never be too large. Otherwise scope would be given for 'organization' and the failures we know so well. If money for too large an institute should be available, let there be two, three, or N institutes, all separate! But if there were just one Institute for Advanced Study isolated in a community devoted chiefly to business it would be in danger of not being able to maintain itself.[37]

The Professor suggested that Princeton would be an ideal location.

Interestingly, Dr. Solomon Lefschetz, Veblen's colleague at Princeton, saw the difficulty of providing for the future of a small institution but offered a somewhat different conclusion. Noting that small colleges were peculiarly vulnerable to non-support, he thought the Institute would be safest if it played a vital part in a large and

heterogeneous community such as Chicago, New York or Philadelphia. But since these were foreclosed by the "deed of gift," he suggested that Washington, belonging as it did to the forty-eight states, might properly be considered an extension of New Jersey. There, he thought, the Institute might be one of a number of separate autonomous groups like the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge; others might be established by other donors, while the Smithsonian and National Academy collections and the Congressional Library would offer their resources. He felt that Congress might even provide money for the buildings of the Institute.[38]

Dr. George D. Birkhoff of the Mathematics Department at Harvard, while transmitting his chairman's suggestion that the Institute could do worse than come to Cambridge, and having himself given some thought to Washington, settled firmly on Princeton as the most desirable location because of the distinguished department of mathematics there.[39]

The government of the Institute's academic affairs engaged the attention of several advisers. Dr. Veblen believed that the faculty should govern the Institute, even if it were hard to bring about. Of the advantages he wrote:

> Faculty government is very conservative. Each suggested change runs into interminable discussions, delay, whittling down, and compromise. But in the meantime most of the faculty go on with their work without the fear that some outsider will upset everything for them overnight. Conservatism in a university is, I think, desirable in and of itself....
>
> A good deal of the trouble is due, I think, to our form of organization, which puts the legal power in the hands of trustees and the actual power in those of a President and his administrative staff, and the professional alumni.[40]

Flexner quickly replied that his intention was to place the

Director on a par with the Institute's professors in "salary, social position, and everything else. He would thus be made to feel his place as an academic individual, not a public executive personage," and the governing Board should include outside scholars and faculty members. Professor Veblen tactfully agreed that these innovations would indeed be an improvement over the usual arrangements, suggesting, however, that the proposed faculty trustees should constitute "an executive committee with large powers to act between the annual or semi-annual meetings of the whole board."[41]

Again Professor Lefschetz took a point of view which was almost exactly contrary to that of his colleague. The machinery of the Institute, he wrote, "should be designed with the utmost care so as to remove administrative duties from the shoulders of the members. I should say that it should be so constructed that they cannot assume such duties even when they themselves desire it. The very temptation should be removed."[42] Such extreme differences of opinion from two colleagues in Princeton's small Department of Mathematics might indicate that their attitudes had been wrought by trial and test.

Others shared Veblen's view. Dr. Vincent, whom Flexner held in very high esteem, suggested that a new form of administration would be an excellent matter for experimentation; why not try letting the full professors control educational policies and appointments? He felt little confidence in faculty trustees; selecting a few professors to sit on the Board would have its drawbacks in envy and suspicion, he feared. Flexner answered that when in 1924 Trevor Arnett went to Chicago University (with Vincent's blessing) he had urged the governing board to adopt the very

plan Flexner was advocating in order to bridge the gap between trustees and faculty. This was less a justification than a quoting of scripture.[43]

Dr. Otis M. Caldwell, Director of the Institute of Experimentation at Teachers College, Columbia, wrote:

> Why do you ask men to form a staff in the Institute? Why not finance real students, and send them to work with the right men, adding to the remuneration of the 'right men' in terms of what they can do for the students? Such a plan would become a sort of higher guide to all sorts of special students, and would avoid all the complications and antagonisms that will come with a staff of men who are mature and individualistic. At least you could do some such work as I suggest and keep your staff down to a small number of very special men...[44]

Mr. Frankfurter wrote in his lengthy comments:

> I do not... think that you ought to commit yourself now to the permanent retention of a lay Board of Trustees, however constituted. If you are going to get the scholars whom you ought to have for your school, they ought to have a very important share in working out your form of government.[45]

Dr. Alfred E. Cohn, a member of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, prepared new by-laws and sent them to Dr. Flexner, apparently on his own motion. Among other things, he said, their effect was to free "the faculty from the control of power inevitably, inalienably, intricably tied to money." He questioned the usefulness of faculty trustees; the relationship would be political, and "a small representation, a minority, never in history established any rights." With Beard and Frankfurter, who approved his letter, he urged complete faculty government. The Director answered, defending the mechanism provided for, but saying easily that if it was not right, it could be changed. During the ensuing correspondence, Cohn became bitter and sarcastic, and Flexner somewhat pompous. Stung to rage, Cohn attacked Flexner's right to speak in these peculiarly professional matters. He was so savage that Frank-

furter, though still agreeing with his basic position, told Flexner that he would have expressed himself differently.[46]

Throughout, Flexner gave no indication that he had lost his composure, nor did he even imply that the By-Laws were not his own creation. At times Frankfurter and Cohn seemed to suffer from a feeling of futility by Flexner's equability in debating with them, so that they wanted to rout him out of his Olympian calm rather than to prevail with cool logic.

While these and a few others insisted that the faculty should have a larger share in government, others took a different position. Thus Aydelotte, who had managed the affairs of Swarthmore College for more than a decade, wrote:

> It seems to me to be the part of wisdom to be as tentative as possible at this stage about the government of the Institute. You might point out...the most serious objection to faculty government, which is that it inevitably becomes legalistic. Oxford is a good (or rather bad) example. The 'inadequacy of uniform proceedure' is the point to be insisted upon...
>
> You might, I think, stress a little more (or at least not forget) the importance of the Director in (1) the selection of the faculty, and (2) the making of the budget. He will want all the advice he can get from inside and outside the Institute, but subject to the approval of the Trustees the final decisions on these matters should, I think, rest with him.[47]

From two friends in Colorado came similar advices, albeit from the other level of responsibility. Dr. Edward Meade Earle, Professor of History at Barnard College when he was stricken with tuberculosis in 1927, from which he was still recovering, had been suggested for a trustee by Flexner in May, 1930. Mrs. Earle had been Secretary of the New School for Social Research. Both approved of the experiment with faculty

Trustees, but looked with disfavor on any more substantial measure of faculty participation in the management of the institution. Mrs. Earle wrote for both, referring to an experience in faculty government with which she had earlier become familiar.

> The result was that a few conscientious, hard-working souls were swamped and their important work suffered, and the rest did nothing. The result was dissatisfaction and inefficiency all around...
>
> Ed believes that any considerable measure of academic administrative responsibility has a demoralizing effect on real scholarship...He believes that what departmental business has to be done should be simplified...and should be conducted at informal luncheon discussions, provided the Institute maintains its primary ideas of limited numbers and simplicity of purpose.
>
> 'Faculty government' would seem to us futile and ineffective ...Scholars should be let alone as much as possible...the ablest of them do not want to be bothered with self government... They would much prefer to be relieved of all administrative duties, provided the head remains always a cultivated, understanding person who will assume the burdens of government.[48]

Flexner replied:

> My own inclinations are naturally with you and Ed, but some distinguished scholars have urged me to formulate a code regulating the relations between trustees, director, professors, etc. I cannot help thinking that any code I formulate now would probably be a terrible obstacle a few years hence, and that no code will restrain an unprincipled man who is out of sympathy with the objects for which this institution exists.[49]

That Flexner had to defend his plan for faculty trustees, and wanted even more faculty participation in government, at least in a consultative role, he made clear to Mr. Straus, who had some influence with Mr. Bamberger as a business associate and as a trustee of New York University. He wrote:

> I was lunching with Mr. Bamberger yesterday, and he told me that you were still dubious about the wisdom of having members of the faculty on the Board of Trustees...

> I am firmly convinced that the absurdities connected with our universities would for the most part never have taken place if a few outstanding scholars had been members of the boards of trustees and in position to express their views to the trustees, as they have expressed them to me. Within the last few days two Harvard professors have talked to me on the School of Business, as it is, and they have both said that, had the faculty been consulted, the School could never have been organized in its present form. The Harvard Corporation never gave these men, who know what education is, a chance to be heard.
>
> Precisely the same has been said to me by Columbia professors with respect to the abuses...there. Last Monday night I dined with one of the most distinguished members of the Columbia Trustees. He said that my book was a revelation to him. Had a few distinguished members of the faculty been sitting on that Board, they could not have helped raising questions which ought to have been raised and which were not raised by President Butler...The autocratic power of the American college president ought to be curtailed. It cannot be curtailed by a lay Board. It can only be curtailed if:
>
> (1) The faculty has a voice in the management of the institution, and
>
> (2) Outside scholars can also criticise the director or anybody or anything else. I don't want to be a Mussolini, but one could almost be if one were dealing with merely a lay board.[50]

Most of the commentators had overlooked the statement in the Certificate that students and workers would be admitted after they had taken the doctoral degree. Several mentioned the difficulties which such a small Institute would have in awarding the Ph. D. or equivalent degrees in competition with famous universities with the prestige of their "traditional hallmarks." Dr. Vincent made this point, and received a laconic "correct" from the usually noncommittal Director.[51] Dr. Frederick Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation suggested the Institute might make arrangements with some university to credit work done at the Institute in awarding its degrees.[52] Mr. Frankfurter held that degrees

were not meaningful as evidence of scholarship, and recommended against them, whereupon Flexner came nearer to disclosing his hand than usual. He replied:

> Theoretically I agree with you absolutely about degrees, but there are practical difficulties....I believe that the best of our men can save two or three years. As a practical measure, therefore, for the present, it seems to me better to throw...the best of students completely into the hands of the several scholars without any requirements as to previous degrees and then safeguard a young fellow's career by giving him a degree if he deserves it. It ought to be a very rare degree....as rare or rarer than the Degree of Doctor Juris at Berlin, which is very carefully safeguarded...
>
> I want the Institute to be different in pretty nearly every important respect from any American institution I know anything about, and I have tried to keep even these experimental features to the minimum required to set up something and to get the consent of the New Jersey Board of Education....[53]

After the State Board of Education granted the Institute the authority to issue the Ph. D., Dr. Flexner explained to the Trustees that it had never been the intent of the Institute to award it, but that Mr. Hardin had considered it wise for legal reasons to secure the right.[54]

It might have been assumed by anyone familiar with academic institutions that a small institute representing only a few highly specialized parts of the three great branches of knowledge would have been unable, as Dr. Vincent saw instantly, to issue the doctoral degree in competition with the great universities, with their "traditional hallmarks." But it did not seem to; only Dr. Keppel had a comment reflecting the same recognition as Vincent's. Later it will be seen that Dr. Veblen insisted for some months that the Institute should admit candidates for the doctoral. Perhaps he recognized then that the Institute would hardly have been welcomed to Princeton and offered the hospitality

of the University had it held itself out to compete for graduate students. While no explicit undertaking not to do so is revealed in the record anywhere, the several conferences held by Flexner and Veblen with Dean Eisenhart always found the Dean and the Director in full agreement that that was not the function of the Institute.

And what of Princeton University, with whose locale and cooperation Flexner was so eager to secure for the Institute, for practical reasons of economy as well as the larger one of entering a community of academic tradition? Dr. Thomas J. Wertenbaker, historian of Princeton University when it was the College of New Jersey (1746-1896), records that after the Hopkins opened there was always more or less agitation among the younger alumni and some of the faculty for the addition of a graduate school. This was powerfully opposed by the traditionalists among the older alumni and the trustees. At the Sesquicentennial the College became Princeton University, but it was not until 1900 that Dean West won his battle for the graduate school, which was established first at Merwick. Dr. Wertenbaker says that the graduate school grew more slowly than those of its friendly rivals: Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, etc., even with the enthusiasm of President Woodrow Wilson for advanced studies. But apparently the schism which was to develop between those two men was one of the reasons. Certainly Wertenbaker makes no secret of the disappointment of many of the alumni, the trustees and the faculty at Wilson's appointment over their favored candidate, Dean West himself.

Flexner found it possible to comment favorably on some of the eastern colleges, as distinguished from their graduate schools, in

Universities. Thus he said at one point:

> It is gratifying to be able to record the fact that there are American colleges which have not succumbed to nonsense. Harvard -- I am speaking now of the college work alone in all the institutions which I am about to name -- Yale, Princeton, Swarthmore, Vanderbilt, Amherst, Williams, Barnard, Bryn Mawr, Smith and Wellesley, to select a small number at random -- give no credit towards admission or graduation for any of the absurd courses which I have mentioned above; they all offer a varied and solid cultural curriculum to undergraduate students who may care to be educated.[55]

And on Princeton as a university, he added a footnote later:

> Of the great American universities that I have mentioned, one, Princeton, still largely a college though in some departments important graduate groups are developing, does no 'service' work whatsoever...[56]

But the historian was forced to admit that during the critical years between 1888 when President James McCosh retired, and 1902 when Wilson became President, those years when the stimulus of the Hopkins was most powerful, President Francis Patton failed to stiffen easy courses, to maintain proper entrance requirements, to drop incorrigibly idle students, or to inaugurate a logical scheme of coordinated electives. He concluded regretfully that if these things had been done, "Princeton could not, even in jest, have been dubbed a delightful country club." Nevertheless, he was careful to say, much excellent teaching and earnest work went on in this period.[57]

At the end of the first quarter of the twentieth century, Princeton took a lead in mathematics and the natural sciences. With the aid of $1 million from the General Education Board, for which Professor Veblen was to thank Dr. Flexner and his colleagues, and the $2 million required to match it, largely raised by Dean Henry Fine, Princeton established its

Foundation for Scientific Research, with chairs for research in mathematics, mathematical physics, physics, chemistry, astronomy, and biology, etc.[58] Another department of real strength was Art and Archaeology, which Flexner as Director of Studies had helped with funds for various explorations, particularly those of the Agora, which he persuaded John D. Rockefeller Jr., to undertake to finance. In economics and finance there had been luminaries also there. From Flexner's vantage point, Princeton was almost made to order for the Institute's background.

But whether this had been the case or not was almost irrelevant. The Founders were determined that the institution they were financing must be located in New Jersey, and it required a major effort on the part of their advisers to get their permission to recognize Princeton as being within the State when their hopes were so concentrated on dignifying Newark. The decision was Dr. Flexner's, and it was a wise one -- the only one possible in all the circumstances. But it was clear that the Director had to remain in the background, and the major responsibility fell upon Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass to bend the iron will of Mr. Bamberger.

CHAPTER III - NOTES

1. Universities, p. 32.

2. Ibid., p. 31.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

4. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/16/32, pp. 5-6.

5. Flexner to Maass, 2/3/31; to L. Bamberger, 2/11/31.

6. Aydelotte to Flexner, 6/1/31. Aydelotte papers.

7. Flexner to Aydelotte, 6/2/31.

8. Flexner to Maass, 6/8/31.

9. Maass to Flexner, 6/9/31.

10. Flexner to Maass, 6/10/31. Maass to Flexner, 6/15/31.

11. Flexner to Leidesdorf, 7/24/31

12. Flexner, Confidential Memorandum to Trustees, 9/26/31. Hereafter this will be referred to as the Confidential Memorandum, considered and discussed at the Trustees' meeting of 10/13/31. The minutes were silent on the nature of the discussion. Though Dr. Flexner wrote Mr. Bamberger that during his travels he had kept careful notes of all conversations, and of his own reflections and ideas, none of these is available in the files of the Institute. Presumably he took them to his summer home in the Canadian woods, where he prepared the Memorandum, and left them there.

13. The Board approved the suggestion for the special committee and authorized the President to appoint to it four members. Minutes, 10/13/31, p. 2.

14. Minutes, meeting of the Committee on Site, 12/7/31.

15. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/1/32.

16. Straus to Flexner, 4/7/32. Flexner to Straus, 4/9/32.

17. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/11/32, pp. 3-6. Shortly before this meeting, Flexner had called on Mr. Edward Harkness to ask him to finance site and buildings for the Institute. Miss Grace Moore, Harkness' secretary, who expressed great interest in the Institute, suggested deferring the interview for prudential reasons. It may be assumed that Flexner followed the matter, but there is no further record. See Memo for files, 1/15/32.

18. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/11/32, p. 2.

19. Ibid., p. 5. See Maass to J. R. Hardin, 12/17/31, and Agenda 12/28/31. Hardin papers.

20. Minutes, meeting, Members of the Corporation, 4/24/33, p. 2.

21. Arnold Toynbee to Flexner, 2/6/31.

22. Aydelotte to Flexner, 12/16/30.

23. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31.

24. Oswald Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31. Veblen papers.

25. Weed to Flexner, 12/23/30. Charles R. Morey to Flexner, 12/23/31.

26. Flexner to Aydelotte, Miss Sabin and Weed, 12/11/30.

27. Weed to Flexner, 12/23/30.

28. Miss Sabin to Flexner, 1/12/31.

29. Charles A. Beard to Flexner, 6/28/31; 7/22/31. Flexner to Beard, 6/29/31.

30. Flexner to Beard, 8/11/31. Beard to Flexner, 8/15/31.

31. Raymond B. Fosdick to Flexner, 9/24/31.

32. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31.

33. Paul Hanus to Flexner, 1/22/32.

34. Felix Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31.

35. Alan Gregg to Flexner, 12/14/31.

36. Hans Zinsser to Flexner, 2/2/32.

37. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.

38. Solomon Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/18/31.

39. George D. Birkhoff to Flexner, 11/5/31.

40. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.

41. Flexner to Veblen, 6/25/31. Veblen to Flexner, 7/11/31.

42. Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/18/31.

43. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31. Flexner to Vincent, 12/11/31.

44. Otis Caldwell to Flexner, 2/26/31.

45. Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31.

46. Alfred E. Cohn to Flexner, 12/14/31; 12/28/31. Flexner to Cohn, 1/7/32. Frankfurter papers.

47. Aydelotte to Flexner, 8/30/31.

48. Mrs. Edward M. Earle to Flexner, 8/11/31.

49. Flexner to Mrs. Earle, 9/15/31.

50. Flexner to P. S. Straus, 10/22/31.

51. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31. Flexner to Vincent, 12/11/31.

52. Frederick Keppel to Flexner, 1/12/32.

53. Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31. Flexner to Frankfurter, 9/25/31.

54. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 13.

55. Universities, p. 64.

56. Ibid., p. 152 (note).

57. Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Princeton 1746-1896, Princeton University Press, 1946, p. 390.

58. Princeton University, Official Register for October, 1929, the President's Report, pp. 9-11, Vol. XXI, No. 1.

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

The advice he received in Europe persuaded the Director to open the Institute with a single subject. That subject he became convinced should be mathematics, not only for the reasons urged in his Memorandum on the organization of the Institute, but because he had learned that a remarkable degree of unanimity prevailed among mathematicians in ranking their great contemporaries; this was facilitated by the "vogue" or prominence of one or another branch of the field at any given time, as one mathematician put it. In no other discipline could he hope to find such accord in these respects.

The old ideal of "building the peaks higher" which had inspired the policies of the early General Education Board promised that, if the Institute could enhance the high prestige of Princeton in mathematics, each institution would shine the more radiantly in the general refulgence. There was also the argument he had presented to the Trustees: mathematics led to economics through statistics, and to physics. Both were in his earliest designs, economics in particular because, as he has written, he probably would have become a specialist in political economy had his circumstances been such as to permit post-graduate work.

As for the link with physics, it is interesting to note that his first act toward establishing the School of Mathematics was to convey to Dr. and Mrs. Albert Einstein on behalf of the Founders an invitation to make the Fuld home in South Orange their headquarters during their travel from Germany to Pasadena for the first of three successive

winter quarters during which the Professor worked with the physicists of California Institute of Technology and the astronomers of Mt. Wilson Observatory.[1] The second was to consult Dr. David Eugene Smith, Professor Emeritus of Mathematics at Columbia University, to learn who were the most eminent American and foreign mathematicians of appointable age. Smith told him that while Leonard Dickson of Chicago, then fifty-six years old, was the only "genius" in America, Dr. George D. Birkhoff of Harvard was "also able." Smith hastened to amend this assessment six months later, after hearing Birkhoff lecture at the Sorbonne and consulting with Hadamard, who pronounced Birkhoff to be "nearest to a mathematical genius in the world."[2]

But even before this news, Flexner had visited Birkhoff, and secured his ideas for organizing the School of Mathematics. Dr. Birkhoff wrote:

> In the first place, I would secure permanently one or two mathematicians of great and undisputed genius. These men should be chosen with respect to the importance of the researches which they have under way and only secondarily with reference to their ability to work with other men. However, it would be unfortunate if such a man was not able to work in conjunction with younger men and to have some interest in them. These leaders are to be taken wherever they are to be found.
>
> In the second place, the remainder of the staff would consist mainly of younger men giving promise of unusual talent, to be taken only for a period of years. Such men should be selected absolutely without regard for what is ordinarily called personality, and the salary should be sufficiently high and the duties so congenial that they could be obtained for a period of years without difficulty. It would, however, be a normal expectation that they would go into the academic field after that period...In exceptional cases where the man developed a first-class power he might be retained.
>
> No importance whatever should be attached to keeping a balanced department of mathematics: that is, one in which the various

> fields of mathematics and its applications should be evenly represented. There would, however, be a definite purpose to give equal weight to pure and applied mathematics, because of the increasing importance which mathematics is likely to have for all of science. If I were in your place, I think I should be inclined to make pure mathematics a very cornerstone of the Institute.[3]

In its modesty and simplicity, its emphasis on the importance of work with younger men, this pleased Flexner. It formed the basis for his plan for the first School. Dr. Birkhoff admitted the call for applied mathematics, but pressed also the claim for pure mathematical research. In his report to the Board Flexner took no more definite a stand:

> 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.

He went on to urge the importance of avoiding "immediacy in the realm of research, reflection and contemplation." The Institute should offer opportunities to the man capable of such thinking, as well as to the man of:

> the precisely opposite type of mind...that derives its initial stimulus from a practical need or problem...Minds that are fundamental in their searching, whatever be the spring that moves them...belong in an institute for advanced study.[4]

By contrast, the plans proposed by Drs. Oswald Veblen and Solomon Lefschetz of Princeton were more ambitious. Thus Veblen wrote in answer to a request for his advice:

> I favor a departmental organization. Each department should be large enough to perpetuate a tradition. The decline of Johns Hopkins was due in part to the fact that most of its departments were one-man shows. In a mathematics department I would suggest having three members of the permanent staff in each of three age groups: 0-35, 35-45, 45-0. A laboratory department would presumably be smaller. Also one dealing with a less composite subject....[5]

Dr. Lefschetz recommended the appointment of all the prominent American and European modern geometers.[6]

Oswald Veblen was an impressive figure in his field. He had come to Princeton as a preceptor in 1905, and worked with Dean Henry Burchard Fine and Dr. Luther P. Eisenhart through the years to build the Department of Mathematics to its present eminence. During the year 1923-1924 he served as President of the American Mathematical Society. He was asked by Dr. Simon Flexner, then a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation as well as Director of Laboratories for the Rockefeller Institute, to give him arguments for the inauguration of National Research Council fellowships in mathematics like those already being given in physics and chemistry, which were the indirect result of an earlier suggestion made by him. Dr. Veblen had complied, writing of the interdependence of the sciences and mathematics, and even ascribing to certain mathematical researches heuristic effects which led Albert Einstein to develop the general theory of relativity.[7] The fellowships in mathematics were promptly begun, financed as were the others by the Rockefeller Foundation, and administered by a single Board with those in the natural sciences at Veblen's request, on the ground that "it will have the effect of stimulating interest on the part of mathematicians in problems of physics and chemistry. This sort of broadening of the interests of the mathematicians in this country is very desirable at the present time," he said.

In 1924 Dr. Veblen showed his own statesmanship in promoting mathematical research by urging Dr. Simon Flexner and Dr. Vernon Kellogg of the National Academy of Science to support the foundation of an institute devoted exclusively to mathematical research. In this his plea was

based on the lot of the young scholar who earned an academic appointment because he had performed some worthy research, then found himself so worn by teaching freshmen and sophomores that he lost the urge to work creatively. Veblen insisted that mathematical research should be dignified as a "profession." The creative thinker in the natural sciences was not wasted so prodigally, because laboratories were expensive, and to waste the talents of the men who used them was obviously uneconomical. As an alternative to an institute, he suggested that the outstanding mathematician might be subsidized to conduct his researches in the institute with which he was connected, thus following the example of the Yarrow professorships of the Royal Society.[8] For that project Dr. Simon referred Veblen to his brother Abraham at the General Education Board, who in turn introduced him to Dr. Wickliffe Rose, the new President of the Board. This was evidently the first meeting of Flexner and Veblen. Out of it grew the Science Research Foundation at Princeton University, which had such a marked success in stimulating the faculty, Trustees and even alumni to put Princeton in the forefront of American universities in the sciences and mathematics.

There is no record of any further contacts between the two until January, 1930, when Flexner saw the Professor quoted as saying "that America still lacks a genuine seat of learning, and that American academic work is inferior in quality to the best abroad." Flexner, then in negotiations with the Founders, asked the Professor for a copy of his speech. But Veblen had spoken without notes. However, he took the occasion to renew his contact with the educator, writing:

> Here in Princeton the [science] research fund which we owe largely to you and your colleagues in the General Education Board is having an influence in the right direction, and I think our new mathematical building [Fine Hall] which is going to be devoted entirely to research and advanced instruction will also help considerably. I think my mathematical research institute, which has not yet found favor, may turn out to be one of the next steps.[9]

Nothing was more natural than his next letter to Dr. Flexner in June after the announcement of the new Foundation for the Institute for Advanced Study. Now he said that he knew why Flexner had written him in January. To this Flexner replied that, curious as it might seem, "this whole development had taken place since the first of March."[10]

Flexner met the Professor during his visits to President John Grier Hibben of Princeton University, and solicited advices which he reviewed carefully during the summer of 1931 as he prepared his Confidential Memorandum. A further chance meeting in December, 1931, reminded the Director that he had not asked Veblen's comments on the Memorandum, which he promptly did, receiving assurances which he found to be singularly gratifying. Veblen agreed diplomatically with the general tenor, but differed on the need to start with a man of genius:

> You indicate that you would not go ahead in a particular field if you were not able to get 'the right man.' My belief is that in most fields, there are sufficiently many good men so that you can surely get a man of the right sort. For example, if you cannot secure the man whom you have picked out and who I agree is the best first choice, there are a number of others who are surely as good and who may, in fact, be better....
>
> Your program is experimental only in its details. The general idea is perfectly conservative and is regarded as sound by every competent judge...[11]

Flexner again recognized the difference between Birkhoff's and Veblen's plans. He agreed that the Princeton man was probably right;

one man was only a "nucleus," while the "mathematical set" is unquestionably under modern conditions the correct conception. But Flexner had always conceded that the near presence of intellectual associates was the chief reason for locating an institute near a university, and so was not necessarily abandoning Birkhoff's position, much as Dr. Veblen perhaps hoped he was.[12]

Professor Veblen was going away on his sabbatical year. Flexner asked him to keep in touch, and to give him the advantage of any thinking he did on the subject of the Institute. Professor Veblen sent one letter. From New Orleans, where he heard Dr. Birkhoff speak, he wrote: "I am more than ever convinced that your choice is a good one. He evidently has a lot of genuine mathematics in him yet."[13]

Veblen was an impressive counsellor. Tall and handsome, clear and concise in his speaking and writing, highly held in the world of mathematics which Flexner had always found recondite, Veblen was clothed with another attraction in Flexner's mind because he was the nephew of his famous uncle, Thorstein Veblen. There was enough of the rebel in Abraham Flexner to provoke his admiration for the elder critic of American education. He must have read Thorstein Veblen's The Higher Learning in America carefully, and found some of the sociologist's ideas strikingly like his own. He even paraphrased some of the elder Veblen's colorful terms in describing the ills of American universities.[14] Indeed, Flexner had shattered several icons himself, notably at Oxford. But his forte was essentially different from that of the older man: he sought to accomplish reforms, while Thorstein Veblen sought to break the forms.

That the younger Veblen had some of his uncle's qualities

Flexner perhaps appreciated; he noted the sharp mind, the assurance of academic authority; the distaste for the power of money in educational institutions. But it was not the nephew's way to revolt openly or to indulge his rancor unwisely. His genius was to have his way, and not to leave or be forced from the field of battle. This must, if Flexner realized it, have established some bond between them, for that was his way, too. While Thorstein roamed from one university to another, having exhausted the founts successively, Oswald, with the same passions seething in him, played to win on the field where he was. After twenty-one years of fierce but restrained anger with the Princeton Trustees and the traditionalist alumni he was appointed Fine Professor of Mathematical Research in 1926, the most coveted chair within the gift of the Trustees in his field.

According to the Director's memoires, he met Dr. Albert Einstein quite fortuitously at the very end of his fortnight's visit to the California Institute of Technology, the single institution which had given him the courage of its example since 1922. The Institute, small and lofty, had demonstrated that the true seeker after scientific knowledge would cross the Continent to study under its small but illustrious faculty in the sciences. Dr. Einstein was spending his second winter working with the physicists at Pasadena and the astronomers at Mt. Wilson. The meeting took place as political and economic ruin faced the German Republic, and though Flexner said they discussed the Institute for Advanced Study alone, it is doubtful that the significance of the physicist's presence in the United States was not recognized as being related to what was going on overseas. When they parted, it was with the understanding

they would meet at Oxford University in the spring.[15]

The California Institute of Technology was suffering sadly from the failure of the Flemming Trust, a substantial part of its endowment which had been pledged in 1921 to call Dr. Robert A. Millikan from the University of Chicago. Millikan was compelled to raise special funds for each of Einstein's visits. It was a sorrow to Einstein that the amount was insufficient to permit his mathematical assistant to accompany him. It was Millikan's sorrow that he could not in the circumstances offer the physicist a permanent appointment. Of these and other aspects of the situation Flexner was well aware as he left for the East, stopping off to visit the Founders in their vacation retreat in Arizona. An exchange of letters following his arrival in New York revealed a rare warmth in Mr. Bamberger's attitude, and cautious optimism in Flexner's. Mr. Bamberger wrote:

> After your departure from here we consoled ourselves with the fact that we had some delightful talks with you, and thought we had learned to know each other better. I can also visualize more than ever the great prospects of the Institute and its wonderful possibilities.[16]

In a letter which crossed Bamberger's in the mails, Flexner wrote:

> I saw Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass and told them the substance of what I told you and Mrs. Fuld regarding my conference at Pasadena. They were both thrilled at the possibilities, but, of course, we cannot count any 'unhatched chickens.'
>
> I shall in a cautious way open negotiations with Birkhoff and /Hermann/ Weyl, and shall endeavor to keep in touch with Professor Einstein, but I shall keep within the financial limits which we mentioned in our conference....
>
> I do hope it may be feasible to perfect an arrangement which will enable us to give Einstein the opportunity which in my opinion he cannot now enjoy either in Germany or in Pasadena.[17]

Hermann Weyl of the Institute for Mathematics at Göttingen had held the Jones chair in mathematical physics at Princeton for one year (1928-1929), then resigning to return to Europe to make himself available to succeed David Hilbert at Göttingen. He did so in 1930, thus achieving his life's ambition. In other circumstances he could have looked forward to occupy this most illustrious chair in world mathematics until he too retired. But the inflation of the twenties had wiped out his savings, and left him apprehensive of his financial welfare in the future, especially since he had two sons to educate. He was in the early forties. He could not see his future clearly in Germany, and accordingly wrote his former colleagues at Princeton that he might consider another appointment in the United States.[18] Flexner, armed with this information, sent the Professor material on the Institute for Advanced Study, and offered to visit him in the spring should he wish to consider an appointment. A lively correspondence ensued, during which Flexner encouraged conversation between Weyl and Veblen, who was to lecture at Göttingen in early spring.

Meanwhile, Flexner saw and wrote to Dr. Birkhoff, proposing an offer with very liberal terms which he was prepared to recommend to the Board should the mathematician indicate his acceptance, adding

> You will select your own students, and in cooperation with your colleagues carry on your work in the way that seems to you most effective....Your appointment would begin October 1, 1932....I may add that it is in our minds to round out the personnel of the School of Mathematics by inviting one or two other distinguished mathematicians to participate in its development...It is impossible for me to say at the present time who they will be, but I can confidently say that we shall endeavor to select only those who hold the same high standard of scholarship that has drawn my attention to you.[19]

Cruel indecision now assailed Birkhoff. Aware as he must have been from the beginning of the Director's intentions, he reviewed his situation at Harvard, the very summit of American academic distinction in his mid-Western eyes, and found it impossible to turn away from the course he had entered upon when in 1912 he had left an associate professorship at Princeton to take an assistant professorship at Harvard. He suffered several changes of mind; his occasional resolves to come to the Institute were supported by the advice of his friend and mentor, Dean R. G. D. Richardson of Brown University, who had great confidence in Flexner, and was certain that the Institute would benefit Birkhoff's career as well as American mathematics. But constant counter-pressure from Harvard prevailed, and finally Birkhoff visited Flexner personally, withdrawing his last acceptance, and confirming it later in a note saying that he could not leave Cambridge because of "personal reasons."[20]

Flexner was sorely disappointed and not a little embarrassed. He had told the Founders of the earlier acceptance, and of Birkhoff's pleasure at his prospects. The reversal of field was not comprehensible to the businessman. Moreover, Flexner had promised the Board a nomination at the next meeting, and now had none. The minutes made no mention of Birkhoff, Einstein or Weyl, but with the agenda Flexner sent a brief memorandum to the Trustees about his conversation with Dr. Einstein. Birkhoff was not mentioned, for later Dr. Aydelotte called Flexner's attention to an item in Scripta Mathematica for December, 1932, saying that Dr. Birkhoff had been offered and had declined appointment as "director" of the School of Mathematics at the Institute. Flexner's repressed reply showed how he bitterly resented the violation of the

confidential relationship which should have prevailed. To Aydelotte he admitted the offer, and said that Birkhoff accepted, then declined for "reasons which I do not care to discuss."[21] At the meeting of the Trustees the President spoke in defense of the Director:

> It may perhaps seem that our progress has been slow, but I have kept in close touch with the Director, and I am sure that what may now appear to be very deliberate procedure will in the end be justified by the thoroughness and care which are being exercised so as to avoid every possible mistake and so as to profit by the experience, present and past, of other institutions.[22]

He cautioned the members to undertake nothing more than current income would carry, and advocated setting aside an annual reserve. The Board authorized the Director to go to Europe, and to submit "one or two" staff appointments to it in October, or to the Executive Committee earlier.

Business and financial conditions offered little basis for optimism as he spoke. The great depression was crushing men and financial institutions inexorably. There seemed to be no stopping point in the collapse of economic activity in fact or in logic. Approximately one-fourth of America's wage and salary earners were jobless. Personal incomes had fallen by more than half during the preceding three years. Unrest among the unemployed and the farmers of the Midwest, who militantly resisted give-away prices for their produce and forced sales of their homes, farms and chattels for debt and taxes, engendered such concern that President Hoover is reported to have excepted the pay of enlisted men in the armed forces as he recommended cuts in all federal salaries, "because, in case of trouble, he did not want to have to rely on troops disgruntled over pay cuts."[23] Nor did leaders in finance, industry, and government offer constructive hope of recovery; the depression seemed

destined in their judgment "to hit bottom," which could mean the collapse of all the country's traditional financial institutions. What then would be the worth of the securities upon which Mr. Bamberger and the Institute depended for income?

As Flexner embarked for Europe, he found himself in a lonely and critical situation. The keystone of his plans was to appoint to the leading position in the School the country's most distinguished American mathematician, who would be familiar with developments in the field here and abroad, and with its outstanding scholars and the potentials of the younger men and women in this country. He felt that the Institute's mission was to develop culture in the United States as German Wissenschaft had been consciously promoted in the nineteenth century. As he was to write Veblen later: "It is our prime and essential function...We must try to develop an American culture and civilization...comparable in value to those of the Western European countries..."[24] He had counted heavily on Birkhoff, undeniably the outstanding American mathematician of his generation. Now he must find a substitute. He looked forward to seeing Veblen at Göttingen; the Princeton man certainly did not think it essential that the new Institute must have Birkhoff!

As Flexner arrived in France at the end of April, he received a letter from Veblen at Göttingen, who reported that while Dr. Weyl seemed willing to come to America, Mrs. Weyl seemed to be "very satisfied with her position in Göttingen."[25] Flexner had intended to call at Göttingen first, but on hearing of a death in Weyl's family, spent some days in France, then went to England, where he made inquiries about mathematicians and economists, finally meeting Dr. Einstein at Oxford on the 19th of May

by appointment for a long walk and talk in Christ Church Meadows. There he put the fateful question: would the physicist accept a professorship at the Institute? Einstein's answer was not decisive; he would give it firmly if Flexner could visit him at Caputh early in June. But the atmosphere was distinctly favorable to Flexner's purpose, as it was unfavorable to the fortunes of the German Republic. For the first of the climactic events which were to lead in less than a year to Hitler's accession to the chancellorship had already taken place.

Dr. Philip Frank has written that in 1921 Einstein foresaw the fate of the Republic, and predicted that he could remain in Germany for no longer than a decade. Now, wrote Dr. Frank, the physicist regarded Dr. Flexner's offer as a "sign from heaven" that he should prepare to migrate to America.[26]

When they met at Caputh on the 4th of June, Einstein agreed to come to the Institute, and terms were discussed. After a long talk, Dr. Einstein walked to the Berlin bus with Flexner, and the words "Ich bin Feuer und Flamme dafür" rang in the Director's ears as he took his departure.[27] After an exchange or two between them, the terms were agreed in writing, and the Einsteins expressed their complete satisfaction. Dr. Einstein was to free himself from his Berlin connections, and to inform Dr. Millikan that after the winter of 1933 he would come to Pasadena no more.[28] The Berlin authorities were quite agreeable, provided Dr. Einstein would spend his summers near Berlin, where he had a summer home. But Dr. Millikan objected strenuously, taking his case directly to Flexner, and telling him what he already knew: that had it not been for the

California Institute of Technology's serious financial situation, he would have offered the physicist a permanent appointment which Einstein would have accepted. It would be good for science, Millikan urged, if the two Institutes could cooperate; in particular, if Einstein could make periodic visits not only to Pasadena, but to other groups of productive scientists in the United States. But Flexner declined to sanction such arrangements, on the ground that Einstein needed peace for his work, and a fixed abode. With this position Einstein heartily agreed, writing Flexner that his work "should not be interrupted by any undertakings which would involve membership in another institution."[29]

Dr. George Hale of Mt. Wilson understood this perfectly, he wrote Flexner:

> I am glad to receive your letter from Canada, and I wish to congratulate you in your arrangement with Professor Einstein. It is a matter of the highest importance to science that he be guaranteed complete peace of mind and security for the future. You have not only accomplished this, but you have assured also that his personal influence will continue to be felt in this country, where it is greatly needed. The Institute for Advanced Study has already justified its foundation.[30]

Flexner made a single visit to Göttingen at the end of May, and saw both Veblen and Weyl. He then left to keep his appointment with Einstein, evidently intending to return. But on the way to Berlin he learned of the serious illness and death of his wife's uncle and former guardian, which caused him to return promptly to this country after doing what he could to comfort his wife, who was in Vienna. He had not concluded an arrangement with Dr. Weyl, whom he had expected to visit again before leaving Europe. But he wrote him saying that as soon as he wished to receive it, a written statement of the terms he was prepared to ask the

Board to approve would be sent.

His conversation with Dr. Veblen had an outcome which he may or may not have anticipated. The Professor gave a number of reasons why it would be desirable to call him to the Institute, insisting that it would neither harm the University's Department of Mathematics, nor prejudice future cooperation with the University. Flexner had evidently satisfied himself in England of Dr. Veblen's high standing among American mathematicians, but withdrew from Göttingen without having made him an offer. From Berlin he wrote Veblen of the news he had received and his imminent departure from Europe, which would prevent his return to Göttingen, and continued:

> As to you, my mind is clear. If Miss /Gwethalyn/ Jones and Professor /Luther P./ Eisenhart interpose no obstacles which hinder you, I shall on hearing affirmatively recommend your appointment on the following terms:....
>
> Your service to begin next fall, though the Institute itself cannot expect to operate until the fall of 1933...All other details to be left in abeyance, until I return to America and see what the financial situation is, Yesterday's Frankfurter Zeitung contained a speech by Senator Reed that was very dark...
>
> I look forward confidently to co-operation in the development of a mathematical institute. I want no needless delay, but on the other hand we must heed the general conditions and pledge ourselves to do nothing we cannot easily live up to.[31]

Even before he had Veblen's acceptance the Director wrote of this commitment to his secretary, Mrs. Esther Bailey, putting his action forward not only on the ground that Veblen was one of the ablest of American mathematicians, but also that he was

> the man on whose judgment I can most fully rely.../Veblen/ thought the Princeton authorities would feel it a great distinction for him, and that they would interpose no difficulty

whatsoever. As for himself, he looked upon it as the greatest opportunity of his life.[32]

The letter was for later use. On the 14th of June, Flexner cabled Mrs. Bailey the happy news that Dr. Einstein had accepted the offer, and that terms were agreeably arranged. Then Mrs. Bailey, fearing that the news of these confidential matters might become public, took the news in both the letter and the cable to the Founders in Newark.[33]

Meanwhile Flexner insisted that he be the first to communicate his arrangement with Veblen to Dean Eisenhart, since he was concerned "that every step I take shall be marked by the utmost courtesy and consideration for you and for those at Princeton who...have helped me so freely and generously." Again he warned Veblen that he had authority for only three appointments, and could not exceed it.[34] Dr. Veblen accepted the offer on the 5th of June, recapitulating the arguments Flexner should advance to Eisenhart and Miss Jones by which he justified leaving the Fine chair. He could not decline the generous retirement benefits promised for himself, and for his wife should she survive him. Moreover, the Department of Mathematics was top-heavy with senior men; his going would benefit his colleagues -- indeed, one or two more might leave with even greater benefit -- making way for necessary promotions, the accession of younger men, and even the calling of an arrivée. He had long wanted to establish an institute for mathematical research, and to refuse now to do so would be illogical. He would continue in the new position what he and Eisenhart had done together in the past: i.e., build mathematics in the United States "and on a larger scale in the same direction." Bearing out the last statement, he enclosed a prospective

budget of over $160,000, together with the names of more than a score of men as prospects, on most of whom he and Weyl were in agreement.[35]

Dr. Flexner arrived in the United States on the 21st of June, cabling Dr. Veblen the next day of Dean Eisenhart's "enthusiastic approval," and his promise to communicate directly with Veblen after he had talked with the Acting President, Henry Duffield. On the 28th Flexner cabled the Executive Committee had approved his appointment and wrote a long letter cautioning the mathematician again that financial conditions made it imperative to confine appointments to the three mentioned. He added:

> Anyone who desires contact with a larger group can get it, so Eisenhart assures me, with the Princeton graduate group. We need at the top in each subject a few men of proved eminence. The number whom we will wish to keep permanently will, as at the Rockefeller Institute /for Medical Research/ be relatively small....Eisenhart was most generous about offering space for the mathematics staff and for me in Fine Hall, and for the present we shall undoubtedly accept his invitation.[36]

The two mathematicians at Göttingen, having made so impressive a start toward a large faculty, now found it impossible to adapt to so limited a program as this. To Veblen, who had been warned in Flexner's letter of conditional appointment, it was less of a surprise but more acceptable, while to Weyl, whose thinking as yet showed irresolution even should the limits of his wishes be realized, the modesty of Flexner's present concept seemed most disturbing. The Director took pains to reassure him, but to little avail. Finally Flexner firmly wrote that no additions to staff could be made until the first three appointees should assemble in Princeton and agree on a program. That this was wise is shown by the fact that already Weyl and Veblen in their separate letters

confidentially expressed misgivings to the Director at what the other wanted. Thus Weyl wrote that he found no stimulus in the prospect of close association with either Einstein or Veblen, though he conceded that Veblen would make an excellent "leading spirit" in the School. Meanwhile Veblen wrote that he saw little reason for Weyl's insistence on the accession of an algebraist, since Professor J. H. M. Wedderburn of the Department was one of the best in the world.[37] Flexner said what he could to alleviate these concerns. While the prospects undoubtedly alarmed Weyl, they stiffened Veblen's determination and sped his planning. He wrote Dean Eisenhart proposing a policy of complete freedom between the two institutions in the transfer of personnel from one to the other. (See p. 147) Eisenhart agreed with Flexner that discussion of such problems must await Veblen's return to Princeton, observing quietly: "from my knowledge of Veblen I know that his mind will raise many questions and we cannot go into long-range discussions of them."[38]

Meanwhile Mr. Bamberger had insisted that Dr. Einstein's salary and retirement annuity with its contingent commitment to his wife as survivor be made equal to Veblen's. Einstein agreed gracefully, saying that it was clear he would need the additional money to help friends and relatives in Germany.[39]

It soon became apparent that the action embarrassed the Director, undoubtedly because he had intended to offer Dr. Weyl more than he had to either Einstein or Veblen. In mid-August when Weyl and Aydelotte, who visited him, cabled that he needed a written offer for his negotiations with the Ministry of Education, Flexner showed perturbation, and asked Mr. Bamberger to call a meeting of the Executive Committee in New York to

discuss the matter. This Mr. Bamberger declined to do, wiring that "if Professor Weyl is seriously interested, he will come on terms that you could reasonably offer." Several days elapsed, during which Flexner prepared a lengthy memorandum justifying in detail the appointment of Veblen as well as of Weyl, and sending a letter for Weyl offering terms equaling those of the other two, which Mr. Bamberger was to mail direct to Göttingen if he found it satisfactory. Cheerily came Bamberger's answering wire: "Have mailed your letter to Professor Weyl today...entirely satisfactory." In a letter of the same day, he wrote:

> Mrs. Fuld and I are quite enthused over the splendid work you have done for the Institute, carrying out the policy you first outlined. I trust you will not overtax your strength in this great work, as we appreciate you have given it much serious thought. Please remember that you are on vacation and allow nothing connected with the Institute to interfere with your holiday.[40]

Dr. Weyl, deeply fearful for his financial security, and still undecided, was evidently disappointed. He did not accept the liberal offer until further adverse political events occurred in Germany, cabling his acceptance "in principle" on the 2nd of December. The delay deprived the Director of the pleasure of recommending three instead of two major appointments to the Board at its October meeting. It also delayed the fine showing he had hoped to make to the University in demonstrating the mutuality of benefits flowing from the presence of the Institute at Princeton. To bring Dr. Weyl back to the Princeton community of scholars where he had been so highly valued was perhaps only slightly less of a triumph than to bring Dr. Einstein. For Princeton University had given the scientific and lay worlds reason to know how highly it valued the controversial physicist in 1921, when it alone of American universities had

honored him.

Dr. Einstein first visited the United States in that year on a tour with Dr. Chaim Weizmann in support of the Zionist cause and of the University of Jerusalem. On the 9th of May, 1921, Princeton awarded Einstein an honorary degree, President Hibben speaking in German with moving sentiment: "We salute the new Columbus of science, voyaging through the strange seas of thought alone." Shortly after that, Einstein delivered a series of lectures at the University on the theory of relativity, which were the high point of what Dr. Philip Frank has called "an event in the cultural history of the 20th century."[41] These memories left a distinct impress of shared greatness on the University and its mathematicians and physicists. In 1925 Princeton had offered Dr. Einstein a professorship, which he declined graciously with an epigram variously rendered as "Man is an animal, but woman is a vegetable, whom to move is to uproot," or "One must not disturb a flowering plant."[42] Both alluded to Mrs. Einstein, who was reluctant to leave Berlin.

A rumor from Germany was published in August, 1932, that Einstein was coming to the Institute, and the press tried in vain to confirm it. Flexner confided only in the Founders and one or two of the Trustees. The Board met in a mood of high anticipation. But the minutes do not reflect any elation. Flexner's taste was for underplaying the moment of triumph, if his memoires are any guide to his sense of dramatics, and this event seemed to be no exception. His report concerned itself with what he regarded as most important to impress upon the minds of Trustees and Founders at this moment -- that salaries and retirement benefits to members of the Institute's faculty would be so liberal that they would be expected to devote

their full time to work at the Institute, and not to engage in outside activities for gain. He had hoped to recommend a start in economics simultaneously, but had not been able to find "the personnel." Finally, it was his expectation that the Institute would begin active work the next autumn. Then in what must have been an elaborately casual manner, he presented motions for the appointment of Albert Einstein and Oswald Veblen and their assistants. The Board approved all. Flexner then reported that Princeton University had offered office space in Fine Hall to the School of Mathematics and himself until such time as the Institute could occupy its own building. The Trustees then formally decided that the Institute should locate in or near Princeton, and accepted the University's hospitable offer with expressions of deep appreciation.[43]

The Director and the University authorities had prepared press notices in cooperation, the Institute announcing the historic event with cool restraint, and the University welcoming the Institute cordially to the community, and temporarily to Fine Hall. Flexner had given his friend and admirer, Dr. John Finley, Editor of the New York Times, background material with the adjuration that "you soft-pedal me." He continued:

> It is the idea I should like to see expounded...the less made of me personally the better for the object which we have at heart. I think too that, while we should not wish any definite statement made as to salaries, it would be wholesome to emphasize that salaries, retiring allowances and widow's pensions will be such that the teaching staff will refrain from activities undertaken solely for remuneration.[44]

The Times gave him full credit for his past and present contributions to American education, however, and the text devoted to his accomplishments exceeded that given Dr. Einstein. Over a page was devoted to all facets

of the story, and photographs of Einstein, Flexner and Fine Hall were displayed. Unfortunately, Einstein was said to have received "a life appointment" as "head of the...School of Mathematics." The main features of the Institute for Advanced Study were recalled: the concentration of both the faculty and their few students upon investigation and research; emphasis upon the individual outstanding graduate student rather than on the "standardized products of university professional schools;" and the points Flexner wanted stressed with respect to liberal provisions in salaries and security. Of particular interest are the following two paragraphs for the new information they contained.

> Students will be selected on the basis of their aptitude for the work rather than on the possession of formal college degrees. It is expected, of course, that most of the students will enter with Ph. D. degrees or their equivalent....
>
> It is understood that ten students is the largest number that any one has suggested for any one professor to work with; and if a professor feels that he can work better with as few as five or six, or even with only two or three, it will be left to his judgment to work that way. Each professor will decide for himself whether to work with seminars or groups, or to work with each student individually.

An editorial devoted to an approving review of Flexner's career in education, and to the new experiment, ended with the following statement, which appeared to be in the nature of an announcement:

> The Institute will not carry in its title the memory of its Founders, but they are to be congratulated upon seizing such an opportunity to establish and perpetuate such a Fellowship of Scholars.[45]

The Director received many personal messages which reflected sentiments like those expressed by Dr. Weed, usually a reserved man:

> You have achieved a perfect balance between the outstanding world figure and the best of the American school; it is the most desirable combination that we could have for the inaug-

> uration of a great undertaking in mathematics. Comment here in Baltimore is widespread, and universal approval and commendation are heard on every side. I am more proud than ever to be connected with the new Institute even in a thoroughly minor capacity.[46]

Dr. Charles Beard, so critical of the start in mathematics, now wrote:

> Hearty congratulations on the achievement of your purpose in grand style. In Einstein you have not only an unquestioned master but a rare human spirit. It's perfect. You may be right in starting with a man and a subject beyond controversy. Anyway, though I argued for the humanities, (despite the impossibility of the thing) I cannot withhold my admiration for a perfect job, perfectly done.[47]

From Dr. Edward Capps, Flexner's old friend and adviser in his days at the General Education Board in matters concerning the humanities, who was Professor of Classics at Princeton, and Chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School for Classical Studies at Athens, came a two-edged thrust:

> I am reminded to write you because of the great news contained in this morning's paper...It is to me personally a great satisfaction that you have chosen Princeton as the seat of the Institute; the presence here of the Institute will be a constant stimulus to higher studies in the University, even if you rob us of our most distinguished men...[48]

Perhaps the least enthusiastic letter came from Mr. Frankfurter, who, when reminded that a letter was in order, wrote:

> I rejoice that your show is under way. Feeling as you do about mathematics in relation to a new community of scholars, of course you have bagged big game. But I hope -- and it's too late in the day for me to learn the art of dissembling -- that you will cease to become front-page news. Precisely the opposite, I take it, it the real objective of your enterprise, and certainly its greatest need: namely, subtly and powerfully to permeate the atmosphere of America with a realization that there may be matters of great importance....that do not make the front page.

When Flexner protested that he was not seeking publicity, Frankfurter rejoined:

> My point was not that you were making the front page, but that the Institute was. You, more than anyone else, are sponsoring an almost cloistered austerity in scholarship and learning. Of course you cannot effectuate your purpose if you are seeking Einsteins for your society of scholars.... You cannot keep the Einsteins off the front page. The very significance of your enterprise is the promotion of silent, ephemerally unrecognized radiations of thought and standards which will command the future.[49]

Flexner's complete answer had to wait. Not until 1960 and the posthumous publication of his revised autobiography were the essential compulsions under which he acted made clear:

> It is obvious to anyone who looks critically at the development of the Institute that it had to start with a group of highly distinguished men....It had to bring together a mathematical group that would at once attract the attention of their peers, and in their setting would succeed.[50]

Indeed, he did have to impress the Trustees, and particularly the Founders, with more than the appearance of a moderate academic success. The calling of Albert Einstein did this as no other appointment could have done. Up to this time, the Institute was an abstraction, a concept in the Director's mind, without physical attributes in men or plant. There was yet a long way to go, but the promised presence of the lone "voyager through the strange seas of thought" immediately gave the Institute the stamp of greatness. The Trustees, and again particularly the Founders, shared with American millions the wonderment and affection evoked by the physicist, an admiration touched with reverence for his mind and its mysterious achievements which they could not comprehend, and for a spiritual quality which they felt instinctively. Professor Veblen's appointment meant much to American mathematics and mathematicians; he had long been known as an astute and indefatigable promoter of

their interests, as well as a distinguished contributor to mathematical thought.

An editorial in the Princeton Alumni Weekly of the 14th of October revealed mixed feelings at the University:

> There has been some questioning of the value to Princeton on the grounds that Dr. Flexner, with his challenging theory of research and his practical means of putting it into effect, will draw men away from the University. This line of reasoning is not quite sound: the question is not whether we should prefer to have Professor Einstein on our faculty or on Dr. Flexner's, but whether we should prefer to have him in Princeton or Berlin. Similarly, everyone will regret that Professor Veblen, one of Princeton's ablest mathematicians, has left the University faculty, but assuming that Dr. Flexner could attract him anyway, the question is whether we should rather have him living in Princeton or some place else. Dr. Flexner was bound to build up a strong faculty; we are pleased that it will be near us.
>
> Opportunity for scholarly development is one of the prime factors considered by teachers in changing from one university to another. Included under this head are a good library, well-equipped laboratories, a reasonable teaching schedule, and the chance for associations with leaders in scholarly work. If Dr. Flexner's group helps to make Princeton more famous as a center of research, we will have a better chance of competing on even terms with sister institutions which are as anxious as we are to strengthen their facilities.[51]

This line of reasoning appealed to those who wanted the University to advance the interests of scholarship and research; needless to say, it did not have the same effect upon those among faculty, trustees and alumni who valued more highly the traditions of the College of New Jersey. Nor did it still the criticism of those who felt that if the Institute needed and wanted to be near the University, it should recruit its faculty elsewhere.

It will be recalled that Professor Veblen raised a serious question with Dean Eisenhart on this matter from Göttingen. Then he had

written:

> The first problem of cooperation between the University and the new Institute that occurs to me is that of making it clear that membership in either one is no obstacle to getting a good job in the other. We shall not let a situation arise in which a young man would hesitate to come to one... for fear of missing a better chance in the other later on. Flexner naturally does not want the University to feel that he is going to drain it of its good men. By the time the Institute is a going concern the problem will be a fully reciprocal one, and I think it ought to be looked at in this way from the start.[52]

When the Director, the Dean and Professor Veblen met in mid-November to discuss this and other policies, Flexner knew that the Professor differed with his viewpoint, but he was serene in the conviction that it was his own responsibility to make policy with the University, subject to the approval of his Trustees, and in the confidence that his wishes would be respected by Veblen. Thus he wrote Dean Eisenhart after the conference:

> More and more a few points stand out fairly clearly not because of any possible difference of opinion between you and Veblen and me, but because we are setting precedents and establishing relations which we hope will prove sound after all three of us are dead and gone. I am giving you these impressions for what they are worth, and I want you to understand first of all, that I have not the slightest desire to be consulted with reference to your concerns. Our chances for perfect harmony, understanding, and cooperation are best if each of us goes his own way, talking things over as freely as possible as long as we are on the job but leaving our successors precisely the same kind of freedom that we now enjoy.
>
> With this general view in mind, let me say that I would not for the world do anything to mar the great work in mathematics that is going on at Princeton....You were generous in letting us have Veblen, and I assume that in so doing you felt sure that you could fill the post without lowering the prestige of the Department, but quite obviously this cannot often happen at this stage of the game of our academic development...Merely moving men from one place on the checkerboard to another does not modify the general situation in respect to scholarship in this country. I would not therefore if I could injure seriously

> any university department and though this involves a sacrifice on the part of individuals, it is a sacrifice that at this stage of our intellectual and scholarly development we must make...
>
> While I am clear in my mind as to this I am equally clear that as long as you and Veblen and I are in command, we can talk about things with the utmost vigor and candor, because I believe we all have at heart the same interests...So please do not let this caution on my part interfere with the frank exchange of views in the future.[53]

This letter was not merely an exercise in semantics. It related to the fact that, as Professor Veblen wrote to Dr. Weyl, though financial conditions were still bad, the psychological atmosphere was improving, with the effect that the limitation to three major appointments in the School of Mathematics was now definitely discarded. There were to be no junior appointments such as assistant or associate professors, and students to be admitted must have taken their doctoral degree and be acceptable to the professors. The Director, he said, awaited Dr. Weyl's decision before taking further action on personnel. Veblen said that he was thinking of calling in men from American and European universities for periods of one or two years, and suggested that "a possible way of...getting someone in modern algebra" would be to invite Artin and Albert to come for a year at the same time, possibly for the next year. Also, Flexner had authorized him to inquire about bringing Dr. Kurt Gödel for the next year. Veblen also discussed the site for the Institute, but said that Fine Hall was very pleasant; he would like to stay there as long as possible, adding: "Perhaps we can stay here permanently."[54]

Dr. Flexner apologetically asked Veblen for a copy of this letter, explaining that he felt keenly that they should both say the

same thing to Dr. Weyl, plagued as he was by indecision and problems. And at the same time he alluded to relations with the Department of Mathematics, saying:

> I wrote Eisenhart a letter summing up the situation as it now looks to me, but my mind is quite open, and it may be that I shall see things differently in the course of time. Don't be impatient with the slowness with which I seem to move. I can decide things if I have to, but in this new venture and in dealing with subjects with which I am unfamiliar, I am a slow learner.[55]

Clearly Professor Veblen contemplated taking another professor from the Department of Mathematics, and Flexner was resisting the idea. The Dean was well aware of the dangers in Veblen's thinking and probable course of action, which were only magnified by the Director's failure to understand the true nature of the problem. He wrote Flexner:

> I agree with you that the relationship of the Institute and our Department of Mathematics must be thought of as a matter of policy extending over the years. Accordingly I am of the opinion that any of its members should be considered for appointment to the Institute on his merits alone and not with reference to whether for the time being his possible withdrawal from the Department would give the impression that such withdrawal would weaken the Department. For if this were not the policy, we should be at a disadvantage in recruiting our personnel from time to time. If our trustees and alumni were disturbed by such a withdrawal, as you suggest, they should meet it by giving us at least as full opportunity to make replacements intended to maintain our distinction. The only disadvantage to us of such withdrawal would arise if we were hampered in any way in continuing the policy which has brought us to the position we now occupy. This policy has been to watch the field carefully and try out men of promise at every possible opportunity. If it is to be the policy of the Institute to have young men here on temporary appointment, this would enable us to be in a much better position to watch the field.
>
> In my opinion the ideas here set forth are so important for the future of our Department that it is my intention to present them to the Curriculum Committee of our Board of Trustees at its meeting next month, after I have had an opportunity to discuss them further with you next week.[56]

Events now moved swiftly, perhaps hastened by the cable of the 2nd of December from Dr. Weyl accepting the appointment "in principle." Evidence that Professor Veblen was putting pressure of an extreme kind on the Director exists in a note dated the 1st of December from Flexner to Veblen setting forth the terms of his appointment by the Board and asking the Professor to sign and return it. Flexner added that he was "negotiating with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association to the end that, in so far as your retiring allowance and your wife's pension depend upon the Board, they will be covered by insurance at the expense of the Institute."[57] Professor Veblen, usually prompt in answering correspondence, held his answer until certain things had happened. Then, on the 13th of December, he returned the contract, signed, with elaborate casualness.[58]

Flexner's response to Dr. Eisenhart's statement of policy and principle was sent two days after his letter to Professor Veblen. It said that he agreed completely that the two institutions should each pursue the path which seemed to it best, maintaining complete autonomy and independence. He added:

> In the long run, cooperation will, I believe, be most effective if each institution pursues this policy, leaving the members of the staff after their appointment to work out such cooperation as may seem to them agreeable and helpful. We must...avoid even the appearance of influencing each other's policy and appointments.
>
> While I am clear that as a matter of principle the above statement of policy is correct, I am not unmindful of the fact that we shall have at the outset to demonstrate to the two institutions and the mathematical world the fact that Princeton has been strengthened, not weakened, by the location of the Institute in immediate proximity to Princeton University. The mere transfer of individuals from one...to the other would add little to the combined resources of both. The calling of Profes-

> sor Einstein is thus a distinct addition to our combined resources. I trust that further developments of the same character may be possible. If this can be accomplished and the students in the two institutions can circulate freely, Princeton will become a mathematical center greater than either of the institutions which will exist on its soil, and the same will be true of other schools as they are added to the Institute.[59]

But even as Flexner wrote this statement, which seems in the first paragraph to beg the issue, Professor Veblen spoke directly to Dr. James W. Alexander, Professor of Mathematics at the University, then lecturing part-time, asking him if he would come to the Institute. Alexander was a brilliant topologist, author of the Alexander Duality Theorem, a former graduate student of Veblen's, and sometime collaborator with him in mathematics. They were close personal friends; their rapport extended to their political views, academic and ideological. Both harbored feelings of great discontent with the University and its administration. No secret was made of Veblen's action, and, in the words of an outside observer, "the air of intrigue hung thickly over Fine Hall." Dr. Lefschetz, for whose appointment to Princeton Veblen always proudly took credit, also aspired to the appointment. The situation was so tense that the decision as between the two men was left to Dean Eisenhart, and that turned on which man he would prefer to have in the Fine professorship.[60]

The Executive Committee met on the 7th of December to authorize a formal appointment to Dr. Weyl, and to consider and approve a request by Dr. Flexner for permission to negotiate with Dr. Alexander, later to submit the terms to the Committee or the Board for approval. Whether it was decided at this meeting that the liberal terms of past

appointments were not to be repeated is not clear. But the decision was made at some time in these days, and the probability is that Dr. Flexner entered his negotiations with some limitations. For the Committee could hardly have approved without question taking a second man from Princeton. According to the minutes, the meeting lasted an hour and three quarters, and since the terms of Weyl's appointment were already decided earlier and simply repeated at this meeting, the likelihood is that the policy was discussed. However, no trace of that made its way into the minutes then -- or ever.

Shortly afterward, Flexner arranged with Veblen to come to Princeton, presumably to meet him and the two aspirants for the appointment. But on the 13th of December, the day before the tryst, he wrote:

> Unforeseen conditions interfered with my trip to Princeton today. As I thought things over at intervals, I became more and more reluctant to show myself on the Princeton campus before Eisenhart had threshed the matter out with Mr. Duffield, the mathematical group, and any other bodies concerned. Perhaps I am punctilious to the point of squeamishness, but just because our relations with Princeton will be so intimate, I wish to give no one the slightest ground for criticism. I am not reluctant to act -- quite the contrary. I want to act, but I would not for the world have anyone associated with Princeton feel that we had been inconsiderate or unmindful of the great kindness and courtesy which Princeton has shown us.[61]

Dean Eisenhart decided he would prefer to retain Professor Lefschetz for the Fine chair, and the University Trustees made the appointment the next day. Dr. Flexner's relief was so great that he wrote with more exuberance than wisdom or insight to Veblen:

> Please make Lefschetz, as well as other members of the Princeton staff, understand that functionally the two groups belong to one another and that we shall all pull together in the same boat, with you as coxswain.

Unfortunately, Veblen used Flexner's authority to show this letter to Dr. Lefschetz.[62]

Dr. Weyl now was experiencing the same agony of indecision as marked Dr. Birkhoff's opportunity. He became ill, suffering a nervous breakdown, and at the turn of the year changed his mind several times in cabled flashes. In the midst of this, Professor Veblen brought together for a conference with Flexner Dr. John von Neumann, a brilliant young Hungarian mathematical physicist who had been at Princeton since 1930, for the first year as Visiting Professor, and then as half-time professor. At the end of his first year, Dr. von Neumann was offered permanent appointment to the Jones Professorship of Mathematical Physics. He would not accept the full position, but insisted on sharing it with his friend and compatriot Dr. Eugene Wigner. Then he and Wigner spent alternate half-years in Germany as Privatdozenten, Von Neumann at Hamburg and the other at Berlin. When Hitler came to power in 1933, they could not continue with the German part of their careers. In view of that fact, Dr. von Neumann's status was still undecided as Veblen pressed Flexner to nominate him for a professorship at the Institute. As they parted on the 6th of January, it would seem that Flexner had agreed to do so on the 9th when the Board was to meet.

But the minutes of that day make no mention of the matter. They show the appointment of Alexander and Weyl, after both were fully discussed (though as usual only that fact was recorded, and not the substance). The motions entertained and passed mentioned in Dr. Weyl's case, without repeating them, the terms of Flexner's letter of the 23rd

of August, 1932. Alexander's terms were specified and represented a distinct departure from past practice.[63]

On that same day Dr. Flexner wrote as tactfully as possible to Dr. von Neumann, saying that he was not to be appointed to the Institute, because no good would derive from moving men like pawns on a checkerboard, and suggesting that he consider favorably a new arrangement which Flexner hoped Dean Eisenhart could "work out which will give you a permanent post in his department." A copy of this letter went to Eisenhart, with a brief note:

> Now that you have weakened yourself by stepping generously out of the way as far as Veblen and Alexander are concerned, it seems to me wise and prudent that we should bend our united efforts to keep your department up to a level at least as high as that of the Institute. Between us we shall then have probably a mathematical outfit nowhere surpassed.[64]

Three days later Dr. Weyl "resigned" from his commitment to come to the Institute. Between the 12th and the 24th of January it was decided between the professor himself, Eisenhart, Flexner and Veblen that the Institute should appoint Dr. von Neumann. The Executive Committee approved the appointment on the 28th, just before the Founders left for their winter vacation in the West.[65]

The three appointments of Princeton faculty members to the Institute took place during an interregnum at the University, although Mr. Hibben was still there but not as President, when Veblen's was discussed in June, 1932. Mr. Hibben had succeeded Woodrow Wilson. He retired in 1932, and the Trustees of the University, apparently unable to agree on a successor, appointed Professor Henry Green Duffield, Professor of Philosophy, Acting President, (1932-1933). It was his lot to preside officially

over the "transfer" of the three men.

Trustees, faculty and alumni in some numbers judged that the Institute had acted unethically, or at least in very bad taste. There was much feeling against the newcomers to peaceful Princeton, whose first school was a guest of the University at Fine Hall, (albeit a paying guest) the finest and newest building on campus. However, even without that grievance, relations between the staffs of the two institutions were bound to be difficult. The lot of those who had left was so much better than that of their colleagues at the University, in salaries, retirement benefits, vacations, and the promised freedom to research as they chose without any routine obligations. Strangers to the campus working for the Institute might have kept their good luck more or less secret, at least as to rates. But it was certain that Professor Veblen did not. As Fine Professor he had been receiving the highest salary in the Department of Mathematics; now, without having changed at all, he received one-half again as much. His retirement pension equaled the salary of some of Princeton's best, and exceeded the pay of some of the best professors in the country. And as for the promise of pensions for widows of professors in addition, a thing which cost much in regular Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association contracts, based on accepted stock-company insurance practices, that looked like sheer gold to the beleaguered Princeton University faculty members, most of whom on retirement looked forward to inadequate pensions for themselves, without having made contingent provision for their wives.

Though Dr. Flexner hoped that the Institute's example would have a salutary effect in institutions throughout the country, and there-

fore he had publicized the more generous policies the Institute intended to pursue, he had not spoken in specific terms. Now they were known, one wondered how the hoped-for cooperation could prosper. The shining example is hard to live with, especially when it is the same old colleague with a new hat. Though they were not more given to jealousy than any others Princeton bosoms rankled over the differences between the good fortunes of the three and their own state, even though it was known that Professor Alexander received just what he would have had he been appointed to the Fine professorship -- a tardy effort to placate feelings in the Department.

But the discomfort was not confined to the professoriate. Princeton's Trustees and executives were angry, and it became necessary to do something about that. Mr. Bamberger and his close advisers ultimately gave a pledge to Acting President Duffield, an old friend of the Founders, that the Institute would take no more men from the University. Naturally, the agreement was secret; only those directly involved knew about it, for the danger to the University was great. As President Dodds was later to say, Princeton professors must be as free to better themselves as were Harvard men.[66]

What Professor Veblen had done would hardly have been considered de rigueur in a bureaucratic milieu, although it was not unknown in competitive business and industry. Neither the University nor the Institute had any real defence against his direct approach to the men he wanted. Any man so approached and not appointed by the Institute would probably have been lost to the University anyway, especially if he suspected that it had objected to his release. This was what gave Veblen his strength. If the Director's request that Veblen sign a contract meant that he

feared Veblen's displeasure should he be crossed in his plans, Flexner was naive indeed. But any rupture in relations would have been a very serious thing. The Institute was not yet established; besides, Mr. Bamberger would not tolerate friction.

The Director had been worsted by what Dean Trowbridge had called "the fine Italian hand of Professor Veblen." But his loyalty to the Professor and his readiness to defend the Institute against any critisism were both strong. He was to spend the rest of his days as Director trying to "make it up" to the University, always referring to the graciousness of its hospitality, to its generosity, and to the value of the scholarly cooperation which propinquity nourished. The difficulties of his position were fully recognized by Dean Eisenhart and the new President; Veblen's talent for getting what he wanted was famous. This they knew well; he had been at Princeton for twenty-seven years, during most of which he had been critical of its management, its accomplishments, its ideals. Flexner's efforts to make up to the University what it had lost through the Institute's presence was to become fairly obvious in the organization and operation of the School of Humanistic Studies. But Professor Veblen's position in Fine Hall suffered. If in November, 1932 he hoped that the School of Mathematics might remain in Fine Hall "forever," as he wrote Dr. Weyl, the coming months were to demonstrate that, even though he occupied one of the largest and handsomest offices of those he had so carefully planned, his relations with his old colleagues, particularly Dr. Lefschetz, were less than happy. He decided that the School of Mathematics should have a building of its very own, near enough to Fine Hall so that the fruits of cooperation might still be enjoyed, while he

himself would be master in the new house, as he no longer was in Fine Hall.

However, it should not be assumed that the Professor was animated by a spirit of reprisal against the University. By his swift actions he had gained two solid advantages: (1) he had acted to recruit staff without waiting for Professors Einstein and Weyl to arrive and confer on the subject; (2) he had added to the Institute's staff a friend and a brilliant topologist, and a most remarkable young mathematical genius.

Late in March, 1933, Flexner learned that Dr. Harold Willis Dodds of the Political Science Department had been named President of the University. Dean Eisenhart was appointed Dean of the Graduate School, leaving to his successor, the new Dean of the Faculty, the coveted residence on the campus -- the old Joseph Henry Jackson House, where President McCosh had lived. There were many Princetonians who had fully expected that Luther P. Eisenhart would be chosen President. He was one of the relatively few men who, though close to Dean Fine and President Wilson, yet was recognized by the West adherents as being entirely disinterested and just, as well as very able. It has been assumed that the actions of the new Institute had no small part in this decision. Dr. Flexner, supported by Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass asked Mr. Bamberger to approve Dean Eisenhart's election to the trusteeship vacated by Governor Lehman, who now as chief executive of his State manifestly had no time to devote to the Institute, and had finally persuaded the Board to accept his resignation.[67] But Mr. Bamberger must have refused; it was not done. That

Professor Veblen bore in the Founder's view no responsibility for the recent events is shown by the fact that he was elected to that vacancy the following year.

So far little or nothing has been said about plans for bringing students to the Institute, or for opening it for operation. During the summer of 1932 Flexner had sought to estop the ambitious planning of Veblen and Weyl for a large faculty by likening the Institute to the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, as he had done in Universities. There, though neither man may have known it, there was a small group of permanent men -- a faculty -- and others called Members, with the status of research associates, who were chosen after they had won their doctoral degrees and demonstrated signal ability in their individual fields. No degrees were awarded; the scientific work was the object. As soon as Veblen returned to the United States from Europe in 1932, Flexner took him to visit the Institute. The analogy was not exact. The Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research did not purpose to train post-doctorals in their researches, whereas this was a cardinal point in the policy of the new Institute. This Flexner explained to Veblen, making the point that the Institute for Advanced Study was not to be a graduate school, but instead an institution for research and the training of the post-doctoral man and woman who wanted to pursue advanced study and had shown a capacity for independent research. After that he invited Professor Veblen's counsel on such matters as the method of selecting students or workers, the sources from which they might be drawn, the method of aiding those who needed it by modest grants, the length and times of the academic

terms, when the Institute should open for work, and what the second Bulletin should say about all these things. Flexner still occupied his office in New York; he did not move it to Princeton until May, 1933. Then, instead of taking space in Fine Hall as he had been invited to do, he opened his offices at 20 Nassau Street. Now Veblen came to New York to see him occasionally, and Flexner came to Princeton about as often. Fortunately for the history, some of their deliberations were carried on by letter.

Despite the object lesson of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, Flexner found it necessary to urge Professor Veblen to send on to him correspondence from candidates for the doctorate who now applied for admission to the Institute, so that he might save his precious time. Again he made it quite explicit that candidates were not to be admitted:

> I feel very certain that persons who have not exhausted the opportunities of our graduate schools are not going to be the kind of persons you or Professor Einstein wish to admit except in very unusual circumstances.[68]

Further conversations enabled Vablen to write Dr. Weyl, and to explain the plan for the Institute as neither of them had understood it from materials so far developed, or from conversations with Dr. Flexner at Göttingen. He said first that Dr. Flexner was determined to make no further moves in personnel until Weyl decided what he was going to do about the Institute's offer.

> /Flexner's/ ideas about the mathematical group seem to have become more definite in this respect: that a sharp distinction will be made between the appointments as permanent members of the Institute and the others. There will be no such spectrum of associate and assistant professors and instructors as there is in the usual American university. One will be

> either a full and permanent member or else on a definitely limited appointment...In the Institute the scientific work will be the only thing.

There were many applications for admission as students, he wrote, and added:

> To all of them who are not approximately at the Ph. D. stage, the answer is that they had better try to get into the Princeton or some other graduate school. The idea is quite definite at present that there are to be no degrees and that only students who are acceptable to the professors are to be admitted.[69]

However, Professor Veblen was reluctant to give up his work with graduate students; he valued highly his contacts with some of the more advanced among those whose work he had supervised, and was well known for his own excellence in the relationship. Though he was now an employee of the Institute, he continued to supervise the work of a graduate student he had accepted before he left Princeton. The next Bulletin was being prepared for press, and Flexner consulted him constantly about the text. Veblen asked that the name of the student be entered in it as "Student of Professor Veblen." But Flexner was unwilling to have anything appear in the Bulletin mentioning graduate work. Again in July, 1933 he found it necessary to defend his post-doctoral principle:

> I don't want to begin giving the Ph. D. degree, for I don't want to involve the staff in theses, examinations, and all the other paraphernalia. There are plenty of places where a man can get a degree. Our work must be beyond that stage.[70]

But Professor Veblen insisted from time to time, and finally in December, 1935, Dr. Flexner discovered that the School of Mathematics had violated both the post-doctoral principle and the equally firmly established full-time rule. A bachelor of Science, candidate for the doctorate, was a member, and Professor Veblen had two half-time assistants, one of whom

was a candidate. All three worked half-time at the University. Flexner tactfully called these breaches of policy to Veblen's attention, and offered to have the Board confirm the policies if Veblen wished.[71] Veblen brought only the two complaints before the School's faculty, which agreed with the Director, except that they wanted English mathematicians with equivalent merit who had not taken the doctorate admitted as exceptions -- to which Flexner readily agreed.[72]

But Veblen wrote as an individual to Flexner, professing to be still unconvinced:

> These cooperative arrangements will, of course, be more difficult under the restrictions which you are now contemplating...

Flexner, accepting the Professor's protest as sincere, referred Veblen to the Bulletins, and then wrote:

> Let us not lose sight of the fact that this Institute has no reason whatsoever for existing unless it offers opportunities beyond the Ph. D. degree which are not obtainable in other institutions. I said this to Mr. Bamberger when he agreed to finance it, and I have repeated it in every Bulletin. If save under the most exceptional conditions we are going to move in the direction of offering opportunities to persons who have not obtained the Ph. D. degree, we could accomplish our ends better by turning our funds over to Princeton University or to some other institution of the kind. We must be different not only in respect to the length of the term, freedom for work, salaries, but also in actual academic standards, and on this latter point the whole issue turns.[73]

So serious was Veblen's attack on the basic principles that the Director took the matter to the Board and received affirmation, though it is clear that Professor Veblen was able to citean exception in the School of Humanistic Studies which proved the rule.[74]

How could this have happened in the School of Mathematics? Because the faculty members of the School were given the responsibility for

deciding who should be admitted, subject to the few principles which had been established. Thus the Director had written Professor Veblen as they collaborated in outlining procedures before the School of Mathematics opened:

> The question of admitting students is, I think, a simple one. There is a certain amount of money available for grants-in-aid. This the mathematical group will administer, and I shall simply exercise a formal oversight, as I think I am in duty bound to do. Beyond this you can admit anyone who seems to you thoroughly worth while at his own expense, if such there be...[75]

Apparently the idea of aiding students to pursue advanced study seemed as strange to Professor Veblen as it had to the Founders earlier. Thus he wrote Flexner in December 1932:

> At present it seems to me that your idea of giving a few fellowships approximately equivalent to the National Research Council fellowships is a good one. Do you propose to put something like that in your Bulletin? I should think we would want a couple of years of experience before arriving at any definite policy.

Ten days later he suggested that if a certain candidate for the doctorate needed money for his studies, and could not get it from the University, the Institute might well supply it. However, this was never done, because Flexner would allow the Institute to take no action concerning candidates.[76] Mention of the grants was omitted in the Bulletin; a registration fee of $100 was specified, however.

To recruit workers, or members, as they were shortly to be called, for the first year of operation, decided by Flexner and Veblen to be 1933-1934, Flexner wrote to the heads of several foundations which awarded fellowships, sending materials and suggesting that they bring the new Institute to the attention of their Fellows. He alerted the National Research Council, the Commonwealth Fund, and the Paris headquarters of the

Rockefeller Foundation, receiving cordial and interested responses from all. Meanwhile Professor Veblen wrote several assistant and associate professors in universities -- or the heads of their departments -- suggesting that the Institute would be willing to pay half their salaries for a year during which they would study at the Institute. Flexner viewed this with grave misgiving -- he felt it was improper to ask the small Institute to subsidize wealthy universities like Harvard, Yale, Columbia, etc. But Professor Veblen insisted that such men, usually ineligible for regular leave such as a sabbatical, would profit by it greatly in some cases; some of the youngest did not even have tenure. Flexner was won over, and actually stepped in to persuade Professor Marston Morse of Harvard to sanction leave for an instructor with the following argument:

> We are trying this experiment because the sabbatical year may come so late in a man's life as to be relatively unimportant from the standpoint of his own development. By the device which I have mentioned a man to whom our Institute attaches great worth can get a year or two years early in his academic career at a time when opportunity of this sort may mean most to him.[77]

But the other condition was that such a young man should be guaranteed his position when he returned. Though Morse agreed heartily with the plan, he could not say that his Department intended to continue the man for the next year. He did not come to Princeton.

How many students or workers should be admitted, as a matter of policy? Veblen had written his ideas on that in June 1931:

> My experience is that it is desirable to have a large audience (20-50) in a lecture, but a small number (3 or 4) of students whose reading or research one supervises. Perhaps the best method would be to leave attendance at lectures open to as many as each professor was willing to admit and restrict the number of Junior Members...[78]

This was written when Veblen thought of the Institute as something like an Oxford College. Now in December, 1932 he proposed that the decision on the admission of workers, or members as they were later to be called, should rest with the professor with whom the applicant wished to work. The Bulletin should make clear, he suggested, that those admitted would be expected to work independently, except for occasional conferences with their professor.[79]

But now Dr. Richard Courant wrote that Dr. Weyl was worried lest there be too few students to constitute an adequate audience for his lectures. After conferring with Dean Eisenhart and Professor Veblen, Flexner drafted a reply conveying the assurance that graduate students, the members of the Institute, and members of the two faculties, would undoubtedly fill Weyl's requirements, adding:

> Professor Veblen's inclination is to work with individuals or with a small group, but the proximity of Princeton makes it possible to pursue a different method and to assemble all those....who are engaged in advanced mathematical work.[80]

But Veblen, whom Flexner asked to review this before it was sent, had changed his mind:

> The general question Weyl has raised has a bearing on the problem as to whom to admit as students to the Institute. My own inclination is to admit men rather freely without any commitment as to whether they will work with a particular member of the staff. This would admit them to our group. At the least, they would be members of Weyl's and my audience. At the most, they would establish personal relations with one of us. I feel that we would find better material for our more intimate work if we had a reservoir of this sort.[81]

However, the Director was not easily persuaded this was desirable. And so Bulletin No. 2 (February, 1933) had these things to say on the subject:

Inasmuch as only those students will be admitted who have already obtained the Ph. D. degree or whose training is equivalent to that represented by [it.]...and who are in addition sufficiently advanced to carry on and to cooperate in independent research, the number of students will be small. A few workers, who have been admitted for the year 1933-1934, already hold assured positions in university departments of mathematics and have given evidence of capacity for original and independent research. Mature persons of this kind will naturally receive preference in the matter of admission.

The staff will aid students in deciding the general methods and purposes of their work, and, as occasion offers, in the details. Only such students will be admitted as are acceptable to the staff of the School and the Director of the Institute.

Instruction will be given either by individual contact with students, by seminars, by courses of lectures, or by other methods. Each professor will be free to follow such methods as he prefers...

The combined opportunities of the Institute and of the mathematical faculty of Princeton University will be open to students enrolled in either institution without payment of additional fees. As long as the School of Mathematics occupies quarters in Fine Hall, the mathematical library in Fine Hall will be open to its use.

The School of Mathematics will join the mathematical faculty of Princeton University in publishing the Annals of Mathematics, the editorial board of which will consist of representatives of both institutions.[82]

Late in the spring of 1933, Dr. Weyl, left practically alone at Göttingen through Hitler's depredations, went to Switzerland and reopened correspondence with Veblen; he would not return to Germany, and was considering a call to Madrid. Veblen and Flexner immediately canvassed the situation at the University and in the Institute; both wanted Weyl in Princeton. But Flexner found that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld were quite opposed, because they did not like his actions earlier, and also because Dr. von Newmann waa appointed in his place. In vain Flexner explained that Weyl had been ill at the beginning of the year, and really sought to

protect the Institute in deciding not to come then.[83] Flexner could not but think how well pleased the University group would be with the return of its former professor. He decided that the time had come for a little extra pressure on the Founders.

He was ill, and distressed by their attitude. But he had been thinking for some time of suggesting Dr. Aydelotte to them for a special position. He now wrote Mr. Bamberger that he and Aydelotte had been conferring on the Institute, and he had come to a conclusion:

> I feel that I have in him an 'understudy' whom you and Mrs. Fuld were rightly anxious that I procure. Whatever happens to me, the Institute is safe, for he and I are in perfect accord as to the principles and ideals which underlie the enterprise.[84]

Dr. and Mrs. Aydelotte visited the Founders shortly after that. The negotiations were successful; the Swarthmore President persuaded the Founders during a relaxed and pleasant period that the matter of Weyl's appointment should go to the Executive Committee. It met on the 6th of September, and approved the nomination, with the understanding that everything was to be quite secret until Weyl had succeeded in getting his family safely out of Göttingen and was on his way to the United States. Then he announced his resignation from Göttingen. He first went to Swarthmore to deliver a series of lectures at Bartol Institute, taking up his residence in Princeton and his new duties on the 1st of December.[85]

The spring and summer of 1933 proved to be an extraordinarily trying one for the Founders, the Director and Dr. Einstein. As the Professor returned to Europe from Pasadena in March, 1933, he was advised by his friends in Germany that his life would be in danger should he

return home. He made no secret of his changed plans, which took them to Belgium; while he was en route, his home, possessions, and bank account were confiscated by the Nazis. To spare his friends at the Berlin Academy he resigned from it, only to become involved in an acrimonious exchange. He was expelled by the Bavarian Academy. The couple rented a house in the sand dunes of Coq-sur-Mer where they lived for a while under guards which Queen Elizabeth insisted were necessary for their protection. It was rumored there was a price on Einstein's head in Germany, and the presence of a group of Nazis at a resort ten miles up the coast was considered a real danger.

News of Einstein's persecution brought prompt responses from all over free Europe. The Professor wrote Flexner on the 26th of March in an effort to explain his situation.

> I have been thinking how astonished you will be when you read what is happening to me in Europe. You will, however, see that I have made no commitment which will interfere with my undertaking at Princeton. In these times of dire threats to Jews and liberals, one is morally obligated to undertake what in normal times one would avoid.
>
> When it became known that the Germans, and particularly the Prussian Academy, took hostile action against my position and my civil rights, people in France and Spain felt it necessary to rally to my support in the noblest way. To accept the obligations was to me not only the demand of enlightenment; it was also an opportunity to aid the interests of oppressed Jews and liberals.
>
> First of all came the Spanish Embassy and offered me a professorship, without exacting from me any commitment as to when and for how long I would be in Spain....I accepted the offer in principle and promised to come next April for four to six weeks. I could make this promise the more easily since I appear to be foreclosed from returning to Germany in the forseeable future. That this commitment conflicts in the slightest way with our arrangements seems to me to be out of the question, since we had firmly in mind that we were to have our half-year in Berlin, which was a more binding undertaking than I am making to Spain.

> Then came the French Consul to offer me on behalf of the Ministry of Education a professorship in the Collége de France. Since I did not have any more time to dispose of I declined this with thanks. He came the next day to say that I need not not commit myself to come to Paris; he would just like to have my word that I would accept membership in the faculty. To refuse this would appear to be unfriendly, and my friends in Paris would have been justified in seeing it in that light....
>
> I have been committed to go to Oxford for several years past. But this is a special project without formal requirements. You will see that my real commitment in Princeton will be respected. If anyone can feel injured, it is myself, who have given up part of my rest and peace. But that is my responsibility.[86]

Understandably, this letter did not reassure the Director. Einstein had suddenly become a symbol of the resistance of all European Jews and liberals against Nazi oppression. He was not only the greatest physicist in the world; he was also a political figure of heroic proportions. This was not in Flexner's opinion a good thing. Moreover, the Professor had committed himself to be abroad during part of the Institute's term. He had left his papers in Germany, and evidently forgot that he was to take up his duties from the beginning of October and to remain at the Institute at least until the middle of April each year. Flexner was at first assuasive, offering to initiate salary payments immediately, and to send money for transportation expenses for the Einsteins and Dr. Mayer. But Dr. Einstein courteously refused these overtures; he had money outside Germany, and was not ready to come to America. He must do all he could to help others, relatives and friends, to leave Germany.

Meanwhile the press notices of new offers and acceptances multiplied. The Founders took to clipping them and sending them to Flexner without comment. Hardly a week passed in those troubled days without some

new announcement that Einstein had accepted another appointment. Some of these were completely self-serving and without foundation. But Flexner could not know that. And so he wrote Mrs. Einstein -- it had been agreed between the three that she would carry on the correspondence because of her better command of English -- that according to the New York Times, "Professor Einstein has accepted professorships in Madrid, Paris, Brussels, Leyden, Oxford and Jerusalem." The Institute for Advanced Study, unmentioned, "is thus...placed in a really absurd position, from which it can be rescued in only one way: by assembling here in Princeton on October 2nd and showing that your connection here is actual and that the appointments received elsewhere are honorary or semi-honorary in character."[87]

In some of his persuasions the Director said that Einstein's responsibility to the Founders should be uppermost in his mind at all times, much as Flexner said his own was. He set the example for all who would come to the Institute in effect by saying to Mrs. Einstein that he constantly refused invitations to speak, and to participate in outside causes, in the interest of serving the Institute with his full devotion. Mrs. Einstein did not help matters any when she wrote that her husband "was now an international figure in world affairs, having obligations which would not have bound lesser men."[88]

Flexner's concern was genuine and well founded. The physicist was caught up in a great crisis in human affairs, beside which his work and its academic accommodations were lost sight of. This was not entirely new. Dr. Frank has written that the worsening prospects of the Republic, and the grinding of men and institutions relentlessly between the

ideological extremes in Germany had affected Einstein sadly during the twenties:

> Gradually complete absorption in the regularities of the universe began to be difficult for him. More and more the anarchy of the human world pushed him into the foreground. With brutal force it slowly but surely laid claim to a greater or lesser part of his intellectual energy.[89]

The Director continued his persuasions, and not in the best of temper, so that Dr. Einstein finally suggested that if the Director preferred, he would surrender his appointment at the Institute. Flexner's persuasions ceased.[90]

But Mrs. Einstein did attempt to set the public record straight by preparing a statement for her husband to give to the press. Early in August the newspapers carried a dispatch from Knock, Belgium in which Dr. Einstein

> deplored the numerous unfounded reports regarding his future activities, particularly concerning his contracts with... universities.
>
> 'My obligations,' he said, 'for the coming season are as follows: First, I have a permanent contract to lecture at the Abraham Flexner Institute at Princeton. Second, I have accepted a chair at the Collége de France. Third, I am engaged to lecture in Madrid. The Paris and Madrid engagements are for April and May, 1934. Fourth, I have been invited to lecture next spring at Christ Church College, Oxford. All other reports are devoid of foundation.[91]

There was no ceremony as the Institute for Advanced Study opened at the beginning of October, 1933. On Sunday, the 1st, Flexner met the three professors of the Institute who were present in Princeton, not at his own office at 20 Nassau Street, but in Veblen's large and pleasant study in Fine Hall. No record exists of what was said; the incident is merely mentioned in Flexner's autobiography. Much of the sting left by

recent events at Princeton and abroad might have been removed for Flexner if he had been able to welcome Einstein and Weyl to that meeting. In view of necessary secrecy attending plans for their arrival, it was not possible to make generally known that Dr. Einstein was due to arrive in New York on the 17th of October, and Dr. Weyl about the 20th. Ironically, only Messrs. Alexander, Veblen and Von Newmann were at Princeton, as they had been.

That the Founders were more conscious of the sting than of the fulfillment of a dream may be suspected, because there is no evidence of any greeting to the Director from them. Fortunately Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass wired a message of cheer and congratulations:

> On the opening day of the first term of the Institute we extend you our heartfelt congratulations upon the achievement of your life's dream and hope its fulfillment will accomplish all your fondest hopes can visualize. We are proud to have been associated with you in its establishment and trust that you will be spared many years of active life to give it the full measure and benefit of your splendid abilities. Kindest remembrances to Mrs. Flexner and you.

In his reply Flexner sought indirectly to reassure Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld:

> Am deeply touched by the joint telegram from you and Mr. Leidesdorf. From the first I have felt fortunate and assured in your cooperation. Nothing could exceed the kindness and helpfulness of the Princeton people. I hope with you that the Founders may have no reason to regret their beneficence. Mrs. Flexner joins me in warmest greetings. Please share this with Mr. Leidesdorf.[92]

Professor Einstein and his entourage arrived at Quarantine in New York harbor as scheduled. There Mr. Maass met them at dawn, took them off in a small launch, and landed them on the Jersey shore, to be driven to Princeton by Edgar Bamberger and Walter Farrier. Left disap-

pointed on a rainy Manhattan dock were Mayor James Walker, Samuel Untermeyer and their political cohorts, who were engaged in an election campaign -- the first of a legion willing to make capital of the physicist for their own ends. For all kinds of interests in the American community -- religious, ethnic, sentimental, social, ideological, political and commercial -- were eager to exploit Dr. Einstein. The appeal of this man to all kinds of people has long mystified observers. One thing is certain: it made him a prime target for all who had something to gain by identifying him with their causes, good or bad. There were also those who revered him for his human quality and scientific achievements. The Professor, fresh from the limelight in Europe, looked forward to peace in Princeton, having done his best for his cause.

He was quite unprepared for the vigor and thoroughness of American techniques of exploitation. Dr. Flexner, who had excellent results in handling his own public relations, deplored the naïvete of the Professor and particularly of Mrs. Einstein, and objected strongly to the publicity which attended their first public appearances. This led him to make a dangerous mistake. By prearrangement he had been answering mail addressed to Einstein at the Institute before their arrival, consistently declining invitations to speak, to dine, to attend meetings, to sponsor causes, etc. He did not offer to reroute this mail while the Einsteins were, with some difficulty, settling in a rented house. Thus he continued to decline invitations, not consulting them even about an invitation tendered by the President of the United States. Instead, he declined it:

Dear Mr. President:

With genuine and profound reluctance, I felt myself compelled this afternoon to explain to your Secretary, Mr. Marvin MacIntyre, that Professor Einstein has come to Princeton for the purpose of carrying on his scientific work in seclusion, and that it is absolutely impossible to make any exception which would inevitably bring him into public notice.

You are aware of the fact that there exists in New York an irresponsible group of Nazis. In addition, if the newspapers had access to him, or if he accepted a single invitation or engagement that could possibly become public, it would be practically impossible for him to remain in the post which he as accepted in this Institute, or in America at all. With his consent and at his desire I have declined in his behalf invitations from high officials and from scientific societies in whose work he is really interested.

I hope that you and your wife will appreciate the fact that in making this explanation to your Secretary I do not forget that you are entitled to a degree of consideration wholly beyond anything that could be claimed or asked by anyone else, but I am convinced that, unless Professor Einstein inflexibly adheres to the regime which we have with the utmost difficulty established during the last two weeks, his position will be an impossible one.

With great respect and very deep regret, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Abraham Flexner[93]

Of course the invitation was repeated, this time in a personal message delivered by the Secretary of the Treasury, and was accepted. Though Flexner explained that he was doing no more than his own good private secretary did with the many invitations he received, the incident caused a proper rerouting of the mail, leaving the Einsteins to answer their own. In such case Mrs. Einstein's social impulses, more highly developed than her husband's, brought them into greater activity publicly. Unfortunately Flexner had not accepted with good grace the rearrangement

in routing the correspondence. He cautioned the Einsteins to remember that since the Institute was the guest of the University, non-academic activities with their accompanying publicity could adversely affect the University as well as the Institute.[94]

Shortly after this, a particularly brash commercial exploiter who claimed some connection with Mrs. Einstein's family told the Professor that Dr. Flexner had spoken disparagingly of him, and had intimated that Einstein might not be able to stay at the Institute for Advanced Study. This loosed the lightning that ultimately cleared the atmosphere. The Professor delivered a "Vorschlag" in which he insisted that he should be free to do in his personal life as he saw fit, or he would leave Princeton at a greatly reduced salary, to travel where he would, publishing all his papers through the Institute, and agreeing to make no other permanent connection. Then in a long conference, attended by a third person friendly to both men and both institutions, the two discussed and resolved their difficulties.[95] Their social relations, which Einstein had summarily terminated, were resumed. Flexner wrote the anxious Founders and Mr. Maass with profound relief that peace was re-established.[96]

The exercise seemed to have a good effect on both sides; outside activities made less call on the Professor's energies, and Flexner observed the amenities. During the winter Dr. Einstein was able to free himself from his European commitments with dignity. He did not return to Europe. He resumed his work, and his life fell into a regular pattern, though he was not deaf to the many calls made on his sympathy and his wisdom. The Director's attitude vacillated between indulgence and occasional reversions to his proprietary role.[97]

If Einstein has with justice been likened to the prophets of old, Flexner might equally well be compared to the stern law-giving patriarchs. Outwardly at least peace reigned. After a year in Princeton the Einsteins bought a small comfortable home on Mercer Street, about a mile from the future home of the Institute. The townspeople grew accustomed to seeing him walk to his office in the mornings, answering courteously but abstractedly their pleased greetings. On occasion, he was asked to pause and pose for a photograph by some tourist; he did so graciously without any apparent interruption to his thinking, which absorbed him always. During the afternoons he worked in his study at home; its large window looked out on his own and his neighbors' gardens flowing together in green harmony unmarked by barriers. Aside from occasional scientific visits, and summer vacations in Northern New York State, or Connecticut, or Long Island, where he loved to sail, the physicist traveled little.

Professor Veblen was the natural and actual leader of the School of Mathematics. He made himself responsible for its business affairs, and was known to have selected its faculty members, except for Professor Einstein, who was Dr. Flexner's choice. The School faculty met three or four times each semester to consider issuing invitations to certain workers, to decide upon applications for membership, to allocate individual stipends from the $30,000 fund made available by the Trustees each year to the School on Dr. Flexner's recommendation. Veblen's colleagues were complaisant with his control as long as they got what they needed and could pursue their own work as they chose. But this was not to be so always.

Professor Veblen was one who had been most deeply impressed by Einstein's visit to Princeton in 1921, and his lectures on the theory of relativity. He was a modern geometer, whose present mathematical preoccupations derived almost entirely from the theory of relativity. Veblen had recalled an aphorism spoken by Dr. Einstein in conversation or lecture which he believed should be carved above the fireplace in the Professors' room in the new Fine Hall. But he checked first on his recollection. The remark: "Rafiniert ist Herr Gott, aber boschaft ist Er nicht." Dr. Einstein replied that it was neither aphorism nor well considered:

> I have no objection to your using the one-time remark in the manner suggested...
>
> I suggest, however, that this expression might appear to the reader as frivolous; he might not understand the context. One can speak such thoughts in a conversational manner, but nature conceals her secrets in the sublimity of her law, not through cunning.[98]

It seems Professor Veblen hoped that Einstein would work in particle physics and quantum mechanics when he came to Princeton in 1933. When he translated the physicist's statement for Bulletin No. 2 for Dr. Flexner, he apologized for possible inaccuracies and wrote that Einstein intended "to discuss the theory of spinors and their application to field theory."[99] Veblen himself was working on that theory, which was concerned with the quantities which describe the rotation of electrons, protons and neutrons. In fact, nothing seemed further from the physicist's intentions. For he had already entered far into his studies to establish a unified field theory, which would incidentally comprehend such phenomena, he hoped. The two men seemed to be set apart in both their personal and

professional concerns from the time Veblen was in Göttingen. In preparing the statement in the Bulletin on the prospective work of Dr. Mayer, employed as Einstein's assistant with the title of Associate, Professor Veblen, who met Dr. Mayer when he visited Einstein at Caputh in July, 1932, wrote that the mathematician "would conduct an advanced mathematical seminar" in Fine Hall. And that is what happened; Dr. Mayer separated himself from Dr. Einstein immediately after his arrival in the United States; and his mathematical colleagues gave him full opportunity to do so in spite of the basis on which he had been appointed. As Dr. Frank was to put it, Mayer secured "an independent position" in the Institute.

Thus Professor Einstein was left without a regular assistant in mathematics, which was part of his arrangement with Dr. Flexner and an absolute necessity to his work. He regarded this as a real handicap, which he overcame in part by working intensively with one or two of the younger mathematical physicists. But he lost time and peace of mind by changing assistants frequently. His desire was to have an assistant who would stay with him for a period of years. As Dr. Frank wrote, it was difficult to find an able mathematician who would be willing to devote himself to assist Einstein. Any such able mathematician would prefer to work on his own problems. Professor Veblen took the position that since Dr. Mayer had been employed to assist the physicist, he was entitled to no other assistant. It would probably have been difficult to limit Dr. Mayer's activities to those for which he was appointed; certainly Professor Veblen and his colleagues seem never to have insisted upon that, but in fact facilitated his departure from them.

In 1936-1937 Dr. Einstein worked with Dr. Peter Bergmann, a

young member from Prague. He notified the mathematics faculty in December, 1936, that he wanted Dr. Bergmann to assist him during the next year. Professor Veblen failed to ask Dr. Flexner to budget the expense, and the School declined to allocate a stipend to Dr. Bergmann for 1937-1938. Professor Einstein would again be without an assistant. He appealed to Dr. Flexner, who told him he could have any assistant he chose. Though Professor Veblen remonstrated vigorously Flexner stood firm, and Bergmann was given a stipend in 1937-1938 and an assistant's salary thereafter for several years. The School did not lack the funds at the time; the stipend could have been paid without difficulty.[100]

This was not the end of the pettiness exhibited toward Dr. Einstein at this time. Dr. Leopold Infeld, an accomplished Polish mathematical physicist, worked with Einstein during 1936-1937 on his papers in unified field theory, receiving less than half of the regular grant. In February, 1937, Dr. Einstein told his colleagues that the same grant should be provided for Dr. Infeld for 1937-1938, as they were engaged in serious research. The $600 was not allocated. The Professor attended the next meeting of the School to make a special appeal. But he returned defeated, to say, as Infeld reported it:

> I tried my best. I told them how good you are, and that we are doing important scientific work together. But they argued that they don't have enough money...I don't know how far their arguments are true. I used very strong words which I have never used before. I told them that in my opinion they were doing an unjust thing...
>
> Not one of them helped me.[101]

Infeld describes his desperation; he could not return to Poland, and had no appointment in sight here. The work was intensely interesting

and important. He declined to accept Einstein's offer to give him the modest sum needed. Then, in his blackest moment, Infeld hit upon a simple plan which, if Dr. Einstein would agree, would save the day. He suggested writing, under the Professor's supervision and with his cooperation, a popular account of the evolution of physics which would be published in both their names. To his delight, the Professor agreed, and during the long hot summer of 1937 the younger man slaved over the work, consulting the master on occasions, and incidentally overcoming his deficiencies in using English. Finally the book was published, yielding much more in his share than the $600 on which he had made out somehow during the previous academic year.[102]

Mathematicians and mathematical physicists seemed not inclined to forget or forgive that Einstein had achieved his work in physics by thinking in physics rather than through mathematics. Thus Veblen, writing in 1923 to Simon Flexner, (See IV, note 7) opined that though the great physicist used mathematics as a "tool," he probably could not have discovered the general theory of relativity without the four-dimensional geometry earlier worked out at Göttingen. Dr. Birkhoff suggested that Einstein's general theory "made natural the surmise that all physics might be looked at as a kind of extended geometry..."[103] Dr. Frank quotes David Hilbert of Göttingen in two passages which indicate recognition of this.

> Every boy in the streets of our mathematical Göttingen understands more about four-dimensional geometry than Einstein. Yet, despite that, Einstein did the work, and not the mathematicians.

And again, speaking this time to mathematicians:

> Do you know why Einstein said the most original and profound things about space and time that have been said in our generation? Because he had learned nothing about all the philosophy and mathematics of time and space.

Nor was Einstein loath to set himself apart from the mathematicians when, Frank wrote, he humorously commented on Dr. von Laue's restatement in mathematical terms of the theory of relativity that "I myself can hardly understand Laue's book." And again he is quoted as saying wryly that "the people at Göttingen sometimes strike me not as if they wanted to help one formulate something clearly, but instead as if they wanted to show us physicists how much brighter they are than we."[104]

One reason for the attitude of some mathematicians at Princeton was that Einstein worked to achieve a unified field theory while questioning the value of work in contemporary quantum theory taken from classical mechanics as offering "no useful point of departure for future developments." In Princeton particularly there was a strong feeling against further work in unitary field theory, Infeld wrote, "although," he added, "practically everyone knew /Einstein's/ papers, which meant something in these days of narrow specialization."[105]

In view of the fact that Einstein apparently worked closely with none of the professors at the University, nor even with Dirac or Pauli whom his colleagues called as visiting professors, it was tragic that a man with whom Einstein did want to work, Dr. Erwin Schroedinger, missed an opportunity to take the Jones research chair in mathematical physics. The Viennese physicist had succeeded Max Planck at Berlin in 1928. A very happy and productive period of work with Dr. Einstein followed. Dr. Frank noted:

> There were no barriers; there was immediate understanding between the two men without any long explanations, and agreement on the manner in which they would act toward one another, without first having to call on Kant's categorical imperative.[106]

Dr. Schroedinger shared the Nobel Prize in 1933 in Physics with Dirac for his work in quantum theory. He had resigned promptly when Hitler came to power, and went temporarily to Oxford, where he was supernumerary. Then Eisenhart called him to Princeton as Visiting Professor of Mathematical Physics during the spring term of 1934 with the idea of offering him the Jones chair should he prove to be acceptable. The two physicists resumed their cooperation; Flexner painted a word-picture for the Trustees of finding them engrossed at the blackboard in Einstein's sun-drenched office one morning. From Professor Einstein's point of view, it should have been an occasion for rejoicing both in the Department and the School when, at the end of the spring semester, the University offered Dr. Schroedinger the chair.

One can imagine Flexner's chagrin when in London in June, 1934, he received an ingenuous letter from Dr. Schroedinger saying that he had just refused the offer, informing President Dodds and Dean Eisenhart that he was expecting a call from the Institute, and felt that he must accept that because of the more generous financial provision which would be made by the Institute for his wife should she survive him. He explained to Flexner that though he had feared transplantation to the New World, his talks with Einstein, Ladenburg, Weyl and Veblen had convinced him [illegible] he had nothing to fear.[107] Flexner, seriously embarrassed, answered tactfully that he was not planning to augment the School's staff, and suggested that if Princeton's offer was better than his conditions at

Oxford, he should seek to reopen negotiations with President Dodds and Dean Eisenhart. Then Flexner sent copies of the correspondence to Eisenhart saying he had not mentioned the possibility of an appointment to Schroedinger, and believed also that "our men played fair."[108] The matter apparently terminated here.

A year later Professor Einstein wrote Flexner as follows:

> Lately I have been carrying on a scholarly correspondence with Schroedinger. In my judgment he would be a wonderful acquisition for our Institute. He wrote me of the intent to accept a call to Graz, since he is at Oxford only on a courtesy call, so to say; there is no real opportunity there for a scholar in theoretical physics.
>
> I believe that the influential people at Princeton, after open discussions, would not have opposed a call to Schroedinger to our Institute...because of his refusal of the call to Princeton. One could hardly take amiss the striving of such an outstanding scholar for a position which promises him the opportunity to contribute his learning as completely as possible...[109]

Flexner answered:

> The Schroedinger matter is a delicate one, which I cannot... settle without talking with you and your colleagues as well as the Princeton people. I will take the matter up...without delay when we are all together once more. Schroedinger made a blunder that embarrassed both me and the Institute, but I shall handle the matter with every possible discretion and with every desire to do the best for him as well as for us...[110]

The Director called the School faculty together for the first time on the 8th of October, 1935. Though it was his purpose to discuss this matter, no mention was made of it in the minutes. But something had so disturbed him that he suggested, probably to Veblen alone before the meeting, that he wanted to attend future meetings of the group. It appears Veblen refused; the minutes show only that henceforth Dr. von Neumann would act as liaison between the Director and his colleagues,

keeping both sides informed of the thinking and planning of the other.[111]

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that someone either at the University or the Institute misled the naive physicist. Certainly it would seem that the conversations Schroedinger referred to as designed to reassure him about transferring his fortunes to this country must have concerned the prospect of being called by the University, which was paying him $1,000 a month and his traveling expenses for the visit. One can be quite sure that Dr. Ladenburg would not have defeated the University's plans. In any event, there was a role here for constructive help in setting the foreigner right about the possibility of the Institute granting an excess pension; Professor Veblen at least must have known of the decision to abandon the practice.

Perhaps some light is shed by the fact that at the end of the spring semester in 1934, Professor Veblen was urging the Director to offer an appointment to Dr. Marston Morse, who wished to leave Harvard and come to the Institute. Dr. Flexner was in favor of Dr. Morse's acession, but told Professor Veblen that he could do nothing during the vacation period; the matter would have to await the fall, when it would be possible to get either the Executive Committee or the Board together to authorize action. This reasoning, together with the fact that the Director was spending the summer in England, did not deter the Professor, who continued to press for action. Then Flexner complained of a lack of consistency:

> When we invite a man, it ought to be first on the formal recommendation of the group /i.e., of the School faculty/ and second, after the matter has been laid before the Board, the authority and interest of which I greatly desire to strengthen. At the moment....my hands are tied, since though you and

> Alexander have talked to me about Morse, no one else has, and the matter has not even been mentioned to the Board. I do not possess the authority 'to bring the matter to a conclusion as soon as possible.' I find faculty somewhat inconsistent in matters of this sort. In one moment they resent the unilateral action of the president, and in another they want him to cut off and ignore the constituted authorities. I do not myself want to do either...
>
> It seems a little funny that you should be in a hurry, while I, nearing the end of my tether, should be the cautious one; but I do not believe that in the long run we will lose if we use a method of procedure that is in the highest degree dignified and considerate, while at the same time holding ourselves to our ideals.[112]

Later, all the mathematicians in the School's faculty voted to approve a call to Dr. Morse. Only Einstein disagreed; he did not know Dr. Morse or his work; there was nothing personal in his attitude. He simply took the position that any appointment then should be in theoretical or mathematical physics. When Flexner took the matter to the Board in October, 1934, he did not mention the name of the candidate for appointment, merely asking and receiving, probably because of a prior authorization from Mr. Bamberger, the right to appoint "another American" to the School, submitting the details to the Executive Committee when he had negotiated them. In three weeks' time the appointment was approved by the Committee.[113]

The School of Mathematics was a marked success from its beginning. It exemplified not Birkhoff's idea of one or two men of genius, with younger men on salary, but rather Professor Veblen's and Dr. Lefschetz's views, for with the Department it represented the strongest group of modern geometers in the country and possibly the world. This was the concept of the "mathematical set" which Veblen had urged on Flexner in December, 1932.

Cooperation with the Department of Mathematics involved sharing the costs and participating in the editing of the Annals of Mathematics, which had originated earlier at Princeton. The Rockefeller Foundation withdrew its support, leaving the Institute to assume a share of the costs, for which an annual appropriation of $2,000 was made.

An invitation or the acceptance of an application to become a short-term member of the School carried from the first a certain prestige for the member. Later this was to grow in value; there were then few prizes or awards exhibiting public honors for mathematicians -- nothing like the Nobel prizes existed for mathematics.

During the first year there were twenty-three members, most of whom stayed for both semesters. Of these six had fellowships, and eleven were employed as teachers or professors of mathematics. Some of them lectured at Fine Hall in their own specialties, not all related to modern geometry. This was a somewhat different situation from Flexner's concept of master and disciple. Fifteen of the workers had taken their doctoral degrees in 1931 or earlier. Flexner reported to the Board in some detail on the modus vivendi at Fine Hall:

> With the cooperation of Dean Eisenhart and his associates Fine Hall has offered abundant opportunity to cultivate delightful social relations in this highly varied group. Every afternoon tea is served, and there is an attendance of 60 to 75 mathematicians who discuss with one another the subjects upon which they are working, and sometimes, fortunately, subjects which have no direct relation to their work. Once a week a mathematical club assembles to hear a paper presented by some member, occasionally a professor, occasionally one of the workers. The attendance is so large...that the largest room in Fine Hall has had to be used...
>
> The workers are often busy in fields in which none of the professors has been productive, with the result that members of the group are engaged in teaching one another....The interest,

enthusiasm, ability, and numbers far exceed anything that anyone could have expected at the outset. There is another respect in which I myself have been astonished. I had supposed that the workers would be mainly young men and women who had recently obtained a Ph. D. degree....As a matter of fact, there are only two in the 21 who are recent Ph. D.'s. All the others have been teaching. Some have reached the rank of associate professor or assistant professor in the most prominent institutions of this country and Europe. They have been at work for as much as eight or ten years, during which they have made notable contributions to mathematics. They are drawn to Princeton by the opportunity to get a year of release from routine work and to spend it under the inspiring leadership of the distinguished mathematicians whom the two institutions have assembled there.

They are variously financed. Some of them pay their own way entirely, and the tuition fee besides. Others are sent by the National Research Council, or...the Rockefeller Foundation; still others have been granted leave of absence on half-pay by their own institutions, despite the fact that these institutions are hard pressed financially, and in these instances the Institute has made grants-in-aid. Already applications have been received for next year from men who have reached the position of associate professor in the most prominent institutions in the United States. I confess that I myself did not expect that so promptly we should attract scholars who will probably ten years hence be leading figures in the mathematical world.[114]

CHAPTER IV - NOTES

1. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 12/9/30.

2. Flexner, Memo to files, 12/1/30. David E. Smith to Flexner, 6/29/31.

3. G. D. Birkhoff to Flexner, 3/17/31.

4. Flexner, Confidential Memorandum, pp. 11-12.

5. O. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.

6. S. Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/28/31.

7. O. Veblen to Simon Flexner, 10/24/23. In part Veblen wrote: "In the modern case of the Einstein theory, the relation between mathematics and physics has been more one-sided /than in the development of the theories of heat conduction and electromagnetic waves/. Einstein's work is a contribution to physics in which mathematics is used as a tool. It happened that the necessary mathematics was already in existence...This left Einstein free to apply his genius to the physical and philosophical problem, using the mathematics wherever it was needed. Had he been under the necessity of creating the mathematical tools which he used in his gravitation theory, it is more than probable that this theory would have been long delayed and possibly never completed. Indeed, it may be added that without the pioneer work of the creators of non-Euclidean geometry, the frame of mind in which Einstein approached his problem would not have been possible." Veblen papers.

8. Veblen to Simon Flexner and Vernon Kellogg, 2/23/24. Veblen papers.

9. Flexner to Veblen, 1/21/30. Veblen to Flexner, 1/24/30.

10. Veblen to Flexner, 6/10/30. Flexner to Veblen, 7/7/30.

11. Flexner to Veblen, 12/9/31. Veblen to Flexner, 12/15/31.

12. Flexner to Veblen, 12/16/31.

13. Veblen to Flexner, 1/1/32.

14. Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America, B. W. Huebsch, 1918.

15. Flexner, Autobiography, p. 259ff. This is the same account in all details as had appeared in the first edition of Flexner's memoires, I Remember, Simon and Schuster, 1940. Dr. Flexner's position was delicate. He was in a sense the guest of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He had asked Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Chair-

man of the joint committee of trustees and faculty which administered the Institute, to welcome and inform the Founders on the nature of the C.I.T. and its administration the previous winter (see Flexner to Millikan, 1/27/31).
Only in the postumously written Introduction did Allan Nevins correct the record: "by persistent, tactful persuasion he enlisted Dr. Albert Einstein" in the faculty.

16. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 2/11/32.

17. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 2/13/32.

18. Flexner to H. Weyl, 2/15/32. Flexner to R. Courant, 2/13/33.

19. Flexner to Birkhoff, 2/29/32. Terms offered: salary, $20,000. Joint contributions to T.I.A.A. by the Institute and the professor, of 10%, the benefits to apply to a pension of $8,000 on retirement at age 65, which might be deferred by agreement. His wife to receive a pension of $5,000 should her husband pre-decease her. In view of the liberal terms, no other services for financial profit were to be undertaken by the professor.

20. Birkhoff to Flexner, 3/28/32. Birkhoff first accepted on 3/7/32, then retracted it to allow time for President Lowell to talk further with him. On 3/20/32 he again accepted, but was apparently dissuaded from leaving by a trustee of Harvard.

21. Aydelotte to Flexner, 3/1/33. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/3/33. Aydelotte papers.

22. Minutes, meeting, Members of the Corporation, 4/11/32, p. 3.

23. A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Coming of the New Deal, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1958, p. 256.

24. Flexner to Veblen, 3/17/33; 3/20/33.

25. Veblen to Flexner, 4/24/32.

26. Philip Frank, Einstein His Life and Times, Alfred A. Knopf, 1947, pp. 178, 266.

27. Flexner to Veblen, 6/6/32.

28. Flexner to Einstein, 6/6/32; 6/10/32; 6/14/32. Einstein to Flexner, 6/8/32; 6/10/32. The terms were: Salary, $10,000; if the German government taxed this income, the Institute would pay the American income tax. Einstein would be eligible for retirement at age 65, but it might be deferred by agreement. Pension $7,500, and for his wife should Einstein predecease her, a pension of $5,000. The

Institute terms would run from the first of October to the middle of April. Earnings outside the Institute were proscribed. The object of the Institute was research and the training of a few competent workers to be chosen by the professor. Dr. Walter Mayer, Einstein's mathematical assistant, would receive $100 per month from 10/1/32, and $4,000 p.a. in salary should he accompany Dr. Einstein to the United States. The Institute would pay the travel costs of the Einsteins.(6/6/32)
Dr. Einstein objected to several points. He thought the retirement benefits were too high. He did not want it known publicly that he would select his own students, because of embarrassments which would ensue. Dr. Mayer wanted an independent appointment, because he did not want to find himself without a position should Dr. Einstein die. Also Einstein wrote, "I want to ask you not to oblige me to start in October. This would be very uncomfortable for me here, and it doesn't mean anything for the fruitfulness of my work there." (6/8/32) Flexner then set minimum and maximum limits to the pensions: i.e., $6,000 to $7,500 for the professor, and $3,500 to $5,000 for Mrs. Einstein, the exact sum in each case to be decided later. He agreed to call Dr. Mayer an "Associate" to meet his objections. The professor's choice of his own workers would be so described as to relieve him of possible embarrassment. Flexner evidently mistook the professor's objection to the beginning date of term to apply only to 1932; he answered by pointing out that the Institute would open in 1933, and that Dr. Einstein's appointment would begin then. This misunderstanding was to cause trouble later. The appointment would be kept secret until the Professor informed Flexner that arrangements for his release were completed. On 6/14/32 the Director acknowledged to Mrs. Einstein letters from both expressing complete satisfaction and gratification.

29. Robert Millikan to Flexner, 7/25/32; 8/15/32. Flexner to Millikan, 7/30/32. Einstein to Flexner, 9/13/32.

30. George E. Hale to Flexner, 9/20/32.

31. Flexner to Veblen, 6/2/32. Terms: salary, $15,000; joint contribution to T.I.A.A. of 5% with benefits to apply on pension of $8,000 on retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. His wife to receive a pension of $5,000 should he predecease her. Sabbatical leave for a full year at full salary every seven years, effective 10/1/32. Aydelotte and Veblen files.

32. Flexner to Mrs. E. S. Bailey, 6/3/32.

33. Flexner to Mrs. Bailey, cable 6/14/32; Interview with Mrs. Bailey.

34. Flexner to Veblen, 6/4/32; 6/30/32.

35. Veblen to Flexner, 6/5/32. Dr. Veblen suggested that the excess of the pension over T.I.A.A. benefits should be insured by the Institute.

He estimated it would cost $3,000 to $4,000 per year for each senior man, and asked that that sum should be added to his salary, if he would not have to pay income tax on it. He and Dr. Weyl had discussed the following men for the faculty: Alexander, Artin, Alexandroff, Lefschetz, Dirac, Emmy Noether. For the younger men: Albert, Douglas, Gödel, Gelfont, Dewey, Whitney, McShane. After he left Weyl the following names occurred to Veblen: Stone, Whitehead, and Bohnenblust. Weyl, he said, emphasized need of a first-class modern algebraist. He also urged that it was necessary to recruit younger men for the faculty, and insisted that there should be no distinction in title between the younger and older men.
It should be noted especially that uniform salaries were not contemplated as between the older and younger men. The budget provided for

Four professors	$60,000
Personal assistants to same	12,500
Three professors or associates	30,000
Assistant professors or younger scholars .	30,000
Secretary	2,500
Librarian	3,000
New books and periodicals	4,000
Publications	3,500
Stationery, supplies	1,000

36. Flexner to Veblen, cables 6/22/32; 6/28/32. Letter, 6/28/32.

37. Veblen to Flexner, 6/18/32; 7/7/32; 7/8/32; 8/12/32. Flexner to Veblen, 7/21/32. To H. Weyl, 7/21/32; 7/29/32. Weyl to Flexner, 7/30/32.

38. Veblen to Eisenhart, 6/28/32, with copy to Flexner. Flexner to Veblen, 7/12/32; to Eisenhart, 7/12/32.

39. Flexner to Einstein, 7/12/32. To L. Bamberger, 8/30/32.

40. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/18/32. Bamberger to Flexner, 8/19/32, Telegrams. Flexner, memorandum to L. Bamberger, Leidesdorf and Maass, 8/20/32. Letter to Bamberger 8/22/32, enclosing a letter addressed to Weyl dated 8/23/32, offering terms for salary, joint contributions to T.I.A., pensions and retirement age identical with Veblen's, plus an allowance for the education of Weyl's sons: $300 p.a. while in secondary school, $1,000 p.a. for university. The Institute would pay transportation costs for the family, and guarantee Weyl against double income taxation, as in the case of Einstein. L. Bamberger to Flexner, wire and letter, 8/26/32.

41. Frank, op. cit., pp. 180-187.

42. Interviews, Veblen and Eisenhart.

43. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/32, pp. 4-7. The terms of the appointments were as agreed upon earlier, except that no mention

was made of the sabbatical year for Professor Veblen, and the effective date of his appointment was changed from 10/1/32, as agreed, to 9/1/32. At the time of his retirement, it became apparent that his salary from the University ceased at 6/30/32. (Oppenheimer to Leidesdorf, 3/27/50.) Flexner omitted his report from the minutes, but Mr. Hardin insisted that "the full report be spread upon the minutes." Hardin to Flexner, 10/26/32. Flexner to Hardin, 10/29/32.

44. Flexner to John Finley, 10/5/32.

45. New York Times, 10/11/32.

46. Weed to Flexner, 10/28/32.

47. Beard to Flexner, 10/12/32.

48. Edward Capps to Flexner, 10/11/32.

49. F. Frankfurter to Flexner, 10/29/32; 11/5/32. One may seek and find what appears to be a reason for Frankfurter's acerbity toward Dr. Einstein. Perhaps it lay in the fact that Einstein accompanied Chaim Weitzmann to the United States in 1921. On that occasion Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court withdrew from the chairmanship of the American Zionist movement, accompanied by some twenty followers, including Mr. Frankfurter, in differences over the highly controversial issue of Jewish nationalism. See Alpheus T. Mason, Brandeis: A Free Man's Life. Viking Press, 1946, pp. 460 ff.

50. Flexner, Autobiography cited, pp. 254-255.

51. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 10/14/32.

52. Veblen to Eisenhart, 6/28/32.

53. Flexner to Eisenhart, 11/12/32.

54. Veblen to Weyl, 11/11/32.

55. Flexner to Veblen, 11/17/32.

56. Eisenhart to Flexner, 11/26/32.

57. Flexner to Veblen, 12/1/32.

58. Veblen to Flexner, 12/13/32. This is the only instance of such contract in the record.

59. Flexner to Eisenhart, 12/3/32.

60. Interviews with Eisenhart and Veblen.

61. Flexner to Veblen, 12/9/32; 12/13/32.

62. Flexner to Veblen, 12/22/32. Veblen to Flexner, 12/24/32.

63. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/9/33, pp. 4-7. Terms of Alexander's appointment: salary, $10,000, with 10% in joint contributions to T.I.A.A. Retirement at age 65, unless deferred by agreement. Effective date, 10/1/33.

64. Flexner to Von Neumann, 1/9/33; to Eisenhart, 1/9/33. It would appear that Flexner submitted the nomination to the Board, and that the Board declined to approve it, probably on the ground that the Institute should not take more men from the University. Professor Veblen did not know of the change in plans until 1/10/33, when he noticed the omission of Von Neumann's name in the Times; he later received a letter from Flexner. (Mrs. Veblen's diary, which noted that "Oswald was very mad.")

65. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 1/28/33. Terms of Von Neumann's appointment were identical with those of Alexander, except that the effective date was 4/1/33.
Despite this appointment, Dr. Wigner remained as half-time professor of mathematical physics at the University, and as will be seen shortly, the University canvassed the field for a man to take the Jones research professorship. (See p. 182) Dr. Wigner accepted a full professorship at Wisconsin in 1937, returning to Princeton and the Jones chair in 1938.

66. S. D. Leidesdorf to R. Oppenheimer,

67. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/29/33.

68. Flexner to Veblen, 10/26/32.

69. Veblen to Weyl, 11/11/32.

70. Flexner to Veblen, 12/13/32; 7/31/33.

71. Flexner to Veblen, 12/11/35.

72. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty meeting, 12/14/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/20/35.

73. Veblen to Flexner, 12/19/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/23/35.

74. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5.

75. Flexner to Veblen, 4/5/33.

76. Veblen to Flexner, 12/2/32; 12/13/32.

77. Flexner to Veblen, 1/24/33. Flexner to Marston Morse, 1/25/33.

78. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.

79. Veblen to Flexner, 12/2/32.

80. R. Courant to Flexner, 12/7/32. Flexner to Courant, (draft) 12/14/32.

81. Veblen to Flexner, 12/16/32.

82. I.A.S. Bulletin No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 4-7.

83. Veblen to Flexner, 7/10/33; 7/18/33. Flexner to Veblen, 7/10/33; 7/14/33; 7/18/33; 7/24/33; 7/25/33. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 7/14/33; 7/24/33. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 7/19/33 (wire).

84. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/1/33.

85. Aydelotte to Flexner, 8/18/33; 8/26/33. Minutes, Executive Committee, 9/6/33. Terms: salary, $15,000; joint contributions of 5% each to T.I.A.A.; benefits to go toward a pension of $8,000 on retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. Instead of a pension for Mrs. Weyl, Weyl was to receive $1,500 p.a. with which to purchase insurance to protect his family. Effective date, 1/1/34, which was advanced later to 12/1/33.

86. Einstein to Flexner, 3/26/33.

87. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 5/29/33; 7/6/33.

88. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 7/6/33. Mrs. Einstein to Flexner, 7/19/33.

89. Frank, op. cit., p. 146.

90. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 7/19/33. Einstein to Flexner, 7/29/33.

91. New York Times, A. P. dispatch dated 8/4/33.

92. Leidesdorf and Maass to Flexner, 10/2/33. Flexner to Maass, 10/2/33, Telegrams.

93. Flexner to President Roosevelt, 11/3/33.

94. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 11/14/33; 11/15/33. Mrs. Einstein to Flexner, 11/15/33. Interview with Miss Helen Dukas.

95. Emil Hilb to Flexner, 11/30/33. Flexner to Hilb, 12/4/33. Einstein to Flexner, 12/9/33. Interview with Dr. Eugene Wigner. The mediator was Professor Ladenburg.

96. Flexner to L. Bamberger, with copy to Maass, 12/11/33.

97. Flexner to Maass, 2/19/34. Jesse Isador Straus to Flexner, 3/15/34. Flexner to Straus, 3/27/34.

98. Veblen to Einstein, 4/17/30. Einstein to Veblen, 4/30/30. Veblen papers.

99. Veblen to Flexner, 1/24/33.

100. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 12/12/36; 2/23/37; 2/25/37; 4/12/37. Einstein to Flexner, 4/11/37. Flexner to Einstein, 4/12/37; to Veblen, 4/12/37.

101. Leopold Infeld, Quest, Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1941, pp. 305-306. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 2/23/37; 2/25/37; 4/12/37. These show that Dr. Infeld's name was held on a reserve list in February, despite Einstein's request. By the April meeting, shifts in the list of those invited left $2,200 available, which was then obligated in other ways, and no part of it for Infeld.
The budgets for 1934-1935 and 1935-1936 allocated $10,000 of the $30,000 stipends for the School of Mathematics for mathematical physics, at the request of Professors Einstein and Von Neumann (who was devoting half his time to that field). Thereafter, at Professor Veblen's request, the division between physics and mathematics was dropped. This occurred in face of diminished stipends for the School, due to the Institute's straitened financial condition.

102. Infeld, op. cit., p. 310 ff.

103. G. D. Birkhoff, Fifty Years of American Mathematics, Reprint from Vol. II, Semicentennial Addresses, Amer. Math. Soc., p. 307.

104. Frank, op. cit., p. 206.

105. Albert Einstein, Autobiographical Notes in Albert Einstein, Philosopher, Scientist, The Library of Living Philosophers Inc., 1949. Infeld, op. cit., p. 253.

106. Frank, op. cit., p. 114.

107. E. S. Schroedinger to Flexner, 6/25/34.

108. Flexner to Schroedinger, 7/4/34. Schroedinger to Flexner, 7/9/34. Flexner to Eisenhart, 7/4/34.

109. Einstein to Flexner, 9/3/35.

110. Flexner to Einstein, 9/7/35.

111. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 10/8/35. At this meeting it was suggested and agreed that workers should henceforth be

called members, and grants-in-aid, stipends.
Minimum stipends for single and married members and assistants were set by agreement at $1,500 and $1,800 respectively. It was also decided that while concern was naturally felt by the faculty for members and assistants who had no positions to go to on leaving the Institute, letters of invitation and acceptance should make clear that the Institute was responsible for nothing beyond the actual period of appointment.

112. Flexner to Veblen, 9/14/34.

113. Veblen to Flexner, 1/14/35, p. 1. / Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, pp. 4, 11. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/27/34. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/29/34, Aydelotte papers. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/14/35, p. 1. Terms: salary, $12,500; equal joint contributions of 5% to T.I.A.A.; retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. Effective 7/1/35.

114. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/29/34.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

Shortly after the first successful steps in organizing the School of Mathematics were taken, the Founders decided to withdraw from active participation as Trustees and the chief officers of the Institute. The Director seized the opportunity to replace them with two men on whose counsel he hoped to rely in establishing the School of Economics. As he had said earlier, this was "the realm most difficult and dangerous to approach" in research. It was not going to be easy even at the Institute, for Mr. Bamberger was very skeptical of the advantages of the researches Flexner had outlined in his book and the Memorandum of September, 1931. Mr. Bamberger apparently had little faith in a scientific approach to economics; he had evidently had an unfortunate experience with economic counsel in his business at one time or another.[1]

In January, 1933, Mr. Bamberger announced a "decision of a personal nature" to the Board. He is reported to have said:

> Mrs. Fuld and I have taken the closest interest and the most profound pleasure in our association with this enterprise. We feel, however, that we wish in its interest not to be burdened with responsibility but rather to leave responsibility in the hands of the Director and the Trustees. We have discussed this matter fully with the Director, and it is our opinion, in which he concurs, that the By-Laws can be simplified so as to permit a gradual evolution by dropping the offices of President and Vice-President of the Board of Trustees, so that the executive management of the Institute will remain in the hands of the Trustees while the Director will be responsible for the scientific direction. In addition, Mrs. Fuld and I would prefer to resign as Trustees and to accept a suggestion made by the Director that we become Honorary Trustees with the privilege of at-

tending meetings of the Board and the committees, and membership on committees.

This statement on my part, with which Mrs. Fuld agrees, will indicate to you our confidence in the Board and our firm belief that the warm reception and commendation which the Institute has received indicate that it is destined to fill a need in the higher scheme of American education. I trust that this informal notice on our part will be accepted by the Board and that suitable amendments and nominations may be submitted at the annual meeting....I assure you that my interest and Mrs. Fuld's interest have become keener and keener as time has passed and that we will do all in our power to promote the objects for which the Institute was founded.

I beg you to accept our warm thanks for your invaluable cooperation and support, and we look to you to maintain the high standard at which a beginning is now to be made.[2]

The By-Laws were amended at the next meeting; the Founders became Honorary Trustees "for the terms of their respective lives;" they would "meet with the Trustees and with each and every committee of the Institute and participate in the deliberations of the Board and of the several committees." Technically, they were not given the right to vote, but that was academic, for the mere expression of their opinion, usually secured in advance of any proposal to act, was more influential than the vote of any other Trustee. Despite the formal changes, Mr. Bamberger continued to exercise control over the appointment of members of the standing committees and the selection of Members of the Corporation and Trustees. Also, he maintained a close watch over expenditures since he continued to countersign the Treasurer's checks.[3] Their offices were combined with others; the amended By-Laws provided that in the following;

The person elected to the office of President shall also be the Chairman of the Board and the person elected as Vice-President shall also be the Vice-Chairman of the Board.

The full powers and duties of the President became those of the Chairman;

those of the Vice-President became those of a new officer, the Vice-Chairman.

The Committee on Educational Policy was eliminated. The provision for faculty trustees had been eliminated at the request of the Founders on 11th January, 1932, and a substitute providing that "members of the faculty not exceeding three in number shall sit with the Board in an advisory capacity to serve for a period of three years" was approved. Now it was amended again, this time to reinstate faculty trustees without limit in number.[4]

The Trustees, gratified by these evidences of confidence on the part of the donors, expressed their thanks and their determination to administer the Institute without discrimination "directly or indirectly because of race, religion or sex." The resolution continued:

> True to the spirit which has animated Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, the Trustees pledge themselves anew to the upbuilding of an institution devoted to the purest and highest type of scholarship and to the pursuit of methods calculated to make the Institute what the Founders desired -- a paradise for scholars. The Trustees join in expressing the hope that the Founders may live long in health and happiness, observing and participating in the growth of the Institute which they have established upon such a lofty basis and with such pure and high ideals.[5]

Mr. Houghton was re-elected Chairman. Because of ill health, his attendance at meetings was very irregular, and Flexner foresaw that the Vice-Chairman was to be a very important officer. He and Mr. Maass viewed things in much the same light, and co-operated in achieving their objectives; the Director would like to see the lawyer in the new office. Maass was not an officer in the first slate, which had been chosen by Mr. Bamberger, but he agreed informally to serve.

> Frankly, I have given our Sunday discussion much thought and after mature reflection can merely say that you know perhaps better than anyone else the extent of my interest in the Institute and its future. If, therefore, you feel that carrying out the suggestion you had in mind will enable me to cooperate with you to promote the welfare of the project which both of us have so close to our hearts, I shall be glad to conform to your views. On the other hand, the depth of my interest is such that I will be content to continue to serve in the present, or any other capacity that may be suggested, so long as I may have a part in bringing to fruition what has had so auspicious a beginning...[6]

Dr. Flexner secured Mr. Bamberger's approval, and Maass was elected Vice-Chairman. It seemed to be a fortunate choice. He was assiduous in attendance and in preparation for the meetings. Mr. Houghton was able to attend less than half of the Board's sessions before his death in September 1941, and was present at but one meeting of the Executive Committee, while Mr. Maass was absent from only two Board meetings and one of the Executive Committee during the same period.

The unexpired terms of the Founders were filled at Flexner's suggestion by Messrs. Felix Frankfurter and Walter W. Stewart. Both men deliberated for some time before accepting the invitations extended informally by the Director and formally by Percy Straus, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations. Mr. Frankfurter's letter to Flexner, with a copy to Mr. Straus, showed how seriously the Harvard man took his new responsibilities, and with what firm convictions:

> If I have delayed action upon your kind suggestion to have me join the Board of Directors of your Institute, it is not for lack of deep sympathy with your efforts or keen interest in the realization of the purposes of the Institute. Just because I so strongly hope for great things for learning and the promotion of higher learning in this country, I have been hesitating lest I undertake a responsibility which I cannot, even within my limited powers, discharge. You know how I feel about dummy directors in general, and most fiercely

about dummy educational directors. They seem to me to violate the spirit of the Holy Ghost most flagrantly.

In saying this I do not mean to overrate the functions of the members of the Board of an organization like your Institute, for of course the essential direction of the Institute should be by its members -- a society of scholars must be governed by scholars of that society; and yet, certainly at the outset, there may be a useful function for a Board -- a temporary period, as it were, in the stages of the ultimate government of the Institute.

I wanted to be sure that I had the available time to discharge such a conception as I have of the duties of a member of your Board. On the whole I do not feel justified in refusing on a speculation in view of the special case you made to me for the enlistment of the interest and experience of men like Stewart and myself, now that you are engaged in the establishment of what roughly I shall call a school of sociology. I am prepared, therefore, to accept membership on your Board if you and the Board are ready to have me, in the light of the attitude of mine disclosed in this letter -- which, of course, is no news to you -- as well as upon the distinct understanding that if I find I cannot responsibly discharge the obligations of the office, you will release me.[7]

The Director's response showed no misgivings about the lawyer's reservations. He knew how able an advocate Frankfurter could be, and perhaps relied upon his help in converting Mr. Bamberger to a more friendly attitude toward faculty participation in academic decisions, as his answer indicated:

I am sure that men like you and Stewart, looking at the problems of social life from somewhat different points of view, will prove of inestimable value to those who are in the last resort bound to do the job.

It is one of my main ambitions to illustrate in the conduct of this Institute what under American conditions the relative functions of faculty, Director and Trustees are and should be.[8]

Of Stewart's acceptance on the occasion of their second luncheon together Flexner wrote Mrs. Fuld, paraphrasing the economist's response thus:

'I have thought over your kind invitation, and I shall accept. In my judgment, there is no place in Europe or America where a school of economics or politics has been formed in such wise that economics can be placed on the level of scientific medicine or any of the exact sciences. Our main difficulty in the present crisis is that nobody knows anything, and we cannot in the midst of this storm find the truth in a hurry. As I understand it, you are proposing to create for economists the conditions which are enjoyed by physicists, mathematicians, etc. If you do, it will make a new era in the world, and I shall be very, very proud to contribute my experience both as professor and as business man to the slow upbuilding of such an enterprise.'[9]

Mr. Bamberger showed his approval in one of his rare letters.

As Mrs. Fuld agreed to take care of the correspondence, I have kept in the background. I am now making an exception to our rule to say that we appreciate the new prospective Trustees. They will add influence and prestige to the Institute.[10]

The Director's reference to the differing points of view of the new Trustees was a masterpiece of understatement. They were unlike in personality, temperament, politics, professional experience and objectives. Mr. Stewart was quiet, almost shy, self-effacing, but firm and decisive nevertheless. Frankfurter was ebullient, vocal, witty. Stewart counseled few; he was reluctant to give advice, and averse to "making a record." Mr. Frankfurter was quick to advise, eager to see his counsel followed. Both men were of small stature physically. Stewart was dignified, charming and reserved to the point of mystery. Frankfurter has been well described by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.:

quick, articulate, jaunty...inexhaustible in his energy and curiosity, giving off sparks...He loved people, loved conversation, loved influence, loved life. Beyond his sparkling personal qualities, he had an erudite and incisive legal intelligence, a resourceful approach to questions of public policy, and a passion for raising standards of public service. And, to make these things effective, he had what Mr. Justice Holmes had not unkindly described in 1920 as 'an unimaginable gift for wiggling in wherever he wants to.'[11]

While Stewart mistrusted "politicians," believing that industry, commerce and finance should be left to manage the nation's economy without interference by government, Frankfurter was all for extending public regulation to new areas of public concern through the agency of administrative law. Their differences could be further elaborated, but to little purpose since the story to be told reveals them. Suffice it to say that Frankfurter's readiness to take positions and debate them ardently contrasted with Mr. Stewart's instinct to play a silent, but not inactive, role. He prevailed on Flexner not to record his infrequent remarks in the minutes.[12] The record reveals that he had profound influence with the Director who shared his conservative political views.

Dr. Flexner knew neither man intimately. He had first heard of Mr. Stewart from Mr. Henry Clay, Economic Adviser to the Bank of England, in the spring of 1932, as he consulted him about economists for the Institute. Clay, formerly Professor of Economics at Manchester University, had succeeded Stewart at the Bank, and was not himself interested then in Flexner's invitation to come to the Institute for Advanced Study as professor. Understanding that the Director was eager to secure men who had both knowledge of theory and practical experience in business and government, Clay suggested his predecessor and one of Stewart's former students, Dr. Winfield W. Riefler, then at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, and author of the definitive work on money rates and markets in the United States. Flexner found that Stewart and Riefler were devoted to their present activities. At his first meeting with Mr. Stewart, or his second, Flexner asked the economist to come to the Institute and establish a School of Economics. Stewart declined, feeling he was bound to stay with his

firm for the time being. But the offer was left open, and Stewart became Flexner's chief adviser on economics, both men anticipating that within months or a few years Stewart would return to academic life as professor at the Institute.[13]

Flexner evidently met Frankfurter through his brother Bernard Flexner, also a brilliant lawyer and friend of Mr. Justice Brandeis. As has been said, he consulted Mr. Frankfurter during 1931 as he planned the organization of the Institute. Late in 1932, despite their seeming differences over the manner of governing the Institute, he intimated that he would like a lawyer of Frankfurter's quality in the School of Economics, and ventured: "you, yourself, may be the fellow." The record reveals no response. Later, he renewed his attack indirectly, again without evoking an answer.[14]

Each of the new Trustees seemed to believe that the Director contemplated development of the new School in the way he would like to see it done. Flexner had always emphasized economics as being the subject of most importance in the social sciences; as a youth he had fallen in love with the political economy of Thomas Edward Cliffe Leslie. In Universities he mentioned politics as important also. As he prepared his Confidential Memorandum of September, 1931, some ambiguity crept into this clear view. He talked first of economics alone, quoting Mr. Justice Holmes on the man of the future -- the man of statistics and the master of economics. But several paragraphs later, probably as a result of Dr. Beard's telling blow, (See p. 104) he had construed economics "in the broad sense, inclusive of political theory, ethics, and other subjects that are involved therein." But when he spoke of the kind of man he

wanted, it was of the economist, and not the philosopher; a man "by turns a student of practice and a thinker," in touch with the realities of business and government, and yet not identified with either, but close to both and capable of analyzing them objectively and accurately.

He spoke of the advantages the Institute could offer the man who "may elect to study thorny and contentious financial business or social problems; he can take his time...Whatever his conclusions, his intellectual integrity is not likely to be impaired or impugned. On this basis alone can a university or institute be in the world and of the world...and yet preserve its absolute independence and freedom of thought and speech."

As has been said, Mr. Frankfurter had expressed his agreement with Flexner's choice of mathematics and economics, differing with his attributing to mathematics what mathematicians were fond of claiming for their discipline -- its stimulation of music, poetry, philosophy and the other humanities. That with other similar criticism of his draft caused Flexner to revise it, so that as presented it claimed for mathematics only that it was the foundation of modern science.

When he met Walter Stewart, he found the man who exemplified almost precisely the qualities he sought. He had had academic experience. He had then inaugurated the system of statistics and economic analyses most relied upon by the government. He was now in business. Thus he was conversant with business and government at high levels; familiar too with the economic theories of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and aware the twentieth was still trying to get along on outmoded generalizations on the nature of the phenomena it sought to understand. There

was a mutuality in Stewart's and Flexner's interest and understanding of the field. Thus Flexner wrote Dr. Aydelotte that "[Stewart] has decided that the way in which we are approaching the subject of economics is the most hopeful in the entire field today."[15]

Walter Stewart was at this time a master of monetary and banking theory and practice, and an outstanding economic analyst. A graduate of the University of Missouri, he was financial editor of the St. Louis Times before he began teaching economics, which he did for twelve years, first as assistant and associate professor at University of Missouri and at Michigan, and then, (1916-1922) as full professor at Amherst. He was greatly admired and respected by his students and colleagues, several of whom kept their friendships and contacts through the years. For the two years preceding his going to Amherst he was both student and colleague of Thorstein Veblen, iconoclast and satirist of the American society and particularly of its leaders in business and finance. A warm friendship endured until Veblen died in 1929; one is given to understand by Isaiah Dorfmann, biographer of Veblen, that the two men were close and companionable. Since Mr. Stewart was to exhibit none of the qualities of a rebel, it may have been Veblen's influence which led Stewart to write a sardonic parody of the Declaration of Independence in discussing J. P. Morgan & Company's disposition of an application for a loan by revolution-torn Mexico.[16] And perhaps Stewart's leaving Amherst was another instance of the same influence; Veblen's independence in personal conduct and in the freedom with which he spoke his mind that had shortened several of his successive university connections. Circumstances were different here. In June, 1923, Amherst's Trustees dismissed President Alexander Meikeljohn

because of his liberal policies, and Mr. Dwight W. Morrow, Morgan partner and influential trustee, tried to persuade Stewart to take the office, with the concession that his friend Meikeljohn could remain as head of the Department of Philosophy. Stewart declined, and resigned with several of his colleagues in protest.[17] Neither episode seemed to prejudice him in subsequent relations with the House of Morgan which appear to have been quite close over the next decade.

During his sabbatical leave (1922-1923) the economist had reorganized and directed the technical economic studies conducted by the Federal Reserve Board's Division of Research and Statistics; he returned to it as Director until 1926, when he became chief economist of the Wall Street investment securities firm of Case, Pomeroy & Company. Meanwhile he had become the chief economic adviser to Governor Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank who, supported by the City's great banking houses, had asserted and exercised control over the monetary policies of the new central banking system of the United States from its inception.[18]

The twenties witnessed the partnership of Strong and Governor Montagu Norman of the Bank of England in efforts to stabilize the currencies of Europe and re-establish gold as their foundation. Walter Stewart served constantly as Strong's adviser during these Herculean labors until he went to the Bank of England as its first Economic Adviser at the end of 1927. There he installed a system of statistical and economic studies like those of the Federal Reserve Board, and also acted as the liaison between the two central banks, remaining until April, 1930, though Strong died in October, 1928. The policies and practices of the

two great central banking systems as they struggled with the problems of international finance in the post-war period were those of the powerful American and British private bankers. Both banks were privately owned, and their owners were dedicated to the conviction that monetary controls belonged by right in their hands, and were not within the purview of governments. Thus sterling was returned to the gold standard in 1925 at its pre-war value by their mutual agreement. The pound could not maintain its position if interest rates in the United States were allowed to equal or exceed British rates. Support of Britain in these circumstances required Strong on occasion to adopt domestic policies which were said to conflict with the best interests of the American economy.

Notable in such case was Strong's action in easing credit in the United States in mid-1927, which aided England in the crisis but contributed to American inflation and to the orgy of stock-market speculation culminating in the crash of October, 1929, for which he was much criticized on grounds both of substance and method.[19] No believers in political remedies for derangements in the economy, Strong and his advisers either could not think of any specific controls to limit market speculation, specifically, or were unwilling to propose measures for legislation giving the Federal Reserve Board more power. Thus it remained to New Deal advisers, notably two of Mr. Frankfurter's young lawyers, acting in cooperation with Dr. Riefler and other financial experts, to devise one specific: i.e., prescription of margins in brokers' loans by the Federal Reserve Board.[20] It was not long after the conference leading to the mid-1927 action that the rumor spread that Walter Stewart

was going to London to become Economic Adviser to the Bank of England. And that, because he was relatively unknown to the financial press, caused some frantic exploration of his background. What was gleaned came from his former students. When he left London in April, 1930, his departure was marked by expressions of the deepest esteem and affection.

Stewart rejoined Case, Pomeroy & Company, as Chairman of the Board, and continued, according to the press, to execute confidential missions for Governor George L. Harrison of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Governor Eugene Meyer of the Federal Reserve Board, and Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon. These he undertook with admirable dispatch and secrecy, moving with apparent invisibility between Europe and the United States, between New York and Washington. Indeed, he has been called the "grey eminence" of American finance of the period. Unlike the friar François du Tremblay, he did not walk vast distances in rope sandals and worn cassock, but like him Stewart, simple and unassuming, melted into the commonalty, holding great power in his quiet hands. Only once did he doff his cloak of invisibility and assume an assignment publicly; late in 1931 he represented Governor Harrison on an international committee called to advise the Bank for International Settlements on Germany's ability to resume reparations payments at the expiration of the moratorium then in effect. By virtue of his excellent economic preparation, his firmness and his tact, he caused his confreres on the Committee to take into consideration the vast commercial credits owed United States interests by Germany and other European countries, and to recognize, despite their reluctance to do so, that reparations and the commercial credits were in fact related, and must be dealt with accordingly.

Stewart was generally recognized as "the brains" behind the highly successful investment counsels of his firm. As a follower of Mr. J. M. Keynes' use of arbitrage, (although he opposed vigorously Keynes' general economic theories) he impressed Mrs. Raymond B. Fosdick, a client, with his success in handling her account in the adverse circumstances of the times. He met her husband, and became a friend of the family. Mr. Fosdick was so impressed with Stewart's quiet wisdom and his financial acumen that he secured his election as a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, despite an inability to get the prior approval of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was traveling abroad. When Mr. Rockefeller met Stewart, and observed his success with the Foundation's portfolio, he was pleased, and insisted that Stewart become also a member of the General Education Board. Later, when the philanthropist retired from the chairmanship of the two boards, he insisted that Stewart take his place, and the economist occupied both posts until he retired at age sixty-five.[21]

As the new Administration took office in 1933 in Washington, and newspapermen indulged their fancies as to cabinet members and other officers, Mr. Stewart was mentioned as possible Under-secretary of the Treasury, and Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. But there was little chance that he would be asked or would have accepted a post in the new Administration. For it was soon evident that the new government was determined to take from the New York bankers the power to control the nation's monetary system which had so long rested in their hands. The philosophy of Benjamin Strong, Stewart, Norman, and their supporters was rejected along with their practices; the interests of the nation

were to be asserted in a series of moves, some successful and some not, but all dedicated to shifting the center of financial power to Washington from New York.

Felix Frankfurter took his law degree from Harvard in 1906, and entered the practice of law under Henry L. Stimson, then United States attorney at New York. After eight years in public practice, he was called to the Harvard Law School, where he remained until President Roosevelt appointed him to the United States Supreme Court in 1939. Politically he was first identified with the Bull Moose Party, supporting such programs as public hydro-electric power and reformed welfare and labor legislation. During these years he briefed and sometimes argued before the Supreme Court cases arising under welfare law. He worked to elect Franklin Roosevelt in 1932, and according to Mr. Schlesinger, declined the President's offer to appoint him Solicitor General in 1933, saying that he could be more helpful to the new Administration as a "professorial free-lance."[22] (According to his biographical account in Who's Who he had declined Governor Ely's offer of an appointment to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in 1932.) He aided the Administration by sending to Washington young and brilliant attorneys for government service who probably would have gone into private practice in normal times.

In the early years of the New Deal Frankfurter and his mentor and friend, Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis, disapproved of the basic social and economic policies of the national planners in Washington. Later their own policies came to the fore. Frankfurter, quoted by Mr. Schlesinger as saying in 1931 that government expenditures not matched by revenues showed

cowardice, met John Maynard Keynes in England during the first year of the new Adminstration and became converted to Keynes' conviction that if private spending did not support the economy, public, even deficit, spending must. It was some time before the Administration was forced to adopt the policy, though Frankfurter did what he could to see that President Roosevelt had the opportunity to meet Keynes and study his theories.[23]

Frankfurter spent his first year as Trustee of the Institute at Oxford as George Eastman Professor, thanks to Aydelotte and Flexner. His absence from the country was to prove disastrous in his relations with the Director. Frankfurter's energetic attack on matters which engaged his special interest, his quick wit unrestrained by concern for the target, and after his election as Trustee his suddenly manifested impatience with Flexner's somewhat labored humor, had clouded relations even before he left for England in the summer of 1933. Flexner learned that a certain kind of playfulness was not helpful in writing to the new Trustee. Nor was his tendency to resort to hyperbole when he found himself unwilling or unable to disclose his position fully. It simply provoked the lawyer to deadly riposte which silenced intercourse. Indeed, Flexner had occasion to note that with his election to the Board Frankfurter's attitude changed. Thus as soon as he received notice of his election, he chided himself for his "thoughtlessness" about his commitment to Oxford, and again deplored "dummy" membership on educational boards. Flexner, in high good humor, replied that his situation was understood when he was elected, and that he wouldn't characterize being Eastman Professor as being a "dummy." Frankfurter replied stiffly:

> No, I don't expect to be wholly a dummy at Oxford, but it does imply my absence...You will have to put up with my pedantry -- for about a few things which used to be called 'principles' I am a little fussy....It is...essential for my own serenity that in a formal way I be given leave of absence from your Board.[24]

The first candidate for the second School who was discussed by Flexner and Frankfurter was Dr. Jacob Viner of the University of Chicago,who was commended to the Director by some of the European economists, notably Schumpeter, who considered him the best of the academic Americans, and by Taussig, Beard, Broadus Mitchell and others with the same opinion. Frankfurter gave Viner his unqualified endorsement, writing on 7th January, 1932:

> I have tested Viner by encountering his mind on economic matters in which the law was implicated and as to which for years I have done a good deal of worrying. I found that I was up against a tougher and acuter mind than that of most of my colleagues whose job it is to deal with the legal questions that Viner was canvassing. Above all I value in Viner an intellectual rectitude that allows him to go wherever his mind carries him, undeflected by those considerations of optimism and prudence which subtly corrode the hardy thinking of so many scholars in America in social economics these days. Viner is like Keynes in his intellectual ruthlessness, in not mixing his insight with his desires or his hopes or in shrinking from the disagreeable.[25]

Flexner had already met and talked with Viner twice, and promised Frankfurter to make further occasions to meet him. But it is apparent that he had not given the Chicago man serious consideration. He had found Viner's views as to useful research in economics different from his own. Nevertheless, he had requested the economist to inform him about contemporary American schools of thought and method, and Viner had presented him with an admirable short essay. He advised the appointment of the best of the European men: one who would not be wedded to

any specialty in the field, and who would be competent to research in any of them and adapt his method to the subject of inquiry. Above all, such a man must approach American economists and their methods with a fully developed critical viewpoint. Viner himself seemed inclined to favor the vanishing school of thought which treated economics as

> primarily a social philosophy with special emphasis on the business organization of society, on standards of living, class stratification, prosperity and poverty, etc...usually with a marked ethical flavor....Economics here is...far away in the subject matter and methods of reaching its conclusions from the 'scientific' disciplines like physics and chemistry ....It should have no pretensions to being scientific, but it should not, on that account, have too much of an inferiority complex.

The professor was very critical of the so-called "institutionalists" and the quantitative schools of thought toward which he found Flexner gravitating.[26]

Despite their differing views, Flexner did not tell Frankfurter then that he was not really considering Viner. However, in the winter of 1934 the two friends became alienated, and Flexner took occasion to end discussion of the economist when it was announced that Mr. Morgenthau had appointed him to be one of his consultants. Then he wrote Frankfurter:

> I am afraid Viner's relationship with Morgenthau and the need of cooperation in doing polite things may hurt him, although there is always the possibility it may simply enrich him.[27]

The first appointment to the second School came about before the Director was really ready, and seems to have led Flexner into a different concept of it. Dr. David Mitrany, a Roumanian living in England, an internationalist, journalist and political scientist, had been a

friend of the Director since 1928. Flexner had been instrumental in Harvard's invitation to the journalist to take a visiting professorship for two years terminating in the spring of 1933.[28] Mitrany had met Frankfurter through Flexner and found a thoroughly congenial friend in him.

Dr. Mitrany asked Flexner to invite him to the Institute for a year to enable him to write a certain paper. Though the Director declined because he was not ready to organize the School of Economics, he expressed interest in Mitrany's possible later appointment.[29] Strangely, it was the offer of an appointment to Yale, where the political scientist had also lectured, and news that Harvard was seeking funds with which to call him in permanently, which precipitated the question of his employment by the Institute. During February Frankfurter added his weight to that of Mitrany, who for personal reasons did not want to remain away from England, and by the 21st Flexner acted on a consensus between them that Mitrany should be nominated at the annual meeting, to return to England for the next academic year to study the organization of the new School, hopefully to be opened in October 1934. The plan was carried out.[30]

During this period Flexner had been led to decide on a broader School, to embrace not only economics, but political science, history and "a lawyer like Frankfurter." Mitrany made clear that he regarded some synthesis of knowledge in the social sciences essential, although he conceded that each scholar should "apecialize in some field." The important thing in his mind was that "the members of the group should start with some sympathy of outlook upon their common road." He frankly

doubted the capacity of any economist to cooperate fully, to become part of a congenial group, without which he feared little of use would be accomplished. To this, Flexner replied that he was sure the three men were in total agreement that "the problem of society has got to be attacked by a congenial group from various angles...but not at the sacrifice of brains and originality to amiability or congeniality and second-rateness." Flexner added his wish that "Felix and Stewart will come to the Board."[31]

Mitrany suggested from the first a survey of the fields generally understood to comprise the social sciences so that a synthesis of existing knowledge and suggestions for specialized researches to be pursued in future might be obtained. But Flexner fended this off, and happily suggested that since Mitrany and Frankfurter would meet at Oxford, near which Mitrany lived, they might confer frequently together and also at times with his great friend Professor Llewellyn Woodward, a historian at All Souls.

Mitrany and Flexner carried on a voluminous correspondence during 1934. Throughout this, they drifted ever farther apart, so that by year's end they were frankly at odds. So were Flexner and Frankfurter, whose correspondence was truncated early, as will be described. Meanwhile, Flexner drew ever closer to Mr. Stewart, whose counsels carried him along the paths he had followed in Universities and in his organization memorandum: i.e., the emphasis on economics studied "scientifically."

Mitrany continued to urge that the planning of the School be put into the hands of a group of eminent social scientists who should be called together at Princeton for the purpose. This Flexner vetoed, saying

that neither he nor the Trustees would entrust that power to a group with whom they would have no influence. The political scientist also asked the Director to bring to Princeton a professor of sociology at the London School to advise him; the professor was about to take his sabbatical leave. But Flexner doubted the validity of sociology as a social science; moreover, he had read the latest book of the London man, and found it "scopey," a term of disparagement used by Frederick Gates to describe diffuse scholarly effort. Other suggestions and supporting arguments were made. Toward the end of October 1934 Mitrany summarized his various suggestions which Flexner had considered individually.

> These are some main aspects of the work that might be undertaken, and inter-related, in the social sciences:
>
> 1. Sociology. Comparative study of certain social institutions and factors.
>
> 2. Economics. An analysis of the economic aspect of social institutions and of the social aspect of economic institutions.
>
> 3. Biology. The reality of social selection.
>
> 4. Psychology. The differential social psychology reflected in social institutions.
>
> 5. Philosophy. Re-examination and re-evaluation of the idea of progress.
>
> On the scientific side, a survey and valuation of the available knowledge would in itself be a most timely contribution, and the only sound starting point for fresh research as well as for any attempt at philosophical restatement.

Finally Flexner brought the discussion back to his own original idea.

> As I conceive the School of Economics and Politics, we are going to try to re-examine the postulates of economic theory

and to take a very objective view of political theory of government.[32]

Meanwhile, an unfortunate impasse had been reached between Frankfurter and Flexner. It arose over the question of the Institute's policy on professorial salaries, and was touched off by a question from Frankfurter in December 1933 when he received a copy of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting at which Hermann Weyl was appointed. He asked Flexner what his intention was as to salaries in the second School. Flexner hedged a bit, then recited the salaries so far established, which were at two different rates, with differing provisions for retiring annuities. In the argument which followed, he might have stood reasonably on the ground that the salary rates were justified according to the age and qualifications of the recipients. But he could not, for he was even then intending to complete the second School and initiate the third in the face of inadequate funds to enable payment of salaries according to the scale set in the School of Mathematics. Indeed, he was short of funds, and contemplated the necessity of offering salaries lower than any heretofore paid. But as was his habit, he would not admit his embarrassment. Instead, he defended individually-negotiated salaries on the ground that the English and German universities followed that practice. Moreover, he argued that he had arranged grants for study on the basis of individual need at the General Education Board, with what he termed complete success.[33]

Mr. Frankfurter advocated classified salary rates objectively applied, and warned that individually-negotiated salaries were alien to institutions in the United States and were inevitably sources of discord

and discontent among scholars. Vainly he urged his policy on the Director with cogent arguments based on his academic experience. Flexner dismissed both by saying that everything being presently done at the Institute was "experimental," and therefore subject to change. The lawyer argued that in the meantime harm would be done. Moreover, he did not want to hear anything more for some time about the German universities; they had not offered effective and courageous opposition to Hitler's depredations, possibly because of the effects of the individual bargaining to which the professors had been subjected. The Director lapsed into hyperbole: the Institute was "a paradise for scholars," who really did not care for money, but only for the search for truth.[34]

This touched off an explosion. Frankfurter, exasperated, replied that he did not

> think it very helpful to take too seriously the exuberant rhetoric of thinking of the Institute as a 'paradise for scholars.' For one thing, the natural history of paradise is none too encouraging as a precedent. Apparently it was an excellent place for one person, but it was fatal even for two -- or at least for two when the snake entered, and the snake seems to be an early and congenial companion of man. Really, figures of speech are among the most fertile sources of intellectual confusion. Let's try to aim at something human, for we are dealing with humans and not with angels. I do not know by what right you may hope for a combination of greater disinterestness and capacity than, say, the Harvard Law School is able to attract, or, let us say, than is now found in the Supreme Court...I can assure you that neither of these institutions could be conducted on the assumption that it is a paradise. In both personal interactions play an important part; in both personal sensitiveness has not been wanting because of personal differentiations.

Temporary grants-in-aid were not to be compared with salary rates for permanent staff; he added:

> I need not repeat the grounds of my objection. But I may say that such a society as I envisage precludes an administrator who plays Lady Bountiful or, to keep my sex straight, Kris Kringle....The Institute's concern is so to fix salaries as to enable a man to live as a civilized gentleman in a world in which the family is the ordinary social unit. You seem to me to have a little bit too much of the administrator's confidence in assuming (a) that you can spot the man 'who is trying to make a good bargain,' or (b) that you could plan the life of a man who is too shy or too proud to enter into the realm of bargaining. And if you'll forgive me for saying so, you also have a little bit of the optimism of the administrator who thinks his scheme 'works perfectly' because evils have not yet disclosed themselves, and particularly have not been disclosed to him.
>
> From all of which you will gather that I feel very strongly about this. It is only one aspect of my conviction that a society of scholars implies a democratic aristocracy like unto the self-government by which say, Balliol is conducted. This implies impersonal equality and self-government by the group. Those are the aims to which I am committed. I write this frankly because you may think that, holding these views, I may not be a very useful member for your Board. If so. I'd better get out before I am on. In putting this to you, I am quite impersonal. It has nothing to do with our personal relations, and they would remain what they were before, were you to tell me that perhaps it is just as well that I resign before I become active.[35]

The Director did not reply in the heat of his first reaction. He was a proud man, and sensitive as only a sentimental person can be. He consulted Dr. Aydelotte before answering. Then it was apparent that the sarcasm had found its mark; he reproved Frankfurter for his "bluntness." He had never attended a Board meeting at which some reference to German universities was not made, and probably never would. His "exuberant rhetoric" was merely a manner of speaking colorfully; men now and then engaged in such flights. He did not regard himself as an administrator; he was fully capable of directing the Institute. He gave not an inch and concluded with perfunctory politesse and the hope that "we may continue to enjoy the benefits of your co-operation and experience

as a member of the Board.[36]

Mr. Frankfurter, aware now that Flexner did not care if he did resign, consulted his good friend Bernard Flexner, who in turn confided copies of the correspondence to Simon. The pathologist expressed admiration for the lawyer's "unusual clarity of insight, as well as felicity and power of expression." But, he added:

> So far as Abe is concerned, he has had battles to fight at the General Education Board and has not sidestepped them. He also does not lack courage and conviction. I have no doubt that he will welcome Felix on his Board just as warmly now that he knows his opposing points of view.[37]

Simon confirmed his brother's statement that young men at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research were paid just enough so that they could be attracted by other institutions; however, when a man proved he was worthy of retention, he was given a salary in line with a "fixed scale" according to his class. Then he added a statement from his profound wisdom.

> And yet, I have almost from the first run into those common human traits of selfishness, envy, jealousy, prestige, which must arise in a body of men. This is irrespective of the fact that the men who are striving and stewing could not be as well off as they are anywhere else in the country -- and they know this. At this very moment I am having a struggle, which should be impossible, all the circumstances considered. It involves the very principle of the existence of the Institute as a center of high productive research. Theoretically, the person on the staff involved is all for the principle; but personally he cannot see 'the wood for the trees,' and would block action if he could.
>
> In other words, he is just an ordinary human being, along with being a fine craftsman...
>
> One of our Trustees asked me how I accounted for the fact that occasionally a gifted scientist would let himself do so regrettable an act as to behave in an underhanded manner one way or another. I have had to answer this kind of question

> often, and the answer is, as I see it, that he is just a human being before he is a fine scientist.[38]

Undoubtedly reassured by whatever Ben Flexner wrote, Mr. Frankfurter replied to the Director's letter after a pleasurable vacation in Palestine, thereby bringing a fine philosophical detachment to the troubled atmosphere. His tone was placatory, friendly, informal. But he yielded no ground, and in defining his own idea of the Institute he was eloquent. It was precisely because

> I care about...scholarship and learning so passionately that I want to see it promoted under conditions that are not self-defeating. And I must say that I derive much more direction by characterizing our aim as the creation of a 'society of scholars.' Only god (sic) can create a paradise for anybody, but by pooling their efforts, their disinterestedness, their confidence in one another, unimpeded by obstructive conditions, of which financial differentiation is one of the most potent in the world, a group of equals can, in course of time, evolve themselves into a society of scholars...
>
> The basis of remuneration and the procedure, including objective classification, by which salaries are fixed, are matters which I deem central for a self-respecting society of scholars and therefore central for the realization of the ideal of learning which you and I share...Your...reply...leaves the central point of the communication unattended....[39]

Individually-determined salaries themselves constituted decisions of policy; he wondered "whether the Board of Trustees adequately discussed what is involved in those individual decisions."

The Director was not mollified. He did not respond. Correspondence between the two languished. Mr. Frankfurter did not withdraw from the Board.

In June 1934 Dr. Flexner and Mr. Stewart sailed for England in the same ship. In contrast to the contentious spirit prevailing between himself and Frankfurter, Flexner found Mr. Stewart's tactful guidance

and the luxury of agreeing with him delightful indeed. He wrote Mr. Bamberger of his great confidence in the economist; Mr. Stewart would be the best possible man to head the School of Economics and Politics and to organize it, for he possessed a rare combination of knowledge and experience and was greatly interested in what might be accomplished by the Institute in his field. He was arranging for Flexner to meet the leading English economists. Again the Director wrote and said that he was exploring possible appointments, and was collecting the works of various economists which Stewart and others would read and evaluate for him.[40]

While Flexner was at Oxford he interviewed a mathematical economist, a young Russian émigré, whom he and Stewart had evidently already discussed. Young Dr. Jacob Marschak was active in statistical work at All Souls. Flexner wrote Stewart in London:

> Marschak may prove to be the man. He is most attractive and plainly able. I have his reprints. He actually worked with von Neumann in Berlin and knows Graham of Princeton, who has invited him to lecture there...[41]

This note raises a question about Mr. Stewart's thinking. At his first Board meeting (October 1933) he had talked to the Trustees about the economics program. The minutes said merely there was a consensus that "a historical approach to the fresh study...would be more fruitful than an approach upon lines hitherto pursued." The opinion prevailed that it would be wise to take promising young men who were uncommitted on controversial issues for periods of three to five years "during which their powers would be disclosed." At the time Flexner elaborated on this in a letter to Frankfurter, asking him to keep his eyes open for some younger

men of the type described:

> Walter Stewart was very clear that we ought in view of existing experiments and conditions to make a fresh and scientific approach from the historic side. He was of the opinion that we would not get far with men who had already committed themselves about so many of the problems with which a school of this sort must concern itself. He thought in the long run we should do far better to take younger men of promise for a period of prolonged probation. It will be a slow development compared with mathematics, but Stewart thought that this method of approach offered the best chances of making a contribution of value to the field.

Frankfurter seemed to agree, but observed that such young men were "scarce as white crows."[42]

At the same meeting Flexner and Dr. Sabin introduced the name of Dr. Edward Meade Earle to the Trustees. He was a young professor of history at Barnard and Columbia who was ill with what Flexner chose to call "an attack of tuberculosis." It will be recalled that Flexner had suggested his name for the Board of Trustees in May, 1930. This like his frequent cheerful letters to the sick man, had probably a therapeutic design. Earle was recommended highly by Dr. Beard. The following letter was one of the many which Dr. Flexner sent the sick man to encourage him in his uphill fight for life. It refers to the Board discussion.

> Walter Stewart was present, and I previously had asked him to think the thing over and give us his views. They coincided with the views which have been gradually maturing in my own mind: namely, that we cannot begin in economics and history with a group of seasoned and distinguished persons as we have begun in mathematics...but that we shall have to take younger men and give them opportunity to show what is in them. So far I had gone in my own thinking.

Stewart went further. He made the point that,

> inasmuch as economists have almost all published things, they have committed themselves to one form or another of economic thinking, whereas the economic world in which we are now living should be re-examined and not particularly from an econ-

> omic point of view but from an historic view. He was strongly in favor, therefore, of starting off in the field of history with younger men, who would find themselves able to delve into the economic aspects of historical study. He is reading your book on the Baghdad Railway and likes it very much.
>
> Miss Sabin and I both spoke of you as having known you from our own personal experience and as having been recommended to us by Professor Beard. I thought you would be interested to know that things are moving and that your name has actually been mentioned to the Board in connection with the next school which we shall organize within a reasonable period of time -- no hurry.[43]

What this letter meant to the still desperately ill man may be imagined. The Board voted to appoint him for one year at half-pay on sick leave, provided Dr. Sabin found the medical prognosis satisfactory on her next visit to him at Colorado Springs, with a second year on the same basis permitted. The report was optimistic, and Flexner used the authority given him to put Earle on the payroll. The action was confirmed in October 1934.[44] Earle moved to Saranac in 1935, visited the Institute and the Founders briefly in the spring of 1936, suffered a cruel relapse which necessitated further operative treatment, and after another year and more of recuperation came to the Institute in the fall of 1937, to undertake his work.

The first full-dress discussion of the School of Economics and Politics occurred in October 1934 when Frankfurter attended his first meeting. Dr. Flexner reported in part:

> I devoted two-thirds of the summer in Europe with a view to securing a nucleus in the subjects of economics and politics ....It is clear to me that in.../these fields/ which should be broadly conceived as the field of social justice, we shall have to proceed somewhat differently from the method pursued in dealing with mathematics. The sort of mathematics in which scientific men are interested today has a history that

> is at least one hundred fifty years old. The economics that is in vogue is upon a very different basis. More and more as I conferred with men who are dealing with economic problems both in universities and in public life, I became convinced that economics ought to be viewed as a clinical science.... Men who are concerned with its teaching and investigation ought also to be men who have been in contact with practical problems of business and government. On the other hand, while the men working in economics must not be aloof from practical life, they ought not to be diverted to the performance of current tasks....The methods of developing economic science, which seem to me to be most promising, bear therefore a certain resemblance to what has happened historically in other fields.[45]

Then the Director, noting that Mitrany was a specialist in government, and Earle interested in economic history, said he looked forward now to the addition of an economist; he had a list of a dozen or so young men who had not "committed themselves in writing" on controversial issues in the field, and hoped he could present a nomination at the next meeting.

Mr. Frankfurter differed; the evolution of economic principles resembled that of the law rather than of the medical sciences. The study should be historical rather than clinical. "Small groups should be called in for limited periods in hope of uncovering and defining the real problems." Mr. Stewart was recorded as saying only that the younger men should not advance beyond the probationary status until and unless they proved their worth. Professor Veblen suggested that they be brought in as "workers," as were the temporary members of the School of Mathematics; thus their academic connections would not be disturbed. The minutes reflected a consensus:

> It seemed to be agreed that with the exception of a small permanent nucleus it would be unwise to make many additional appointments for terms of three to five years which would involve the withdrawal of men from their own institutions and thereby impair the freedom of the Institute in dealing with them.[46]

When Mr. Maass received the minutes, he remonstrated with Flexner over the omission of Mr. Stewart's complete remarks. Flexner answered:

> I promised Mr. Stewart personally that his name would not be mentioned in connection with any expression of opinion.
>
> It seems to me that in preparing the minutes we must make the following distinctions: the chairman of a committee or the Director, who makes a report, is presumed to have given the matter careful thought and to be ready to stand by his words. We can therefore be named, but the Trustees discuss matters informally and may wish to change their minds. They will hesitate to speak freely if a permanent record of their names is made.[47]

Though it might have been reasonable to hold that Mr. Stewart spoke with some authority in his subject, the matter stood thus. Meanwhile Flexner, in an excess of caution, asked Frankfurter if he cared to elaborate on or correct Mrs. Bailey's notes on his remarks.[48]

Two weeks after the Board met, the Director polled by letter the members of the Executive Committee asking authorization to call Dr. Jaboc Marschak to the United States for interviews. Eight signified their approval; Mr. Frankfurter alone opposed the idea, and vigorously so. He challanged: (1) Flexner's right to consider a mathematical economist without prior discussion with the Trustees; (2) and his good faith in not having disclosed his interest in Marschak at the last meeting. (3) He questioned the wisdom of appointing first an economist unfamiliar with the American economy, and (4) asserted that to call an émigré with temporary status for interviews over such a distance would entitle him to believe that an appointment was assured.

Letters flew back and forth. Flexner answered that at the time of the Board meeting Professor von Neumann had not finished reading

Marschak's papers, but had eliminated several of the "dozen young economists" on grounds of poor mathematical powers. Now the mathematician insisted on interviews with the economist before giving his approval. As for Marschak's competence as an economist, (Frankfurter had insisted that mathematical competence was not enough) the Director said he had assured himself that economists here and abroad commended him. Frankfurter asked pointedly for Mr. Stewart's opinion; it was not forthcoming. As for calling Dr. and Mrs. Marschak for interviews, Flexner conceded it might have some effect on the émigré's opportunities at Oxford, and agreed not to proceed until he had first consulted the Warden of All Souls. The contested point emerged; did the Director have the sole responsibility to investigate candidates for appointment when there was yet no faculty in the School, and to nominate its members, or should the Trustees share it with him? Flexner maintained that the right and responsibility to investigate and nominate rested with him in the circumstances, and that the Trustees had only the right to approve or to disapprove his proposals. Frankfurter asserted that, absent a faculty in the School, each Trustee shared that responsibility with the Director.[49]

Early in the argument Flexner agreed not to proceed until he had heard from the Warden of All Souls; this was because he now had another candidate. Obliquely he revealed the fact to the lawyer. But Frankfurter was intent on winning the argument over the principles. He sent copies of his and Flexner's letters to Messrs. Aydelotte and Stewart, apparently with the intention of gaining their support in bringing the whole question before the Board for consideration. Mr. Stewart returned the correspondence without answering the pointed question as to his

attitude on the acceptability of Marschak as the first economist at the Institute:

> As matters now stand, I gather that Flexner does not intend, prior to a general discussion either with the Board or the Executive Committee, to go further with the Marschak proposal than to make a confidential inquiry of the Warden of All Souls. Since we will have this opportunity for an exchange of views, I am not now inclined to comment on the various issues arising out of the correspondence. While I take my responsibilities as Trustee seriously, as a correspondent I rate myself very low. I have for years enjoyed a bad reputation as a letter writer and I am sure you will not take it as a lack of interest in the issues you raise, that I should prefer to discuss them orally rather than by an exchange of letters.

Dr. Aydelotte, sorrowed by the illness and death of his mother, attempted to defend and uphold Flexner, but in doing so offended him by referring to his responsibilities and privileges as being "administrative," a characterization which the Director rejected. But gratitude for the support soon won over his pique.[50]

Meanwhile a happy circumstance had rendered moot the Marschak matter. Toward the end of October Dr. Flexner learned that Dr. Winfield Riefler was considering giving up his positions in Washington and promptly met him, while Mr. Stewart arranged a conference in New York at which the possibility of Riefler's coming to the Institute was discussed. As a result, Riefler prepared a brief outline of the kind of study he thought it worthwhile to undertake at the Institute, sending copies to both Flexner and his former teacher. Briefly, he mentioned the confusion which prevailed in the field; the total lack of any

> central core of accepted verifiable generalizations, such as are found in other major disciplines. There is no unity in the various subdivisions of intensive specialization, nor is there a common body of logic to serve as intellectual tools in the development of new hypotheses on the frontiers of advanced study. As a result there is confusion in accredited professional economic judgment on almost any major

> problem...This has been emphasized during the past few years of divergent counsels when economists as a group have almost universally failed to speak with an authoritative voice either in their analyses of...events or in their proposals for their ameliorization or cure. Indeed, when professional counsel is most urgently demanded, economists have been found widely divided even upon questions of basic import where professional competence could be presumed to be final.

The difficulty lay in the inapplicability of basic assumptions inherited from the past to modern phenomena. He selected for particular study the American phenomena of heavy industry and durable goods, and their impact and significance on the accompanying financial aspects of the economy, necessitating studies of savings and investment, of security and mortgage markets, money markets, foreign exchanges and currencies.

As a start, he said such investigations could lead to discoveries essential to an understanding of modern economic conditions, while lack of a defined objective could lead to more of the prevailing confusion. The Institute could contribute by formulating the special problems to be tested; this would require the collection of data not already being assembled or studied, which would be gathered by universities, research institutions and governmental agencies.

The Institute's faculty would be small and flexible, with a small clerical and statistical staff. They would maintain close personal contact with the institutions collecting and studying economic data to forge the materials basic to the research. The program would be chiefly confined to research; there would be no classes, and little opportunity for students as such,

> but ample opportunity for close contact between intellectual workers on a common group of projects of high promise. Part of this group will be brought to Princeton, part will be working in the universities, and an important part will be located at centers of specialized research. The Institute should not

consider itself as a location but rather as a source of mental ferment embracing all of the advanced students.[51]

It would be difficult to imagine a more equivocal statement than Riefler's memorandum evoked from Mr. Stewart.

> I am very much impressed with the memorandum Riefler sent you. It seems to be a cogent and effective presentation of his case, and I am persuaded that in making a start, it is probably wise to select some field of interest and use the problems in that field as a basis for selecting personnel and of establishing some unity in the work.
>
> Whether the problem which Riefler has outlined is the problem is another question. From the form of his memorandum, I judge that with him it is a question of 'Love me, love my problem.' It forces us to a decision as to whether we want both him and his problem. He has the advantages of youth, energy, enthusiasm and intelligence, and has apparently reached the stage of intellectual maturity where he is possessed with a problem.
>
> In economics, my preference runs toward someone who is possessed with some concrete problem but who is prepared to deal with its general implications. This seems to me to furnish the best hope of escaping from the vagueness of superficiality which has affected so much current work in economics, and of establishing a fresh approach.[52]

If Dr. Flexner noticed the ambivalence he did not show it. Perhaps his ear was not tuned to the academic idiom. It is more likely, however, that he overlooked the nuances, for he had satisfied himself that Dr. Riefler was highly regarded in Washington as a most accomplished economist, and that he stood uncommitted on controversial issues since his writings in the Federal Reserve Board's Bulletin were anonymous. Indeed, it was in the very multiplicity of demands for Riefler's services that his own discontent lay. In addition to his regular duties in the Division of Research and Statistics at the Federal Reserve Board, to which Stewart had called him in 1923, he served as Economic Adviser (1933-1934) of the Executive Committee of the Board, and to the National

Emergency Council, and Chairman of the new Central Statistical Board. Moreover, Flexner suffered from the pressure exerted by Mr. Frankfurter, and wanted an early decision on the important first appointment in economics.

Mr. Stewart had commented favorably on one aspect of Riefler's memorandum: its insistence on starting with a specific problem and following whither it led. But according to Flexner's ensuing correspondence with Mitrany, even that approval seemed to be infirm. Thus the Director recounted a conversation with "his adviser," whom he characterized as "probably the ablest economic thinker in the United States:"

> This man would prefer someone 'who is possessed with some concrete problem, but who is prepared to deal with its general implications.'

Continuing, Flexner said his adviser had quoted a friend, who did not think the Institute should outline its specific inquiries as yet. He quoted this one:

> 'I think it should assemble a group that would just stew around for a while and wonder what it is all about. After six months or a year probably somebody would think of something. I doubt the world is in urgent need of more statistics, more facts, more research; or that the Institute needs to start with a clerical and statistical force. In fact, I think that the members should be required to take a vow of total abstinence from statistics, data, and maybe even facts for a six-months period. This country is simply lousy with statistics, and crawling with research workers.'[53]

One might almost conclude that Mr. Stewart's friend favored withdrawing all economic researchers from their labors just to enable them to lie fallow for a time. But clearly his "adviser," Mr. Stewart, was referring to the Institute, perhaps in the interest of keeping the situation there fluid for the time.

Dr. Flexner "quoted scripture" to ease Mitrany's fears, for the Professor, still in England, had heard indirectly that Flexner considered first a mathematical economist, and now an expert in money and rates. Mitrany was not reassured; he repeated his demands for a philosophical economist, and above all, for a congenial group. As for Dr. Riefler, had he been informed with equal candor of Mr. Stewart's views, he might have had serious misgivings about his future career in research at the Institute. He decided to accept the offer from Flexner late in December. While Mr. Frankfurter had been given to understand that Dr. Riefler was being interviewed by the Director and Mr. Stewart, Flexner's notes and agenda did not announce his intention to nominate the economist at the January meeting.

To the Trustees, Dr. Flexner gave a brief description of Dr. Riefler's qualifications, and expressed the hope that the three men then in the School of Economics and Politics would be able to work together in international politics and economics. They would have the same autonomy, individually and as a School, as was enjoyed in the School of Mathematics. The appointment was unanimously approved, but Mr. Frankfurter took vigorous exception to the fact that Flexner proposed and the Board granted a salary for the economist which exceeded by $2,000 the full-time rates of his absent colleagues in the School. The minutes say that "standardized" rates were discussed, and noted "that most of the Board was opposed to the principle." Mr. Frankfurter asked to be recorded as opposed to the differential, maintaining that either Riefler should receive the same salary as Earle and Mitrany, or that their salaries should be raised to equal his.[54]

Two days after the meeting, Frankfurter at Harvard wrote the following letter to Dr. Riefler, sending a copy to Flexner.

> Ever since I have been on this faculty, for now a little over twenty years, it has been my practice to tell acquaintances whose names have come up for consideration directly what doubts or difficulties I may have had to raise in faculty meeting. This avoids misunderstanding through the dangers of misreport, however innocent, through indirect transmission. That practice of candor seems to me to be equally appropriate for you and me in the case of the Institute for Advanced Study.
>
> Therefore, I should like you to know that I welcomed your accession to the Institute and voted for it with pleasure and hope. But I voted against the stipend proposed by Dr. Flexner, not because it was too high, but because it was higher than that given to your colleagues in the School of Politics and Economics. For I deem inequality of treatment among men of substantially similar age and scholarly distinction as inimical to the aims of a society of scholars. This is not the occasion to argue the matter; I simply wanted you to know precisely what my attitude was towards your coming to the Institute, and to the conditions of your coming.
>
> If you have to leave government -- and I cannot conceal my regret that you are doing so, in view of my great interest in a permanent civil service -- I am at least happy that you are giving yourself to scholarship.[55]

Reactions were prompt and severe. Dr. Riefler was shocked and unhappy. He sought to withdraw from the appointment, and suggested that Mr. Frankfurter bring the matter before the Board for reconsideration. He had great respect for the lawyer. As for Flexner, his anger was now fully aroused. He wrote Frankfurter declaring that his letter to Riefler was a "piece of unmitigated impertinence;" he was notifying the Committee on Nominations that "under no circumstances can they nominate both me and you for re-election. They shall have to choose between us."[56]

To Riefler he wrote:

> I wish to assure you once more that there is nothing within reason that we will not do to enable you to fulfill your own ambitions and to make you and your family happy in this new environment.[57]

Unfortunately, this was a commitment which Flexner later seemed unable to fulfill.

The Trustees were naturally disturbed by what they regarded not only as a serious transgression against the confidential nature of proceedings within the Board, but also by the implication that any of them might similarly have violated that confidential relationship.

But Mr. Frankfurter was not quiescent. Again he tried to rally some of the Trustees to his side, as he had in the Marschak affair. He exchanged with Dr. Weed his correspondence in that passage for copies of Weed's correspondence with Flexner in the controversy over the placement of young mathematicians.[58] (See p.331) Professor Veblen, who had been ardently urging Flexner to establish a uniform salary of $15,000 in the School of Mathematics, had spoken at the meeting, and Mr. Frankfurter wrote him also, sending a copy to the Director.

> Of course I was gratified to have your confirmation about the importance of the general principle of equality of treatment of scholars of substantially the same age and distinction. I have long reflected on the problem and have had not a little experience in observing the consequences of departure from it. I am much confirmed by the testimony you bore at our Board meeting last Monday regarding the feelings of the members of the School of Mathematics. Of course, I know nothing about the 'historical considerations' to which you referred which are responsible for the present differentiations in that School. I have no doubt, however, that as a principle the practice is vicious. Bargaining for terms, with the diverse pressures wholly unrelated to scholarship, belongs to the world of commerce, and is inimical to the true size of a society of scholars.[59]

Professor Veblen's response indicated something less than a firm conviction that he had represented his colleagues' views with fidelity:

> I think I correctly reflected the feelings of our group -- but of course I would have a hard time if put under cross-examination. Also I should be disposed to go very far in support of Dr. Flexner, who seems, in his acts, to be

> enormously better than anyone who is likely to succeed him in his present job...
>
> I am sure my colleagues, as well as myself, would be delighted if you would drop off in Princeton some day and look us over in our lair.[60]

Flexner was as good as his word; he refused to be nominated at the annual meeting if Frankfurter were also to be. Mr. Aydelotte undertook for the Committee on Nominations the difficult task of meeting and discussing the matter with Mr. Frankfurter, who was conscious of no error in his conduct. Finally, after review by the Committee of a kind of brief filed with them by Frankfurter, the Committee unanimously nominated for re-election only Messrs. Flexner and Straus, and the Members of the Corporation approved the report. For a time after that it appeared that Mr. Frankfurter believed that he had some cause for legal action against the Committee or the Board, but he finally accepted the decision.[61]

The first public announcement of the appointments in the second School was made in January 1935. It evoked the following notice in the Princetonian:

> Already the School of Mathematics, drawing so heavily from Princeton's Department, has borne rich fruit, and this community's position as perhaps the greatest center of mathematical study upon the American continent is rendered even more impregnable. And the same procedure, we hope, bids fair to repeat itself in the case of the social sciences. The proposed School will attempt a 're-examination of political and economic theory,' and 'with absolute freedom of thought, opinion and expression, study the economic and political phenomena of our own times.' In this time, when in so many countries the heavy hand of arbitrary censorship is crushing the impetus for free thought and untrammeled investigation, such a reaffirmation of academic freedom is a welcome note. And certainly, in this period of economic change, when so much that we formerly accepted upon blind faith as the truth is being upset, a re-examination of political and economic theory is very much in order...[62]

Dr. Flexner had kept President Dodds informed of his progress, and had also consulted the senior economists of the University, who welcomed the news enthusiastically in an informal memorandum which said in part:

> Itneeds hardly be said that.../the new faculty/ should have a stimulating effect upon the scholarly work of our own staff, and we hope that we shall be able to contribute in some measure toward the attainment of the ideals of the new project...[63]

Shortly after his appointment, and several months before he entered upon his new work, Professor Riefler wrote Flexner that he had been offered a highly remunerative position by the Social Science Research Council, an agency to which the Rockefeller Foundation contributed liberally. Said Riefler: "This offers one of those rare opportunities when an original commitment can be freely reconsidered..." Flexner's reply was unequivocal: "I do not want to let you out with honor or anything else..."[64]

The economist took up his duties in October 1935. He visited Professor Earle at Saranac and conferred with Professor Mitrany on his arrival. It was soon evident that no slightest possibility existed for cooperative research, nor any real disposition on the part of the three men to plan a common approach to any problem of the School of Economics and Politics.

In October, 1935, Professor Riefler presented to Flexner his matured plans for research in finance which, he said, could result in valuable new knowledge in some of the most troublesome areas of contemporary economics. It was most timely, since "a huge body of factual data has recently become available" which could afford a real test of "our

theoretical analysis." Moreover, his own training and experience lay in finance, including the scope and functions of the securities and mortgage markets, economic fluctuations, employment and unemployment, production and trade, and certain governmental problems. His proposed researches were sufficiently limited to come within the Institute's resources, and were perfectly susceptible of meaningful research. He would require additional professional, clerical and statistical staff; the annual budget entailed would ultimately be about $100,000. He set forth the following subjects, on which clear thinking was obscured by partisan interests as well as by lack of knowledge.

1. The banking crisis of 1929-1933, and the effect of the Federal Reserve System's attempts to mitigate it in 1931-1932. These actions, and particularly the government's concentration in 1933 on the rehabilitation of bank capital, merited careful analysis, "now that the...secrecy...imposed on all participants can be dispensed with, and its essential character can be analyzed for the benefit of all economists."
2. The nature and effects of the large cash balances accumulated by corporations during the twenties, which financed in part the stock market speculation of the end of the decade, and after the market crash contributed to the instability of the banking system in their mobile search for security.
3. The circumstances of Britain's departure from gold in 1931.
4. A study of means to achieve a wider distribution of economic materials among economists, so as to enhance their opportunities to study current data and to aid in its assimilation.[65]

Here at last was the kind of program Dr. Flexner had wanted since 1930. Mr. Stewart seemed to be well disposed toward it -- at least, some unspecified part of it. For on the 31st October he wrote the Director.

> I was very well impressed with the extent to which he /Riefler/ has adapted himself to the problems of the Institute....You may feel, as I am inclined to, that we should act rather promptly on some of the things he has in mind... The evening's discussion confirmed my feeling of how fortunate we are to have a person of Riefler's intelligence, judgment and lack of conventional commitments to help us conceive the proper field of work in the social studies.[66]

Again, Dr. Flexner seemed to misunderstand Mr. Stewart's idiom. For he assumed that the economist favored all the projects, and would recommend a beginning in "some of the things" Riefler had in mind. For the time being, Dr. Flexner proceeded in good faith to arrange for the necessary funds and authorizations. Three weeks after receiving Stewart's approval, he wrote Riefler as follows:

> As far as my knowledge and experience entitle me to an opinion, the problems which you have selected and the methods by means of which you propose to attack them seem to me to be sound and promising. There is nothing in your program or our organization which will prevent taking advantage of them. I am sure that the Executive Committee will meet in the near future and authorize such expenditures as you may desire for the rest of the year, and our next year's budget can include the larger sum upon which you figure...
>
> I have only one caution to suggest: you have outlined four problems. Is there any likelihood that...you may find yourself under pressure? While you are perfectly free to proceed according to your own judgment, I should myself take up one problem at a time and carry it far enough to be certain that I could take up another without getting in a rush. There is no hurry. Work such as you contemplate needs ample time for reflection...[67]

It became evident, however, at the January meeting of the Board that Professor Riefler's budget had not been submitted to the Executive

Committee after all. At about the same time as Flexner received Stewart's letter, he had learned from an indignant Mr. Bamberger that in view of what he and Mrs. Fuld considered extravagance in the purchase of too large a site, they would give no further increments to endowment "at the present time" after meeting "present commitments."[68] (See Chapter IV) It would have been most unlike Flexner to make the statement he did to Riefler without having first received Mr. Bamberger's approval. But the Director's report on Riefler's needs to the Trustees in January, 1936, indicated that he was taking a most remote view of them. He remarked that any professor had the right to "cross lines" as between schools, and continued:

> Professor Riefler is beginning to feel the need of mathematical or statistical help. There is nothing in the set-up of the Institute which prevents his obtaining from mathematicians either at the Institute, Princeton University, Washington, or elsewhere such cooperation as he may desire. There is nothing to prevent his adding to his own small staff a statistician, if he can find a person whose mathematical training is sound. The organization of autonomous schools, the individuals within which can cross any boundary they please, seems, therefore, as far as I can now see, to offer the best method for realizing our purposes.[69]

This marked a retreat on the record, but his hearers could not have known either of Flexner's commitment to Riefler or the economist's proposals. If Professor Einstein had difficulties in getting and holding mathematical assistance, what chance would an economist have to get cooperative assistance from men whose devotion to "pure" mathematics was complete? But Flexner appeared to believe what he said, and sought and received confirmation of the appointment of three humanists authorized by the Executive Committee at a meeting which left no record except what Flexner told the Board. (See p. 27)

He may have been hoping to secure funds for Dr. Riefler's work from some other source. The record shows several such attempts, none of which was successful. Thus he had asked Dr. E. E. Day, Director of the Social Sciences for the Rockefeller Foundation, for a substantial annual grant for economics immediately after Riefler's appointment. That disappeared without record. Then he had besought another philanthropist, who was interested in the better teaching of economics in secondary schools, to endow the Institute's studies so that better economics might be taught, but without changing his friend's mind. Still pending as late as March 1943, however, was a continuing petition to the Rockefeller Foundation for a large gift to endowment, which for some reason Flexner was always hopeful of securing.[70]

But Professor Riefler was evidently told to ascertain professional attitudes toward his proposals and what degree of cooperation with his working plans he could find. It seems clear that he was not informed either of Mr. Bamberger's new posture, nor of the apparent hopelessness of his situation as far as Institute financing was concerned. The sum with which the Founders had met their "present commitments" amounted to just under a million dollars, and sufficed only to meet the cost of the land and to capitalize a part of the humanists' salaries.

By early March the economist had satisfied himself that highly placed authorities in official and academic economics were solidly in favor of his proposed researches; that they regarded him as entirely capable of organizing and directing them, and the Institute for Advanced Study was peculiarly able to sponsor them; and they had promised valuable cooperation which in some particulars would amount to large financial

contributions in kind. On the 13th March, 1936, Professor Riefler addressed a report to Dr. Flexner challengingly entitled: Shall the Institute concentrate its work in economics in the field of finance? His own answer was that it should; the researches he had outlined were timely, most important, and neither too large or too small. Moreover, he said:

> It is of primary social and economic importance. Problems of finance, especially monetary policy, stand in the very center of the public problems with which the world is wrestling and will...continue to wrestle during the next generation at least...[They] call for insight and guidance from the economist.
>
> No outstanding educational institution in the world has concentrated heavily in this field...Scholars of outstanding reputation can almost be counted on the fingers of two hands. Most of them work in relative isolation, and many of them, such as Walter Stewart, Henry Clay, Benjamin Anderson, R. G. Hawtry and Alexander Goldenweiser have no academic connections...[71]

He continued; the necessary combination of the broad theoretical background with "a high degree of sheer technical proficiency" was rarely found among professors in the universities. It was therefore the more important to organize the studies in such a way as to make possible the acquisition of valuable experience. The fact that so much important information previously secret was now available, and that it should be studied for its light on obscure matters, made it desirable to proceed at once. Had Riefler been speaking from a fresh reading of the Idea of a Modern University or Flexner's Confidential Memorandum he could hardly have offered a more tempting prospect either to the Director, or to those who were aware they must have more exact information to avoid in future such violent cataclysms as had just occurred in the Western World. He continued with an imposing array of the support he had

received, and of one "unethusiastic" response:

> I have talked this proposal over with numerous key individuals who would be involved and so far have found them unanimously enthusiastic and urgent that we proceed immediately, with the single exception of Walter Stewart, who was friendly, but did not seem to me to be enthusiastic.
>
> At the Social Science Research Council, for example, I was requested to frame a specific proposal immediately so that they could sound out the possibilities of financing the project. At the Reserve Bank of New York, I was urged to go ahead and promised hearty cooperation in making contacts and obtaining materials. At the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, Dr. Emanuel Goldenweiser was equally enthusiastic and thought that the Board might welcome the opportunity to cooperate formally in a joint, far-reaching investigation of the financial crisis, detailing its own experts to participate in shouldering the heavy expense that might ensue in the detailed examination of its own records. I have also gone over the general scope of the proposal with Stacy May, /Assistant Director of the Division of the Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation/ who has made valuable suggestions as to the best form in which an inquiry of this kind should be set up.
>
> To summarize these remarks so far: (1) The need for a comprehensive inquiry of the type contemplated is, I think, almost unquestioned; (2) I have found not only enthusiasm... but also an extraordinary desire to cooperate on the part of those whose cooperation would be most essential, so far as I have been able to sound them out; and (3) I have been urged from many sides to try to persuade the Institute to take the leadership in the undertaking.

Riefler's plan for the accomplishment of the work was well conceived; the School would be a small "distinctive school of finance." Its influence would be broad and deep, as he conceived it.

> /It/ would, then, assume leadership in formulating a broad inquiry into the causes and phenomena of the financial crisis ...set up as a project sponsored by the Institute...to be carried out disinterestedly in cooperation with all of the agencies and interests affected, and to be financed in part by the Rockefeller Foundation and in part by the official /governmental/ agencies involved.

> While the Institute would assume the leadership, little of the actual investigation would be carried on here. The Institute would represent rather a center of the intellectual stimulus. Specific problems...would be proposed here, their exact formulation agreed upon here after full consultation with scholars and experts from outside, and the results of the investigations as they are carried on would be subjected to constant evaluation and advice from the Institute which would act as the rallying point for disinterested and competent scientific opinion.

Was the Institute for Advanced Study the best possible organization to exercise leadership in such investigations? asked Riefler. He believed it was, and for most important reasons concerning the objectivity of the research.

> A project of this kind must be authoritative, disinterested, completely free from suspicion of bias; it must command the respect of the community. It requires the complete cooperation of the parties at interest, but should preferably not be directed or controlled by them. This rules out automatically the use of the aegis of such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers' Association, and the Stock Exchange. It also militates somewhat against the use of such a device as a Congressional Committee of Inquiry, or an inquiry inaugurated wholly and completely by the Federal Reserve System. With these sponsors eliminated there remain (a) the universities...(b) special research foundations such as the Brookings Institution and the National Bureau of Economic Research...(c) the possibility of organizing a special Institute...with special Foundation support. On balance...it would seem that the Institute for Advanced Study is as well equipped as any other organization to assume the leadership for the undertaking.[72]

But later Riefler would have had to add that though he had been pronounced equal to the objective studies he contemplated, the Institute was not well enough equipped with funds to afford them, nor able to induce the Rockefeller Foundation to grant them. Meanwhile, he closed his memorandum with an estimate for professional help, statistical and clerical work, space for all and for some temporary members also, which would require

ultimately a budget of $100,000 a year, and a lesser amount for fiscal 1936. He believed the Rockefeller Foundation would finance the services of various experts for short periods of work in Princeton. They could hardly be spared from their present duties for more extended participation, he felt.

Professor Riefler had also conceived and explored an interesting experiment furthering the lines Flexner had laid down in discussing the cooperation between the Institute and the University. It resembled the practices among the universities of the German-speaking peoples of the Empire period, in which the several institutions exhibited marked advantages for the student in certain disciplines, because of outstanding faculty, or facilities such as laboratories and libraries. Indeed, it foreshadowed the so-called "common market in ideas" currently being pursued by some Mid-Western American universities which receive students from any cooperating institution, recognizing that all cannot be equally excellent in all fields of graduate study. President Dodds welcomed Riefler's suggestion that Princeton -- the University's graduate school and the Institute -- might well in their advanced work in economics specialize in finance, and was prepared to shape the graduate faculty to that end.[73]

The memorandum makes it abundantly clear that Professor Riefler expected an authorization to carry out the work it described. But now it was to appear that the one person whom he characterized as "friendly, but not enthusiastic," was standing in the way, either because of his quiet advice to the Director not to move on it with Mr. Bamberger, or because as a most influential Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation he

declined to support or sanction an income grant or one to endowment purpose. And considering that the social sciences constituted active programs in the Foundation, which recognized fully the need for competent researches in those fields, such aid would seem to have been a routine affair.

It would seem that Mr. Stewart played both the active and the inactive roles. Just one month after Riefler's demand for an answer, the Director reported to the Trustees in a manner which belied the economist's program and activity. He said:

> Professor Riefler and Professor Mitrany have been working in their individual ways in the hope of finding a more promising approach to their several subjects than is generally current. As far as I can now see, neither will have workers associated with him for another year at least, perhaps longer, for they are dealing with the most tangled and difficult subjects, and neither of them is as yet certain that he has found a clew to the maze.[74]

Mr. Stewart was present, (as he had not been in January). He evidently did not speak, which means he was party to the statement. On the other hand, had the Director ever taken the program up with Mr. Bamberger, who was also present, or with the Executive Committee, the members of which were likewise present, he could not have said what he did. For a knowledge of Riefler's program, and the assiduity with which he had sought to bring it into being, could not lie with this statement. And, though Dr. Flexner did not agree with what Mr. Mitrany outlined for himself, and withheld an assistant and members from him, the political scientist also was wronged by the characterization.

Professor Riefler was elected a Trustee at that annual meeting, and thereafter was to be constant in attendance at meetings of the Board.

But the beginning of September was to see signs of his bitter unhappiness, and indications that he was planning to leave the Institute. Then Mr. Stewart, who was still considering Dr. Flexner's open offer to join the faculty, and whose desire was apparently to keep Professor Riefler there without allowing the program of work and the kind of personnel recruited to become set in a direction he did not like, suggested to the Director that a single colleague be appointed who should be "as nearly as possible his /Riefler's/ equal." Flexner consulted Mr. Leidesdorf and learned that money was in hand.[75] But the step was not taken. What happened?

Let Professor Riefler say in his own words, which appear in a memorandum to Dr. Aydelotte in December, 1939, just after the Swarthmore President had succeeded Dr. Flexner, and was seeking knowledge of what was going on at the Institute. With the following statement Riefler sent copies of his memorandums to Flexner of October, 1935, the 13th March, 1936, and of the 24th September, 1936:

> My own activities since.../the memorandum of September/ have been wholly devoted to carrying out the objectives therein set forth. My procedures, of course, have been flexible and adapted to what was feasible.
>
> In the spring of 1936 Dr. Flexner did not feel that the Institute was in a position to proceed immediately, either with the additional appointments recommended...or with the program of financial research on the scale envisioned. Instead, he sent me abroad to improve my contacts with foreign economists and to gain first-hand experience with certain aspects of international financial problems.
>
> On the day of my return, however, there came an opportunity to further the research program I had in mind in the form of a telegram from Joseph Willitts.../asking/ me to attend a conference of leading bankers and economists to explore the possibility of inaugurating a more comprehensive attack on financial problems through a program of research. As a

> result of the conference I undertook to act as chairman of a committee of the National Bureau of Economic Research to draw up such a program...
>
> Under the leadership of Joseph Willitts, the program recommended by the committee was adopted by the National Bureau of Economic Research and large grants of funds have been made for its support from private banking institutions and public agencies as well as the Rockefeller Foundation....[76]

After the Exploratory Committee completed its survey and recommendations, Professor Riefler undertook to supervise some of the projects. These differed materially from his own earlier recommendations, though there seems to be little question that his memorandums had an influence on the organization of the Bureau's program in financial research. Riefler supervised the exhaustive study of all corporate bonds issued in the United States during the twentieth century; a study of employment and unemployment, another of consumer credit. These might be described as some of the raw materials to be used in searching analyses of the economic phenomena he had wanted to investigate. They were highly specialized and uncoordinated; hardly the kind of investigations which sophisticated economists like Stewart and himself would want to engage in. This is not to say they were not useful, however, for they were, and the Bureau continued for a couple of decades to perform similar studies. Dr. Riefler devoted himself to the work, and demonstrated that he was a fine guide and mentor to young post-doctoral economists, helping them to formulate their problems, and supervising the preparation of their results.

But his own circumstances were unenviable. He spent half of each week at Hillside, an estate on the Hudson where the work went forward. He was not therefore the economist in residence, whom other

economists could visit to talk about their problems. Much time and energy were consumed in going back and forth to Hillside. That his situation was not satisfactorily explained -- nor could be -- to faculty and Trustees led to much grumbling. Professor Veblen dubbed him "a man of affairs," and the title stuck. It was an unfriendly appellation in an academic context. But the deenest disappointments inhered in the failure of his important program to receive support. The exploration of projects at the Bureau was done with funds supplied by the private bankers. The resulting projects were largely financed by the same group, with aid from insurance companies and the Rockefeller Foundation, and special help from some governmental agencies. These were special projects and funds, not part of the Bureau's regular financing or work. The conditions were markedly unlike working in a sovereign institution which, though small, could accept or decline assistance as it wished.

But his lot was not unalloyed dissatisfaction. He had undertaken work at Geneva with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, sitting with the Committees on Finance and Business Depressions, which gave him valuable insights. His participation continued until 1941, when he was mainly instrumental in bringing to Princeton the League's Division of Finance and Transit of the Secretariat, with Dr. Aydelotte's delighted cooperation and Dr. Flexner's blessings. This made possible the continuation of its work, and its ultimate absorption into the United Nations. The economist was also called into consultation on occasion by the Secretary of the Treasury; in one such case, he guided the gold-buying program of the government from June, 1937 until March, 1938, serving without compensation except for his salary from the Institute and government reimbursement for his

expenses. He had no title, and shunned publicity. Professor Veblen, teaching and working at the University of Washington during the summer of 1936, questioned the Director sharply about this further absence from Princeton.[77]

Professor Riefler must have been buoyed by some hope that Mr. Stewart would soon decide whether he would come to the Institute. He apparently viewed the prospect with mixed feelings, as well he might. However, there is no doubt that he looked upon his former college professor as a great and creative economist, whose return to academic life could make a vast difference in knowledge of the field. But after Mr. Stewart came, the realization was disappointing, for reasons which will be discussed later. Riefler was glad to be called to Washington to draft the plan for Economic Warfare, and then to administer the program as Minister to England from 1942 to 1944.

Relations between Professor Mitrany and the Director did not prosper after the controversies over the organization and concept of the School of Economics and Politics, nor after the departure of Mr. Frankfurter, who Mitrany was given to understand by Harold Laski, was victimized by the Director for exercising "freedom of speech." Mitrany came to the Institute first in October, 1935, and the contentiousness which had marked his appointment during 1934 continued. The Director now was unhappy with his impulsive action in appointing Mitrany and seemed to have little faith in his various projects, which required an assistant and some members whom Flexner at first denied him. That Mitrany showed no intention to domesticate himself in America was another cause

of discontent for Flexner, though the political scientist's wife was ill in England and he apparently did not feel that he could transplant her, nor had that been understood when he was appointed. Matters finally became so bad that Mitrany suggested that the Executive Committee, or Dr. Aydelotte and Bernard Flexner, mediate between them.[78] This evidently caused a re-examination of his position by Dr. Flexner, and relations were mended to some extent thereafter. Of course nothing could change the fact that Mitrany had been right when he said that if the School of Economics and Politics faculty were to cooperate in working around a central core of interests, they must be selected with that in view. Flexner endeavored to persuade both Earle and Mitrany to approach their work through economics, but neither they nor Professor Riefler warmed to the idea. These three were not only autonomous; they were actively disunited.

With the outbreak of the war in Europe Professor Mitrany remained in England to work in the development of information on central Europe. He was to relinquish his professorship later, retaining the status granted him by the Trustees of "Permanent Member" with the privilege of coming occasionally to Princeton to work.

Professor Earle was finally able to come to the Institute to take up his work in the fall of 1937. But he needed to circulate among historians, with whom he had lost contact over the past eleven years, and to meet the newcomers to the field. Somewhat to Flexner's distress, he traveled to Pasadena to work at the Huntington Library for a time. Later Flexner helped raise funds for him to travel in Europe. It was not until the beginning of 1938-1939 that Professor Earle settled to

work at Princeton. But his travels had valuable results for the Institute. For he was catalyst among men, and brought to the Institute through the following years some of the best non-mathematical members to come to it. He had decided firmly to concentrate his attention on American foreign relations, and the Director watched helplessly while the orientation there with the onset of hostilities inevitably became matters of defence and security. As late as 1938 the Director wrote Earle that he was advising Professor Mitrany to concentrate in his studies of international affairs "on the economic side," urging Earle to do likewise:

> If you and Mitrany can interest yourselves in the economic aspect of your problems you will, in my judgment, not only be on the right track, but you will make a unit of the School of Economics and Politics, such as it will not be if there are three tangents. On the other hand, I do not want to dictate to you or to anybody else what he shall do...
>
> I have the...feeling that economics will for the next fifty or one hundred years furnish the pattern and that political theory and statecraft will either enter into that pattern or shrivel up.[79]

Earle pursued his own way. In 1939-1940 he conducted his first seminar, bringing to Princeton several European scholars and a number of Americans, notably three from Princeton University. In the same year he became Chairman of the American Committee for International Studies whose purpose was to encourage "basic research which is necessary to the formulation of an intelligent American foreign policy." Headquarters would be at the Institute, and Dr. Earle was assisted by a secretary to the Committee who was paid by the Rockefeller Foundation.

But Flexner made no secret of his wish to see Professor Earle produce another book like The Baghdad Railway, which was the very highly

regarded work of his career before his illness. However, Professor Earle, so long immured within four walls, understandably would not willingly return to such a setting for any purpose as prolonged as the creation of another book. His first meeting with Riefler at Saranac in 1935 was a happy occasion, for the economist agreed that he should work on America's foreign relations.

There is little doubt that Flexner's consciousness of early friendship for Professors Earle and Mitrany caused him to be hypercritical in judging their actions, plans and wishes. He felt responsible for their success in a highly personal sense, which they resented. His fault was exaggerated by his frequent references to the certainty and harmony with which the faculty members of the School of Mathematics seemed to function. (But he confessed he had no judgment whatever of what they did or how successful their work was.) His two friends deplored the fact that while all the mathematicians had personal assistants, they had none, though Flexner earlier would have been the first to grant that the complexity of their fields, the need for languages not their own, the wealth of written materials in any subject in their fields with which they should be familiar, made such help desirable.

It was curious that the one person in the School of Economics and Politics who had been promised the colleagues and assistants he required, not only before his appointment but twice thereafter, and who never received any of what was promised, was the Director's real friend. Riefler might have been so resentful of Flexner's failure to live up to his commitments that their relationship would have curdled. Like the Trustees, Professor Riefler had understood from the beginning of his

connection with the Institute that Dr. Flexner was awaiting a decision from Mr. Stewart, for whom he had had a great respect at Amherst. But he had not been close to Stewart after Stewart left the Federal Reserve Board in 1926; he was quite unprepared for the subtle negativism of the older man and its effect on the Director, who had fallen under the spell of Stewart's charm from their first meeting. He was also unprepared, as was Flexner, for the stony silence which greeted the Director as he approached his former colleagues at the Rockefeller Foundation for grants to finance eminently worthwhile researches of the kind and with the prospects the Foundation rarely or never before had the opportunity to aid -- proposals deemed to be so valuable that they were taken over by an agency heavily supported by the Foundation and served up in fragments.

CHAPTER V - NOTES

1. Interview with Messrs, Leidesdorf and Maass.

2. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/9/33, pp. 2-3.

3. Maass to Flexner, 4/7/33. Also, C. R. Hardin to J. R. Hardin, 4/4/33; J. R. Hardin to Flexner, 4/5/33, Hardin papers. The senior Hardin held that if the Honorary Trustees were given the right to vote, the Certificate of Incorporation would have to be amended.

4. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/11/32, p. 5. Minutes, meeting of the Corporation, 4/24/33, pp. 2-4. See Maass to Hardin, 12/17/31.

5. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/24/33, p. 7.

6. Maass to Flexner, 12/23/32.

7. Frankfurter to Flexner, 3/4/33.

8. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/6/33.

9. Flexner to Mrs. Fuld, 3/1/33.

10. Louis Bamberger to Flexner, 3/11/33.

11. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Crisis of the Old Order, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1957, pp. 419-420.

12. Flexner to Maass, 11/14/34.

13. Interview with Flexner. See Clay to Flexner, 5/13/32. Also, Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/38, p. 6.

14. Flexner to Frankfurter, 11/7/32; to D. Mitrany, 1/17/33.

15. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/3/33.

16. See Joseph Dorfman, Thorstein Veblen and His America, The Viking Press, 1934, pp. 456, 457.

17. Gardner Jackson, The American Signer of the Basle Report, Watertown, N. Y. Times, 1/23/32, p. X12.

18. Lester V. Chandler, Benjamin Strong, Central Banker, The Brookings Institution, pp. 41 ff., 51 ff., 465.

19. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 438 ff. William Allen White, Puritan in Babylon, MacMillan, 1938, pp. 367-372. Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 69.

20. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Coming of the New Deal, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1959, p. 456.

21. Interview with Raymond B. Fosdick.

22. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Politics of Upheaval, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1960, p. 225.

23. Ibid., pp. 235-237.

24. Frankfurter to Flexner, 4/27/33, 5/1/33; Flexner to Frankfurter, 4/28/33, 5/3/33.

25. Frankfurter to Flexner, 1/7/32.

26. Viner to Flexner, 7/10/31. Interview with Viner.

27. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/15/34.

28. See Wm. Yandell Elliott to Flexner, 11/7/33.

29. Mitrany to Flexner, 1/14/33; Flexner to Mitrany, 1/17/33.

30. Flexner to Mitrany, 2/21/33. Frankfurter to Flexner, 2/14/33. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/24/33, pp. 4-5, 8. Mitrany's appointment became effective 9/1/33, at a salary of $6,000 for the year 1933-1934, or until he came to Princeton, when he would receive $10,000. Regular joint contributions to the T.I.A.A. Retirement at 65 unless deferred by mutual consent. No public announcement was to be made then. It was understood that he would "devote himself, in cooperation with the Director, to studies preliminary to the organization of the School of Economics and Politics whenever the Board of Trustees shall authorize such action." Flexner secured permission to increase the salary to the full rate effective 9/1/34. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 11.

31. Mitrany to Flexner, 2/10/33; Flexner to Mitrany, 2/14/33.

32. Mitrany to Flexner, 10/31/34; Flexner to Mitrany, 12/13/34.

33. Frankfurter to Flexner, 12/11/33; Flexner to Frankfurter, 12/28/33; 1/4/34.

34. Frankfurter to Flexner, 1/24/34; Flexner to Frankfurter, 2/6/34.

35. Frankfurter to Flexner, 2/21/34.

36. Aydelotte to Flexner, 3/19/34. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/21/34. Aydelotte papers.

37. Simon Flexner to Bernard Flexner, 4/2/34. Frankfurter papers.

38. Ibid.

39. Frankfurter to Abraham Flexner, 4/24/34.

40. Flexner to Louis Bamberger, 6/19/34, 6/28/34.

41. Flexner to Stewart, June, 1934. School of Economics and Politics papers.

42. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/9/33, p. 6. Flexner to Frankfurter, 11/1/33; Frankfurter to Flexner, 12/1/33.

43. Flexner to Earle, 10/12/33.

44. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 11. Professor Earle's appointment was effective 9/1/34 at half pay of $5,000 while on sick leave. The appointment was limited to one year, with the understanding it might be extended for a second year on the same terms. No contribution to T. I. A. A. was provided. In April, 1936, the budget for 1936-1937 carried full salary for Earle.

45. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

46. Ibid., p. 12.

47. Maass to Flexner, 11/11/34; Flexner to Maass, 11/14/34.

48. Flexner to Frankfurter, 10/10/34. Mr. Frankfurter's statement was received on 2nd November, and sent to the Trustees as an addendum to the minutes.

49. Flexner to Frankfurter, 10/27/34; 10/30/34; 11/2/34; 11/8/34; 11/12/34. Frankfurter to Flexner (telegram) 10/29/34; 10/31/34; 11/6/34; 11/9/34; 11/13/34.

50. Frankfurter to Stewart, 11/5/34; Stewart to Frankfurter, 11/28/34, Frankfurter papers. Aydelotte to Frankfurter, 12/21/34 and undated "postscript." Flexner to Aydelotte, 12/24/34, Aydelotte papers.

51. Riefler, Memorandum; Proposed Economic Unit, Institute for Advanced Study, 11/16/34. [illegible]

52. Stewart to Flexner, 11/19/34.

53. Flexner to Mitrany, 12/13/34.

54. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/14/35, pp. 4, 6-7. Professor Riefler's salary was to be $12,000, the appointment to be effective upon arrangement with the Director, with the usual provisions for retirement and annuity insurance.

55. Frankfurter to Riefler, 1/16/35.

56. Flexner to Frankfurter, 1/19/35. The terms of both men expired in April, 1935.

57. Flexner to Riefler, 1/19/35.

58. Weed to Frankfurter, 1/16/35; 1/29/35; 2/3/35. Frankfurter to Weed, 1/26/35; 2/6/35; 2/19/35; 5/14/35. Frankfurter papers.

59. Frankfurter to Veblen, 1/16/35.

60. Veblen to Frankfurter, 1/18/35, Frankfurter papers. It may be recalled that when Veblen submitted the proposed mathematical budget to Flexner with his letter of 6/5/32, it was with the statement that the four highest-paid professors would receive the same salaries, and the next group of three younger men $10,000 each. That was the policy which had been followed, except in the case of Professor Morse, who as a younger man received $12,500.

61. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 3/26/35; Frankfurter to Aydelotte, 4/3/35; Aydelotte papers. Aydelotte to Frankfurter, 4/17/35; 5/1/35; Aydelotte papers. Minutes, Meeting of the Corporation, 4/22/35, p. 1. The brief is not available.

62. The Princetonian, 1/16/35, pp. 1-3.

63. E. W. Kemmerer, Frank P. Graham, James G. Smith, C. R. Whittlesley, David A. McCabe, Frank H. Dixon, Stanley E. Howard and J. Douglas Brown to Flexner, 1/16/35.

64. Riefler to Flexner, 4/30/35; Flexner to Riefler, 5/2/35. The Rockefeller Foundation and the Spelman Foundation subsidized generously the Social Science Research Council in its many researches into sociological and economic problems.

65. Riefler to Flexner, Memorandum: Program for Economics in the SEP, Institute for Advanced Study, October 1935, SEP papers.

66. Stewart to Flexner, 10/31/35.

67. Flexner to Riefler, 11/20/35.

68. Louis Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.

69. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 4.

70. Flexner to E. E. Day, 1/28/35. Flexner to Victor Morawetz, 4/25/34; 5/3/34. Morawetz to Flexner, 5/10/34. Draft of proposed letter, Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/10/43. Aydelotte papers.

71. Riefler to Flexner, 3/13/36. Aydelotte papers.

72. Ibid.

73. Ibid.

74. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/13/36, pp. 2-3.

75. Flexner to Stewart, 9/3/36.

76. Riefler to Aydelotte, 12/13/39. Aydelotte papers. In his memo to Flexner, 9/24/36, Riefler reinforced his previous recommendations for specializing in research on finance, because of the virtue of concentration, the favorable location of the Institute, and the fact that most universities were incapable of the kind and degree of specialization required to do what he had contemplated. Meanwhile, general confusion still prevailed over what to do with the economy to prevent future collapses, and to cure the present one. Then Riefler had formally told Flexner he was taking the chairmanship of the Exploratory Committee for Financial Research of the National Bureau of Economic Research.
Dr. Joseph Willitts was Director of the National Bureau of Economic Research (1936-1939). He was also Director of the Wharton School of Finance at Pennsylvania University (1933-1939). A close friend of Mr. Stewart, Dr. Willitts succeeded Dr. E. E. Day as Director for the Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation in the fall of 1939. Dr. Day had left to take the presidency of Cornell in 1937. Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick wrote that the Rockefeller Foundation was the largest single financial supporter of the National Bureau of Economic Research between 1920 and 1951. (See Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, p. 213.

77. Veblen to Flexner, 7/3/37. Flexner to Veblen, 7/9/37. See Flexner to Secretary of the Treasury, 6/9/37, cautioning him against any publicity concerning Riefler's consultancy, and insisting that Riefler should have no policy-forming responsibilities. This was a little amusing, as it followed by only a few months publication of a letter by Flexner to the editor of the Herald Tribune, castigating President Roosevelt for bad faith in proposing the "court-packing plan," and suggesting that "if the President has his way, we may as well go further: abolish Congress and substitute for it a Hitler Reichstag which, on occasions, will meet for a few moments, listen to their dictator's decrees, and adjourn." Dated 2/7/39. N. Y. Herald Tribune for 2/9/39. Clipping, Aydelotte files.

78. Mitrany to Flexner, 1/18/36. Flexner to Mitrany, 1/21/36.

79. Flexner to Earle, 2/28/38.

CHAPTER VI

THE SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES

The humanities did not present a completely new challenge to the Director. In 1924 he had initiated the first programs undertaken by any of the Rockefeller foundations, inaugurating grants in the General Education Board to aid teaching and research in various humanistic disciplines in American universities. Gifts to the endowment of selected institutions supported the training of archaeologists, field explorations and research, and helped to maintain the American Council of Learned Studies, a federation of institutions dedicated to promoting humanistic studies. As Director of Studies of the International Education Board, he recommended and secured support for the American School for Classical Studies at Athens and the American Academy at Rome as well as for archaeological operations in the Nile Valley. In 1926 he persuaded Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., to underwrite anonymously the excavation of the Athenian Agora, thus earning the eternal gratitude of the American School of Classical Studies.

As often happens to the pioneer, Flexner was the target of acute criticism for these activities on the one hand, and on the other was accused by the classicists of failing to support the classics. In appraising Flexner's record at the General Education Board and the International Education Board, Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick later wrote:

> In reviewing the history of the early work in the humanities ...one gathers that it was colored by traditional concepts, centering largely in archaeological excavations, in scholarly work in ancient cultures, and in researches centered in this

> country for classical humanistic studies. Even at this time, this type of activity did not escape the criticism of some of the Trustees.[1]

Fosdick quoted Anson Phelps Stokes as saying that Flexner's emphasis seemed to be "mainly on ancient history, ancient languages and archaeology;" he himself believed the humanities should be more broadly conceived and supported. Ten years later Dr. David Stevens, Director of the Humanities for the Rockefeller Foundation, characterized Flexner's early programs as a credit because of their "magnitude," but a discredit because "they buttressed scholasticism and antiquarianism in our universities."[2]

The Director could well have cited his own criticism of the foundations' failure to employ experts in the fields in which their aid was dispensed; as will be recalled, he urged in 1924 that qualified men be placed on the staff to handle the work in two new fields -- the humanities, and music and the fine arts. (See p. 33) When the Rockefeller foundations were reorganized in 1929, there were five or six divisions over which qualified experts presided in administering funds for aid to education on a world-wide basis. As Flexner was to make clear his views later, he apparently approved of the divisions into the social sciences, the humanities, and the sciences, medical education, etc., but regarded the geographical spread as impossible of satisfactory administration. But that is beside the point here. When he talked of the place of the humanities in his concept of the modern university, he urged a broad development, which was needed more urgently in the modern world than continuing discrimination in promoting the sciences. Thus he wrote:

> Our world is not, however, merely a matter of democracy and science. Indeed, if some sort of cultural equilibrium is to be attained, the humanistic disciplines, in which philosophy is included, necessarily become of greater rather than less importance; and by humanistic disciplines I refer not only to the humanities as such, but to the human values inherent in a deep knowledge of science itself. With the quick march of science, philosophy and humanism have gone under a cloud; when they assert themselves, they are prone to do so apologetically, on the ground that they too are, or can be, scientific. To be sure, they are and can...But quite aside from their pursuit in a scientific spirit, the world has not lost, and, unless it is to lose its savour, will never lose the pure, appreciative, humanistic spirit -- the love of beauty, the concern for ends established by ideals that dare to command rather than to obey.
>
> Now science, while widening our vision, increasing our satisfactions, and solving our problems, brings with it dangers peculiarly its own. We can become so infatuated with progress in knowledge and control...that we lose our perspective, lose our historic sense, lose a philosophic outlook, lose sight of relative cultural values. Something like this has happened to many, perhaps to most, of the enthusiastic, clear-headed, forward-looking, and highly specialized votaries of science. They are, culturally, too often thin and metallic; their training appears technological rather than broadly and deeply scientific. Taste and reason do not intervene to stop the scientist prosecuting his search for truth; they do sit in judgment on the uses to which society puts the forces which the scientist has set free. I say, our younger scientists not infrequently appear to have been dehumanized; so also do some humanists.
>
> In the modern university, therefore, the more vigorously science is prosecuted, the more acute the need that society be held accountable for the purposes to which larger knowledge and experience are turned. Philosophers and critics, therefore, gain in importance as science makes life more complex -- more rational in some ways, more irrational in others.[3]

And so he urged that the gaps in man's knowledge of his history disclosed by paleontologists and historians be closed by studies in archaeology, philology, paleography, etc. "Further study of mediaeval and modern art, literature, music and history will inevitably revise

notions formed on the basis of defective data which have hitherto controlled our thinking," he added. More important, perhaps, was his thinking that the humanists would contribute "the philosophic intelligence trying...to see things in the large."[4]

When he spoke of the humanities in the Confidential Memorandum he was constrained by the modesty of the first endowment to limit the fields the Institute would consider then. Mathematics must come first, for it was the most practicable; economics second, for he was convinced the Institute with its freedom could discover means of helping democracy survive. After expatiating on these, he mentioned how readily "history literature, music...can be added when men, money and ideas are available." He continued from time to time to remind the Trustees -- and the Founders -- of his wishes to start the third School. Thus in April, 1934, as a gift was announced to enable him to make a start in economics, he said he "was inclined to think that, before I lay down my directorship, whenever the means are forthcoming, I should like to start with a nucleus... in the humanities." In January, 1935, as he nominated Professor Riefler, he expressed the fear that it would not be "feasible" to start a third School in the fall. The truth was, of course, that he did not have the funds with which to do it; he was reminding Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld that he wanted to move. So far he had kept his promise not to start what he could not see finished as far as funds were concerned, but he knew now that he was facing a vigorous competition for what funds were in sight from the active Committee on Buildings and Grounds. This came at a time when various pressures were being applied in behalf of one or another humanist who needed employment, or by the possible availability

of men whom he wanted particularly to associate with the Institute.

Flexner found congenial counsel in Princeton's Department of Art and Archaeology, which had in the past benefited from Rockefeller grants for archaeology. To cooperate with that Department was again, as it had been in mathematics, to "build the peaks higher;" it was at that time one of the strong departments in the University. Moreover, its Chairman, Dr. Charles Rufus Morey, was willing to cooperate with the Director by lending his academic authority to support the accession by the Institute of classicists as well as of art-historians and archaeologists. In the circumstances, one may understand that the scholars and their fields of interest who were chosen to staff the third School represented an accommodation between the two men.

Dr. Morey was a powerful administrator as well as an ardent art-historian. He had only recently become Chairman, although he was brought into the Department by Professor Allan Marquand, who, Morey said, was the first art-historian in any American university, since most men in the fine arts to the limited extent of their development in those early days inclined toward connoiseurship. Under the enthusiastic leadership of Marquand and his successors, the Department of Art and Archaeology acquired valuable art collections and two fine libraries, the Barr Ferree and the Marquand, which made Princeton a prime source of materials for the history of art.

Of Morey himself one of his colleagues and successors was to write at the time of his death that he had "a magnetic eye and a quiet but determined manner of speaking...a compelling personality and steadfast character, and where questions of value entered in, he could be uncompro-

mising."[5] His great value to Flexner was, of course, his academic authority; however, like Veblen, on whom the Director relied for the same sure guidance in mathematics, Morey was to prove difficult of assimilation into Flexner's plans for the whole Institute, which did not always go as far as Morey wished.

In what follows, it may be difficult to understand the Director's attitude toward the Department without bearing in mind that, with the Founders, he felt under the obligation to make some restitution to the University for having drawn so heavily on the Department of Mathematics in building the School of Mathematics. Corollary to that was the fact that Professor Veblen continually applied pressure for faculty government, even when the School of Mathematics was the only faculty present. It was absolutely necessary for Flexner to rely upon an unimpeachable academic authority, therefore, in making his recommendations. But Professor Veblen apparently questioned the good faith of Professor Morey in the first of his recommendations, and it appears from the defensive statements Dr. Flexner made at certain of the Trustees' meetings, apparently without context or reason, that the mathematician was inclined to resist every appointment which was not for the School of Mathematics. For Flexner not to have had backing as distinguished in the humanities as he received from Veblen in the School of Mathematics would have been disastrous for him.

In the light of this background, it becomes understandable that after several consultations between them, Dr. Morey presented Flexner with a memorandum for professors and research assistants which represented the interests of both men. These were prefaced by a description

of the Department, its past and present preoccupations and engagements, and plans for the new School which tied it in theory clasely to the Department and its needs. The archaeology and art-history of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages were the Department's main fields of specialization. The Agora excavations for the American School for Classical Studies were directed by Professor T. Leslie Shear of the University; at this time Richard Stillwell, Professor of Architecture at Princeton, was assisting him and acting as Director of the American School for Classical Studies. Both men were also working on the earlier finds at Corinth. The Department also was part of a consortium which was excavating Antioch-on-Orontes, valuable source of information on the transformation from classical antiquity to the art of the Middle Ages. Two large research enterprises were going forward in the Department in Princeton; certain parts of the catalogues of the Museo Cristiano, and an Index of Christian Art. They represented ambitious projects in assembling and arranging authoritative source materials in both for the periods covered, and both were nominated for expansion into other periods and types of objects. The Index had been worked on for some ten or twelve years; its aim was to catalogue and bibliograph all known manuscripts and objets d'art up to the year 1400.

Morey frankly expressed the opinion that the School of Humanistic Studies could do nothing better than to "realize and fill the lacunae which have made themselves insistently felt within our...research -- and to fill these with scholars of outstanding ability who would add powerfully to the sum of archaeological scholarship that can be usefully concentrated at Princeton." He asserted that for the Institute to estab-

lish new objectives, say, in American archaeology, or Egyptian, or Assyrian, would be neither as satisfactory nor as economical; Princeton had gained "a considerable momentum" in its fields, and the Institute could be more effective in contributing to their development than by initiating its own fields of inquiry. To strengthen his position he quoted an opinion from Dr. Erwin Panofsky, eminent art-historian lately of Hamburg, and presently teaching as Visiting Professor at New York University.

> 'Art and archaeology would really be the best thing to begin with, for as things have developed, art-history has become a kind of clearing house (both literally and figuratively speaking) for all the other historical disciplines which, when left alone, tend to a certain self-isolation. This key position in modern Geistesgeschichte accounts also for the success of the Warburg Library in Hamburg, and it would be a magnificent idea to build up a similar thing (yet not a duplicate, thanks to the well-established tradition of your Department) at Princeton.'[6]

According to this pattern, Dr. Morey then listed five professorial positions, and suggested four candidates as follows: (1) An art-historian in the 14th Century and the later Middle Ages, for which he named Dr. Panofsky, "the most brilliant scholar in.../those periods/ that we know." (2) A paleographer in Greek and Latin, for which, with the admission that such a genius did not exist, he named Dr. Elias A. Lowe as "second to none in Europe" in Latin. (3) A specialist in Greek architecture, for which he suggested Dr. W. B. Dinsmoor of Columbia. (4) A Greek epigraphist, for which he named Dr. Benjamin D. Meritt, "outstanding...known for his brilliant work on the Agora inscriptions." (5) A Near Eastern archaeologist with a special competence in Islamic art. For this position he had no candidate. But he said that not only

was such a scholar needed for expertise in the art problems of the Middle Ages, but also for training two promising students in the Department of Oriental (Near Eastern) Languages and Literatures who wanted to specialize in Near Eastern archaeology. For research assistants he described three positions and named three men to fill them, saying that they were the men who would ultimately replace the scholars mentioned above, and would build on the foundations they have laid.[7]

As for facilities, Dr. Morey alluded to certain remodeling in prospect at McCormick Hall which housed the Department and the Marquand Library, and wrote:

> In a conversation we had some time ago, you had some fun with me because I admired the 'installation' of the mathematics group in Fine Hall....The archaeologist and art-historian cannot say with Dr. Einstein that all they need 'is a pencil and a pad of paper.' We work with plates, architectural drawings, plans, maps, photographs, movable objects from excavations, etc...We cannot do without drafting rooms, large spaces in which to lay out comparative material, rooms for the classified shelving of photographs, facilities for photographing and photostating, and storerooms for excavation records. And we must be near an adequate library, complete in the extensive publications by which archaeological scholarship is recorded.
>
> When the...remodeling of McCormick Hall is completed...the group will have all these facilities...to meet present and minimum requirements /of the Department/. (Emphasis his.)

While one or two more men in the research staff might not tax facilities too heavily, more would. And so Dr. Morey suggested that the Institute should build a north wing to the museum to provide more space for offices and facilities. He closed with a warning note:

> I mention this in order to give you as complete a picture as I can of the full extent of the commitments which the Institute might be assuming in undertaking an extension into the field of archaeology and history of art in cooperation with the Department of Art and Archaeology.[8]

In its tone this was less an outline for cooperation than a statement of conditions. But Morey's straightforward approach apparently satisfied the Director.

Though it would seem that he had intended to present some nominations at the annual meeting of the Board in 1934, Flexner was evidently dissuaded by the inadequacy of an addition to endowment then provided by the Founders. But a year later, faced with a similar shortage of funds and the rapidly advancing plans of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds which were competing for a share of them, Flexner presented two nominations to the Trustees on the grounds that (1) his best contribution to the Institute was to bring men to it before he retired; (2) the men concerned were then available, and would likely not be later since they were considering other offers which, if accepted, would hold them for several years. The first was Dr. Benjamin Meritt, and the second Dr. Erwin Panofsky. Dr. Meritt was a young scholar in Greek history, epigraphy, archaeology and philology, who at thirty-three years of age had two years before been called to the Hopkins' Francis White Chair, first filled by Gildersleeve. His rise had been meteoric. Now he was offered a chair at Chicago (which he was unlikely to take because the Hopkins had met the terms). Though Flexner did not explain the latter fact, it was true that if Dr. Meritt accepted the increase at Baltimore he would be committed to remain there for a time.

Meritt was an ideal choice; as an eminent American scholar, he hopefully would be the "leading spirit" of the School of Humanistic Studies, familiar with academic conditions in this country, and recognized as a very eminent scholar. Flexner's old friend and adviser, Dr. Edward Capps, who

may have known of Flexner's intentions early, wrote him in October, 1932, about Meritt:

> I am looking forward to seeing Ben become the head of the Department of History and Archaeology of the Institute....
>
> I believe that archaeology as a part of history is one of the subjects that can be successfully prosecuted on the higher levels of research in this country, and that such stimulus to research in that field is greatly needed here. Conducting excavations alone is all right if the excavator is trained to his job, but exploiting finds can be terribly superficial and will generally be so unless the scholar in question is imbued with the historical spirit from first to last and thoroughly grounded in his department of history.[9]

Few men could meet that test as could Dr. Meritt. He was willing to accept a call to the Institute, but only on specified conditions: he would devote his whole time to research in epigraphy; he would retain his positions with the American School for Classical Studies as Editor of its publications, as Member of the Agora Commission, and as Member of the Managing Committee of the School. He recognized that in leaving Baltimore he would have to surrender his work as an editor of the American Journal of Philology. Also he was committed to spend 1935-1936 at Oxford, and would keep the engagement. Flexner agreed.[10]

Dr. Panofsky was temporarily teaching at New York University full-time after being summarily dismissed from his position at Hamburg by Hitler's ministry in 1933. Like Dr. von Neumann, he had been teaching half-time in this country since 1931. But he did not intend to remain at New York University, especially after talking with Morey, who needed at Princeton a highly qualified art-historian in certain periods since the retirement of Dr. Frank Mather from the Department in 1933. Morey wanted "a specialist in the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, a Quatrocencist...whose preference for Italian or Northern Renaissance

would be immaterial, provided he would bring to bear upon our work an outstanding competence in the period, and the critical acumen and ability to synthesize the diverse phenomena of the end of the Middle Age...." He regarded Panofsky as "the most brilliant scholar [in the period] that we know."[11] He had introduced Panofsky to Flexner in 1934, and the Professor had fallen in love with Princeton, making his home here and entering his two sons in the University. Hopefully, he wrote Flexner, the Institute would soon open its third School, and would call him.[12]

In the early spring of 1935 the art-historian was being asked to accept a permanent full-time appointment at New York University, and was also considering a bid from the Renaissance Society of Chicago. Flexner feared the scholar would be lost to the Institute if he hesitated longer. Moreover, the opportunity to place an Institute man in McCormick Hall, without whose facilities no art-historian could hope to work in Princeton, was still open; Morey still needed Panofsky, and the Professor still wanted to come.

Mr. Percy Straus became a party in interest here. As a member of the governing board of New York University, he inclined to the view that Flexner was "competing" with his institution for Panofsky. When Flexner succeeded in convincing the Trustee that the professor had been deaf to his persuasions to remain at New York University, Straus adverted to Institute finances. The social sciences, he urged, would need substantial amounts of money for their development; they now had prior claim on the Institute. Straus was much interested in economics; he had recently had something to do with calling Dr. Beardsley Rumml from the University of Chicago to be treasurer of R. H. Macy & Company, and seemed

to be trying to persuade Dr. Riefler to shape his course in research to Rumml's views. Straus seemed to be certain that Mr. Bamberger would make but few more gifts to endowment during his lifetime, though he had no doubt the Founders' bequests would take care of the Institute's needs. The two men argued vigorously, they reached no accord before the Board meeting in April, 1935.[13] Then, despite his knowledge that in following his usual proceedure, Flexner would have cleared the appointments with Mr. Bamberger before proposing them to the Trustees, Mr. Straus precipitated a debate, evidently joined by Mr. Hardin. The minutes recite:

> A question was raised as to whether, instead of beginning two new schools in the coming autumn, it would not be wiser to attempt a forecast of the possible budget of the School of Economics and Politics and a survey of the costs involved in the support of the two existing schools over a period of fifteen years. The Director stated that such a forecast was, in his judgment, impossible, and that the Institute could only develop if it carefully kept within the sum of money available from year to year, retaining a safe margin.[14]

This was tantamount to saying that since new funds became available only on a year-by-year basis, the Director could not withhold development of the first modest outlines of the Institute, especially since he was encountering vigorous competition for them. The other point in the debate arose from the fact that Dr. Morey was the academic sponsor for both appointments. "The importance of a more definite understanding with the Trustees of Princeton University was raised," say the minutes. Flexner defended the planned cooperation: not only was it working out well in Fine Hall, but it was successful as between the Bartol Institute and Swarthmore, and between the Carnegie Institute's Department of Embryology and the Hopkins' School of Medicine. In both cases what he called "free trade" prevailed. Moreover, he described the relations prevailing in

Princeton:

> The cooperation.../between the University and the Institute/ has been ideal. This is to some extent to be explained by the fact that the President of the University and the Dean of the Graduate School and the Director of the Institute have adopted a very definite technique: that of talking over with one another any points of interest to both institutions before undertaking any direct communications with the members of the faculty of either institution. There has been no crossing of wires, and there has been a thorough understanding on the part of the respective heads as to every detail before action of any kind has been taken.[15]

While the purpose here was to give particularity to his claim of harmony with the University, it may have been that his statement was provoked by questions from Professor Veblen, who was opposed to the influence of Morey in the appointment of Panofsky, although the only mention specifically of that fact was made in a letter from the Director to the Professor shortly after the meeting. But Veblen made no secret of his feeling that Morey sought to secure the services of Panofsky at the Institute's expense while avoiding any possible criticism by employing the eminent art-historian himself.[16] Beside that, no statement of basic policy could have been so unacceptable to the mathematician, ardent advocate of faculty selection and approval of academic appointments, than Flexner offered here.

These appointments marked a new departure -- for a period at least -- in salary policy. The Director said:

> I am strongly convinced that we should offer at the outset no particular financial inducement to those whom we invite to join the Institute. I do not abate in the least my conviction that...academic salaries in this country should be higher. I do not believe that the highest academic salaries paid by the Institute are too high. I feel strongly that everyone who is invited to join the Institute as a professor should also feel that in due time on the basis of merit and

> that alone -- not on the basis of length of service or priority of appointment -- his salary may be increased should the Director recommend and the Board approve. Should the Board adopt my view and authorize the appointment of two persons as a small nucleus for a school of humanistic studies, I should suggest that their salaries be no higher than they are in the institutions with which they have been connected...I should hope...that if justified by their usefulness they might expect, as the resources...permit, to be gradually and eventually elevated to the standard upon which the Institute began.[17]

The Director then warned the Board that land and buildings should not be allowed to compete for funds needed to bring "brains" to the Institute:

> I shall not in this report anticipate what the Committee [on Buildings and Grounds] has to say, but I wish to restate my conviction that the real greatness of the Institute depends and will forever depend not upon buildings but upon brains. Fine Hall is an excellent illustration of what can be accomplished through the establishment of a communal life, which does indeed require a separate building. But the several schools need not all be erected upon a single plot, and, if necessary, over a preliminary period of years satisfactory results may be obtained in rented quarters...Like the Johns Hopkins University in its glory, the Institute for Advanced Study may flourish in any sort of buildings...provided each school as established has assembled a group of men comparable with those who have already been brought together.[18]

With the conclusion that the Board should support "conservative leadership," the Trustees approved the start of the third School and the two appointments, although it appeared that even with Mr. Straus recorded at his request as abstaining, the vote was not otherwise unanimous.[19]

The debate seriously disturbed Flexner. He spent the next day interviewing possible sources of endowment in New York, informing Messrs. Bamberger and Straus of the fact. Straus was obdurate; he still could not see that Flexner had not prejudiced the work in economics, in which most universities were doing badly, he said. Somewhat surprisingly Flexner

replied that he saw little liklihood that the School of Economics and Politics would need more money in the immediate future -- evidently an indication of Stewart's unreadiness to accept appointment as professor, and his unwillingness to see a definite program undertaken until he was ready to do so. Nor was the School of Humanistic Studies going to expand substantially until resources increased; meanwhile, he said, "we can sit back and await developments without imperiling our solvency."[20]

To Mr. Bamberger he said much the same thing:

> I want to reassure you and Mrs. Fuld about the future. Nothing that was said by either Mr. Straus or Mr. Hardin was new to me...I have been looking day by day as far ahead as I can at the question of our relations with Princeton, and I have been watching the budget with the eye of an eagle...

As to future relations with the University, he saw only mutual benefits from his course of action,

> because the interests of the two institutions absolutely coincide...Nothing is so apt to cement relationships as mutual interests, and mutual interests from which both parties benefit equally exist here.
>
> As to the budget, we have a probable surplus of $50,000 next year, and there are items in the mathematical budget which, though very important, could, if necessary, be dropped, with the result that our surplus would be almost doubled.[21]

Though he expressed hope that funds would come as the result of his interviews of the day before, he could offer nothing conclusive.

After this Dr. Flexner and his wife took a Mediterranean cruise, in the hope, as he wrote a friend, that he would recover from the effects of "a Board meeting, preparation for which had exhausted me."[22] And well they might have. For Flexner had always taken certain precautions to avoid acrimony in disagreements in Trustees' meetings which would disturb Mr. Bamberger, who was extraordinarily sensitive to discord. Thus the

Director usually sought to iron out differences or to establish clearly the basis of argument, before the meetings, as he had here with Mr. Straus. It was a matter of course for him to secure the prior personal approval of Mr. Bamberger to every action to be submitted to the Board. In any ordinary situation Flexner would have welcomed a complete airing of differences. He had stood up in battle over program and principle with Mr. Gates and other Trustees in the General Education Board. It was not argument that was dangerous here; it was anger and bad feeling. True, this was not manifested in the instant discussion, but the difference with his policy manifested by two of Mr. Bamberger's close associates was troublesome. It was curious that in the previous meeting the first bitter difference to occur in the Board had taken place. Mr. Frankfurter had been extremely disputatious, so that Mrs. Fuld said sotto voce to Flexner as the lawyer was speaking: "This man has to go!"[23] But it was not for this reason that the Trustees voted unanimously to omit Frankfurter's name from the Board at this meeting. Flexner had lost a valued friend and a strong Trustee, whose voice he had expected to be clear and informed but reasonable in clarifying the academic practices and experience to the lay Trustees.

In the event, there was no time "to sit back and await developments." For Mr. Bamberger, disturbed by what he considered to be too ambitious a program of land purchase for the site of the Institute, decided with Mrs. Fuld that they would take care of "present commitments" and then cease giving financial aid "at the present time."[24] The Institute was to be frozen in whatever shape the Director could bring it to quickly; the need for decisions in respect of the schools of economics

and the humanities was clear. As has been said, he seems to have decided that no further development in economics should be undertaken then, and hastened to secure Mr. Bamberger's approval of certain additions to the staff in the humanities.

Three nominations were submitted to the Executive Committee which gave him permission to offer appointments on the 6th December. On the 20th January, 1936, the Founders made their last gift to endowment: cash and securities valued at $994,000. On the 27th January the Board approved the appointment of Messrs. W. A. Campbell, Ernst Herzfeld and E. A. Lowe as professors in the School of Humanistic Studies.[25] The gift was sufficient to meet the estimated cost of the site, and to capitalize the salaries of the three new appointees with a little to spare.

Though it was the time for presentation of estimates for the following year's budget, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the very substantial summary of requirements for the School of Humanistic Studies and the Department of Art and Archaeology presented by Dr. Morey to Professor Panofsky in November was related to Dr. Flexner's crisis. Not only were some of the items quite extravagant, but they totaled nearly $50,000 annually, and contemplated a capital expenditure for the north wing at an estimated $120,000 as well. In the budget there was approximately $18,000 for positions deferred; $15,000 for cash subventions to the Department of Art and Archaeology in view of its services to Institute members, of which $8,000 a year over the next ten was to supplement the Department's appropriations for the Index, and $7,000 p.a. for library accessions.

The memorandum was prefaced by Morey's Ptolemaic view of the relation of the School to the Department.

> It may be stated at the outset, as a result of a great deal of thinking and discussion on the part of the art and archaeology group at Princeton, that they have become convinced of the advisability of developing the School of the Humanities in and around the Department of Art and Archaeology.... To attempt to develop in the Institute all the widely scattered humanity disciplines would not only involve it in a staggering expense, but would be likely to result in a faculty of more or less isolated specialties. If, on the other hand, the focus is placed in art and archaeology, the collateral demands of this subject (sic) will insure a certain breadth to the School, but at the same time insure its integration as a group of scholars with the necessary contact one with the other.[26]

Needless to say, the cash subventions and the contruction of the wing were not forthcoming from the Institute.

Dr. Elias A. Lowe, Latin paleographer, was then in his fifty-fifth year. He had studied, taught and researched in Europe since the beginning of the century; he had been a member of the Carnegie Institute in Washington, D.C. since 1911, and lecturer, then Reader, at Oxford since 1914. Since 1929 he had been working on a great project under the auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Union Académique, and the American Council of Learned Societies which administered a grant of $75,000 for expenses given by the Foundation in 1929. He was assembling, photographing and documenting all Latin literary manuscripts from 79 B.C., to 800 A.D. Ten volumes of the Codes Latini Antiquiores were projected, of which two were published by this time. The work was basic to the study of mediaeval history and literature.

The Rockefeller grant was now exhausted, and would not be supplemented. Dr. Lowe had begun to find the climate of Oxford oppressive

and unhealthful. He wanted to return to his native land. Having met Flexner at Oxford in 1928, and followed the development of the Institute, he naturally thought of the possibility of coming to it. But nothing seemed further from Flexner's mind than appointing a paleographer at the Institute when Mr. Frankfurter at Oxford, to whom Flexner had introduced Dr. Lowe, raised the question in January, 1934. He answered that while universities generally were not employing paleographers, Princeton might be interested in an application from Lowe to match its friendly rival, Harvard. Lowe then asked Flexner's intercession on his behalf; the result was that Dr. Morey recommended that the Institute employ Lowe. The paleographer enjoyed considerable support in American quarters which impressed the Director; Miss Belle da Costa Greene of the Morgan Library, Drs. John C. Merriam and W. M. Gilbert of the Carnegie Institute, and Dr. Waldo Leland of the American Council of Learned Societies among others were all eager to see the Institute give him an opportunity to complete the work he had undertaken in 1929. For that he needed a haven and means apparently not otherwise available.[27]

Of Ernst Herzfeld's availability Dr. Morey had been lately apprised. The German scholar, at fifty-six, was an eminent Persian archaeologist, epigraphist and historian. Dr. Walter W. S. Cook of New York University joined Morey in urging Flexner to undertake the appointment. Herzfeld had the results of twenty years of field work ready or in preparation for publication. He had been dismissed by Hitler from his German connections, which had originated with the Emperor, and a contract with the Oriental Institute in Chicago was expiring. Morey supported his

appointment not only because of the Department's interest in the Middle Ages but also in the hope that Herzfeld would work with some Princeton students in the Department of Oriental Studies, who were eager to train in Islamic archaeology.[28]

The third was young W. A. Campbell, Master of Fine Arts at Princeton magna cum laude in 1930, presently Associate Professor of Arts half-time at Wellesley, and supervising the Antioch excavations the other half. The consortium of which Princeton was part was then seeking renewal of its concession, and Princeton wanted Campbell to continue if it were extended. But Wellesley intended to appoint him to the Chair in Classics which became vacant. Accordingly Dr. Morey persuaded the Director it would be good if the Institute should appoint Campbell to a full-time position as a staff archaeologist to work on whatever explorations it might become interested in. But Dr. Flexner, evidently realizing the Institute would not engage in archaeology, presented the appointment to the Trustees as one of a young classicist of Meritt's type, who had the capacity to take his place in the higher ranks as had Meritt. This was true enough. After the Board had approved the appointment, a bad hitch occurred. Flexner had left all arrangements with Campbell and Wellesley to Dr. Morey. That worthy, claiming that he was unprepared for the routine announcement, protested that he had not informed either of his action or the Institute's. The episode resulted in much embarrassment and a year's delay, during which Campbell accepted the chair at Wellesley and the consortium succeeded in renewing its concession at Antioch. In January, 1937, Flexner presented a revised recommendation to the Board; it approved his nomination of Campbell as Field Archaeologist for the

term of the concession (1937-1943), to work half of each year at Antioch for the University, paid by the Institute, and carrying on his work at Wellesley the other half-year.[29]

If this incident seemed to betray a certain negligence on the Director's part in passing on Dr. Morey's requests, nothing can be said to dispel the impression. Morey even reproved Flexner for approving certain men whom he nominated for membership and stipends without having seen and passed on their credentials. Flexner's reply that of course he assumed Panofsky had seen and approved them hardly carried conviction, for there is no evidence he had ever made Panofsky responsible for the observance of established standards.[30]

The Director made the sixth recommendation for the staff of the School of Humanistic Studies in October, 1936, when he asked the Board to appoint Dr. Hetty Goldman, archaeologist, as Professor, and the Board obliged. For this action the academic approval of Professor Meritt appeared as follows in the minutes:

> I remember our conversation of this summer about possible appointments in the humanistic Section and wish to give you this record of my opinion favoring the appointment of Miss Hetty Goldman, with whom I have been associated from time to time since 1922, when we were both at the excavations of Colophon in Asia Minor.
>
> Miss Goldman is recognized as an outstanding explorer and excavator, who has done excellent work in both historic and pre-historic investigation. Her '<u>Fach</u>' is a desirable complement to my own historical-epigraphical studies, and I should look forward to close association with her in the Institute with the greatest pleasure. Miss Goldman's published reports and books have been admirable, and I think of her appointment not with a view to any commitment of the Institute to field work as such, but as an opportunity for Miss Goldman's further exploitation of her unpublished material so that she may prepare it and studies coming from it for publication.

> I should be particularly interested in continuing my own work with her on Colophon, but this I mention as one item only. The important thing, as I see it, is to get her where she can carry on her whole program most successfully.[31]

Dr. Goldman had been excavating at Tarsus in Anatolia for several years under the auspices of the Fogg Museum, the Archaeological Institute of America, and Bryn Mawr. At the time of her appointment she had resigned as Director of the explorations, and presumably would devote herself entirely to preparing her work for publication. Shortly after her appointment, however, she resumed her direction of the exploration at Tarsus, which took her abroad during each spring semester until 1940 when the war made further field work impossible. The cost of her expedition had been met in the past, and continued to be supported largely by a private donor, who was greatly interested in Miss Goldman's achievement and wished to remain anonymous.[32] The Institute received a small donation from this source, which went toward paying for the Institute's expenses for secretarial assistance, members and research assistants whom she brought to Princeton to work on her studies. During the war the archaeologist spent all her time at the Institute. Her retirement in 1947 meant little in the way of decreased work, except that she did no further exploration. She has continued to work in her study at Fuld Hall, the only woman ever to be on the Institute's faculty.

In 1936 Dr. Edward Capps retired at seventy from the University, but continued for a time as Chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies. His work was to be largely in Princeton, where he had no office and no means of getting one. His wife was ill. It appeared that he would not be able to afford high-cost

Princeton. At that pass Flexner stepped into the picture. He had a deep interest in the American School of Classical Studies, as has been said, and a deeper one in his old friend and guide of past days. Impulsively he suggested that Dr. Capps might occupy an office near Meritt's in 69 Alexander Street. That in turn led to finding an apartment nearby which would enable the classicist to take care of his wife while working on the Agora investigations. And, since his economic situation was precarious, Flexner also offered a visiting professorship at the Institute with a small honorarium; all apparently without previous consultation with either Meritt or President Dodds. The former expressed delight; the latter, rage at this gratuitous interference with University personnel, and its tacit reflection on the retirement system. But he did not make his anger public.

Professor Meritt supported both these appointments: Miss Goldman's because Dr. Morey had referred Flexner to Meritt for the purpose, and Capp's because the arrangement was designed to benefit him particularly. Of this he wrote:

> The appointment of Capps, who is one of the best-known and most highly respected classical scholars in America, would lend distinction to the Institute as such, and in particular his association would be most helpful to me because of the close connection we both have with the excavation of the Athenian Agora, Capps being Chairman of the Managing Committee of the School, and Chairman of the Agora Commission of the School, while I hold the less prominent positions of member of the Managing Committee and of the Agora Commission, and of member of the excavation staff in charge of epigraphy.
>
> Our work together would thus afford a concentration which I know would be most useful to me -- and I hope in some degree to Capps -- in forwarding the best ideals of scholarship in which the Institute is interested.[33]

Unfortunately, ambiguities crept into the Director's report as reflected in the Minutes of this meeting and the resolutions on which the Board took action. It is apparent that Professor Veblen did not understand that Dr. Goldman was being appointed a Professor of the Institute, but construed her status to be, like that of Dr. Capps whom Flexner first discussed, that of a visiting professor. The resolution which was passed however, showed that her position was permanent. Veblen questioned Mrs. Bailey about this; Dr. Flexner answered that Dr. Goldman qualified for a professorship, that he had recommended it, and that her compensation would have been in line with previous appointments had funds been available. The second misunderstanding was voiced by Mr. Maass, who had understood from the Director's report that the appointment of a curator for the Gest Oriental Library was to be for several years only, while she finished her task of cataloging the collection and took care of it in its informal repository. Flexner's reply was equally firm; he hoped the Gest Library, which would always need a Chinese-speaking Custodian, would be the "nucleus" of Oriental studies at Princeton, and had conferred with President Dodds on the subject.[34]

Within eighteen months the Director had staffed the School of Humanistic Studies with five professors, each highly qualified in his field. Evidence is not lacking that he did this under the most extreme pressure: indeed, though he had one, Professor Meritt, in mind from the very beginning, and had every reason to be proud of the rest of his selections, he undoubtedly would have wished to defer all of them until funds were in hand to enable the payment of something like uniform salaries, and provision for adequate retirement benefits to those who were

too old to accumulate them at Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. For whatever of doubt attended his actions in these matters, his devotion to higher salaries and better security in age was beyond question. In the race between land and buildings on the one hand and scholars on the other, he was forced by lack of funds to make otherwise indefensible arrangements with some of the humanists. Was this necessary? The Trustees and Flexner himself regarded it as imperative that the nucleus of each school be established before the first Director laid down his burden; again and again letters bear this out, as do his own frequent statements to the Board. For the other Trustees recognized that he was the only man with acceptable ideas of what the Institute should be and become who enjoyed at the same time the confidence of the Founders, on whose generosity the accomplishment depended.

Flexner had frankly represented the accession of Professors Goldman, Herzfeld and Lowe as of older scholars who needed a haven and auspices under which to complete the preparation for publication of their discoveries over long lives of study and investigation. He spoke convincingly of the scholarly waste in unpublished records such as theirs. Of course, the Institute had no fund for publications in the humanities, and no money to devote to it. Professor Lowe's ten volumes had all been paid for, one-third by the Clarendon Press which was publishing them. As for the rest, Flexner had to seek funds from the foundations, as he did for stipends for members in the humanities.

In view of the pressures on him, and the financial circumstances of the Institute, it was fortunate that the Director was able to make

reasonably generous arrangements with three of the humanists. It might be said that it was done in the face of continuing demands from Professor Veblen that two members of the School of Mathematics faculty should be given the maximum salary -- and apparently without special interest being manifested by the younger men themselves. Indeed, at the very meeting where the Director proposed a salary of $4,000 for Herzfeld, who was, he said, "recognized as the foremost scholar in the field of Islamic archaeology," he was constrained to announce an increase in the salaries of Professors Alexander and Von Neumann by $2,500 each, though he did so without mentioning their names (effective 7/1/36).[35]

The accommodation of the humanists in quarters at the University was apparently not possible. The Chairman of the Classics Department was very unfriendly to the Institute, and apparently had no direct intercourse with Flexner. Perhaps Professor Meritt, an alumnus of Princeton, would have been welcomed by the Department, but President Dodds held a conversation with the Chairman about Messrs. Campbell, Herzfeld and Lowe, and transmitted some information to Flexner personally.[36] After that the Institute purchased a large old residence at 69 Alexander Street at what was evidently considered a premium price. It was remodeled during the summer of 1936 for use as offices, and by the time the new appointees arrived in Princeton in October, it was ready. Dr. Morey was eager to see Herzfeld's museum and library installed in McCormick Hall, and made space for it. But Herzfeld, claiming that he wanted access to his notes, library and artifacts all hours of day and night, asked the Director to rent space for him. The Institute rented a large apartment at 10 Bayard Lane, where Herzfeld and his sister also each had an apartment. Profes-

sorPanofsky was at McCormick Hall. Professor Lowe, coming to Princeton in the winter of 1937 after traveling to collect facsimilies, found inadequate the study prepared for his use at 69 Alexander Street and rented space in his home for his work, the Institute paying for the extra facilities. Professors Capps, Goldman, Meritt, Earle, Mitrany and Riefler occupied studies in the house on Alexander Street.

There is no doubt that Flexner hoped the School of Humanistic Studies would organize itself, as had the School of Mathematics, around and under the leadership of Professor Meritt. But the Professor spent his first year of employment by the Institute at Oxford and in Athens, arriving in Princeton in October, 1936. Meanwhile Flexner had implied his expectation that Meritt would unofficially "lead" the humanists as Veblen dio the mathematicians by noting in the Bulletin that in the absence of Professor Meritt, "the task of beginning fell to Professor Panofsky."[38] But even after Professor Meritt's arrival, the faculty of the School showed no disposition to organize themselves into a group. Of course they were scattered; casual meetings were impossible, except for the three at the old house. One had to make an appointment, and they were so busy with their work that they failed to do it. Herzfeld and Panofsky were each giving a course of lectures at New York University and the Metropolitan Museum, and devoting some time to the Department's needs, while the greatest part of their thought and energy was devoted to completing their own studies.[39] Beside that, Herzfeld was a natural recluse. Dr. Lowe worked at home.

But humanists seem to be different from mathematicians in any event. The new men were more individualistic; the mathematicians were

delighted that Professor Veblen anticipated their needs and took care of them with Flexner. Dr. Morey was the only administrator among the humanists; he continued to press his demands upon Flexner through Professor Panofsky, whose survival in the direct line of fire between Flexner and Morey was a tribute to his tact and forbearance. But there was no longer any possibility of allocating a lump sum for stipends to the humanists, though the School of Mathematics continued to demand and get its appropriation. Flexner had to "pass the hat," so to speak, among the foundations, garnering enough to satisfy most of the entirely reasonable requests made by the humanists, and giving credit to the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation for their valuable aid in the Bulletin.

His dilemma was shown clearly when in 1937 he met Professor Panofsky's requests for stipends for himself and Dr. Morey with an irrascible declaration that he could not continue to handle such demands individually for the School of Humanistic Studies, and rashly suggested that after the holidays he might call the professors and Dr. Morey too to a meeting. When Panofsky asked how much money there was for stipends for the humanists, Flexner thought better of his suggestion. He did not call such a meeting.[40] The reasons were obvious enough. Without explanations the professors would hardly understand why the Director aided the Department of Art and Archaeology. These would not be possible. Nor would it be possible to explain how the Institute became involved in Princeton's obligations under the corsortium exploring Antioch, which bore little relation to any of the School's interests and displeased even Professor Meritt. But no humanist appeared to challenge Flexner's

concessions to the Department as did Professor Veblen, who had his own interests in doing so, as will be seen later.

In reality, an unhealthy situation existed now within the Institute. The hope that each school would be autonomous had not been realized. Nothing was further from the possibilities of the situation than the Director's suggestion that each might have a chairman, changing annually, as he understood it was done in Germany and elsewhere. The School of Humanistic Studies was composed of individualists interested in different disciplines, loyal to the Institute, while rather taking it for granted, but having little or no sense of solidarity within their group. The School of Economics and Politics was composed of three actively divergent personalities whom Flexner had tried vainly and mistakenly to weld into one. It could hardly become an autonomous School, for its members were each completely "autonomous," and none was satisfied with what he was permitted to do. This vacuum of power or meaningful policy for grouping was in strange contrast with the School of Mathematics, where five professors allowed the sixth, with only occasional challenges, to take care of their needs. And not the least sinister aspect of the situation was the attitude of the Director himself. Weary and beset with problems which might have been met readily without the restrictions imposed by Mr. Bamberger, Flexner not unnaturally came to regard Professor Veblen as speaking for the entire faculty, as will later be seen. For Veblen moved expertly, and devoted much of his time to management activities, saving the Director many hours and conversations with the others. In a real sense, he was renouncing his personal concerns with each professor. This left the field to Veblen, who took it quietly.

The Institute's financial aid to the Department of Art and Archaeology began in the fall of 1934 at Dr. Morey's request. Dr. Flexner secured from the Board in October an appropriation of $6,000 for 1934-1935, later extended to 1935-1936, to be spent for a survey of resources for art history between New York and Washington. Two excellent German art-historians, Drs. Helmut Schlunk and Kurt Weitzmann, were employed by Dr. Morey. Apparently they made the survey, in addition to helping with research projects in the Department, but it is not available. They supported Dr. Morey's position that Princeton was the first American university to be interested in the history of art, appointing Allan Marquand to a professorship in 1881, while Harvard inclined more toward appreciation. They suggested that if both Harvard and Princeton were made very strong in the fine arts, they would supply the other universities with the men to spread the interest in those disciplines.[41]

The real nature of the Executive cooperation between the Institute and the University became really apparent in 1936-1937, when the School began to operate. Then there were nine members enrolled in the School of Humanistic Studies, of whom all but one were nominated by Dr. Morey to work in the Department. The following year there were twelve members, of whom ten worked in the Department and two with Professor Meritt. In 1938-1939, twelve of nineteen members in the School of Humanistic Studies worked primarily in and with the Department, in addition to three men attached to the Institute's staff.[42] The Director found the strain of providing the necessary stipends great, for the Institute was not able to pay them all; he depended for help in individual cases from the foundations.

In 1936, he decided to seek a lump sum grant for the purpose, and found himself in a very embarrassing situation. He wrote President Frederick Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation as follows:

> Last year we began a program of the same kind [as in mathematics] in the fields of economics and the humanities. The economics group will develop very, very slowly, and its needs can be met from our own resources.
>
> The humanities group can develop more rapidly...Indeed, it is almost entirely a question of money. I believe that, if the Carnegie Corporation voted an appropriation of $25,000 a year for three years, it would beyond question be capitalized by friends of the Institute by the end of that period, and meanwhile facilities and opportunities of the Institute need not wait...
>
> It is for the purpose of bridging this gap and enabling us to progress more rapidly...that I submit this application to you and your Trustees.[43]

Mr. Keppel's reply was disconcerting.

> We have been praying over your letter of October 31st. Our Trustees, or rather those I've had a chance to consult, are interested in the possibilities, but one of them suggests that, in view of the intimate relations between the Institute and Princeton University it might be well for you to see President Dodds at your common convenience to discuss the whole situation with him. Princeton may have some plans for us too, and we don't want to get the wires crossed.[44]

To Flexner's answer that he talked often with President Dodds, and that frequent conferences prevented any "crossing of wires," Mr. Keppel noted that he also had talked with Dodds, and understood that the agreement between him and Flexner was one "in principle;" Keppel suggested that a "bill of particulars" should be drawn up to which agreement would be secured, then to be presented to the Corporation.[45]

During this correspondence Dr. Morey presented to Professor Panofsky for Dr. Flexner a very ample budget for the Department of Art and Archaeology. The concession for Antioch had been renewed, and Morey asked

asked for two aides in addition to Mr. Campbell for the duration of the new contract period (1937-1942). He also mentioned two Princeton professors of art-history who needed sabbatical leave to prepare their work for publication, and asked for membership and their regular University salaries as stipend for the half-year. This had evidently been discussed previously; it was not made formal. Moreover, he renewed a previous request for a new chair in modern art-history, and named again the man he wished to see appointed to it. The Institute should also consider establishing a chair of musicology, but for this he had no candidate in mind. Also, would not the Institute be willing to halve with the Department the expense of bringing Dr. Adolph Goldschmidt, the German mediaevalist and art-historian, from Germany to teach the graduate students for a year? There was a final item: the Institute should remit to the Department $2,000 to compensate for services of the custodian of slides, photographs, etc. rendered to Institute members. (Here Professor Panofsky put his foot down, for the members using the services were those appointed for the benefit of the Department.) The conclusion of Morey's memorandum was not calculated to ease Professor Panofsky's feelings:

> This is a heavy offering. Nevertheless, it represents pretty much the sum total of the desiderata so far as our staff is concerned, and I think that friendly consideration of the research needs thereof as here set forth will make for an even greater degree of cooperation than that which the Institute and the Department have enjoyed ever since you came...
>
> Since our conversation I feel dubious about this request. I think, however, that it is best for all concerned that a direct answer be made to it to clear up any misunderstanding as to the extent of the use the Institute makes of this section.[46]

Flexner, usually equable, acknowledged the demands with rare irony: "with much appreciation for your marvellous cooperation -- sometimes a little too marvellous for our resources..."[47]

Apparently the Director decided that relations with Morey now required some measure of formalization. Accordingly, an intra-mural memorandum to department chairmen affected by the operations of the Institute was dispatched by President Dodds on 27th November. It read:

> The work of the Institute for Advanced Study is now of such scope as to make it desirable to regularize our administrative proceedure in negotiations with them. This letter is, therefore, being addressed to the chairmen whose programs touch that of the Institute.
>
> In choosing the personnel and determining the policy of the Institute for Advanced Study, Dr. Flexner has at times sought the advice of members of our faculty. Also at times members of our faculty on their own initiative have approached Dr. Flexner with suggestions, the adoption of which they thought would enlarge the opportunities in Princeton in their fields of study. In so doing they were recognizing the relationship possible between the University and the Institute in scholarly matters. For this reason the future development of the Institute is of interest not only to individual members of our faculty but to the University as a whole.
>
> I have been considering ways in which our relations with the Institute may best be so coordinated as to avoid misunderstandings and the danger that various persons may work at cross-purposes. To this end I have designated the Dean of the Graduate School as our representative in these relations, and I am now asking that all members of the Faculty will consult with him before taking up with the Institute any matters which concern the cooperation between the two institutions.
>
> I may add that this arrangement meets with the approval of the Director of the Institute.[48]

As may be imagined, this statement, with its clear recognition of the advantages of scholarly cooperation between the institutions, and the admission that restraint was needed on the University's part, was not unwelcome to Flexner. It may have come as something of a surprise to some on the campus that the President found it necessary to protect the Institute. In the event, not all the items on Dr. Morey's budget for 1937-1938 were granted. The personnel for Antioch were all appointed

with stipends, probably because Flexner had earlier promised they would be if the contract was extended. President Dodds himself volunteered his approval of Morey's request that the Institute subsidize the two art-historians mentioned by Dr. Morey for their half-year of research and writing.[49]

During the first five years of the School's operations, nearly forty individuals were registered as members in it for periods of six months to several years. Approximately one-half were nominated by the Department and worked primarily on researches of interest to it and to its professors. Dr. Morey tended to nominate men who had taken their highest degree at Princeton University. This was true of twelve, of whom six had their doctor's degrees and six were Masters of Fine Arts. Morey had adopted standards for the award of the Master of Fine Arts degree which required candidates to fulfill all the formal steps for the doctorate except the thesis. It was his belief that a man so qualified could, after several years of teaching, or administering a museum, or exploring, write a work "worth publishing on its own hook," a tribute not always earned by the doctoral thesis.[50]

One of the members appointed for the Department was a Bachelor of Science, working on Antioch materials. The use of Dr. Schlunk's unused salary by Princeton's Committee on Antioch, left Flexner when the term opened with a notable exception to the post-doctoral rule which even Morey's Master of Fine Arts did not explain. This was evidently mentioned by Professor Veblen at the Trustees' meeting of the 27th January, 1936, (See p. 162) for Flexner said:

> In principle, full time prevails throughout the institution. Any departure from it would be made only in a particular case

> and after the most careful scrutiny and under the most careful limitations. In no instance should any exception be cited as a precedent.[51]

There is a real doubt that Flexner regarded the members appointed for the Department of Art and Archaeology as in fact members of the Institute for Advanced Study. True, they received stipends from the Institute, or from one of the foundations at the Director's request, and their names appeared in the annual Bulletins as did the members' who came to work with professors of the Institute. But in the textual materials which gave a brief account of the activities in each School, the names of those who were called for the Department did not appear, except in rare instances. Dr. Aydelotte changed this policy, including as full an account of the work of these men as of those called by the Institute. Though Flexner was the true prophet of scholarly cooperation to achieve the largest possible results without a meum or teum, it was Aydelotte, who had not gone through the bruising experiences with Dr. Morey, who was able to describe the fruit of his predecessor's vision with clarity and generosity.

Flexner's accommodation to the needs of the Department of Art and Archaeology brought him much criticism which never took into consideration the worthiness of the individuals or the importance or value of their contributions to their particular researches, but rather questioned the propriety of the Institute for Advanced Study doing it at all. Here two members of the School of Mathematics faculty read unworthy motives in what the Director did, saying he sought to placate hostility at the University engendered by prejudice and bigotry. Manifestly it was to the advantage of Professor Veblen to deflect from himself any criticism for raiding the University for

part of the School of Mathematics' staff, which was the source of some if not most of the bitterness. Flexner, proud of the School, loyal to Veblen for making a success of it, could not and would not believe in the seriousness of such canard.

Nevertheless, it might be conceded that when it came to making it up to the University, Flexner was generous and, though he was pressured by Morey's attitude, grateful for the art-historian's support in establishing the School of Humanistic Studies. Certain it is that he was deeply impressed -- unduly impressed, perhaps -- by the two strong men in the academic life of the Institute in those early days. But without them he might not have succeeded as he did.

In organizing the School of Humanistic Studies the Director was particularly insistent that the Board should recognize the experimental nature of everything which had been done, the flexibility which it must always preserve to change the fields of activity, as "men and money" might become available, or members of the present faculty retire or die. Thus he refused to establish "chairs" which must be filled when they became vacant, whether or not there was an outstanding man to call, or whether something new which did permit the appointment of an outstanding scholar or scientist gave greater promise. Here he alluded again to the example of the Collége de France. When he appointed three out of five humanists who were within eleven years of the retirement age, with the announced purpose of enabling them to finish writing their records for posterity, he manifestly had to refresh these most important principles in the minds of the Trustees. He did it in the following:

> I hope that we shall never forget the truth of what our first years have abundantly demonstrated: namely, that the success

of the Institute depends solely and simply upon men and not upon accessories of any kind...If we will bring together men of great ability or great eminence, workers will flock to them regardless of the way they are housed. We have been careful to attach no specific title to any professor. Thus the freedom of an able man is completely guaranteed. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that, inasmuch as the Institute for Advanced Study has no ordinary teaching duties, it is under no obligation to fill a vacant post. In the event that a chair becomes vacant several courses are open:

1 It may be filled in case there is a person of sufficient eminence and the subject itself is still a living one.

2 The amount expended can revert to the treasury to be used for any other legitimate purpose...

3 A new professorship in some entirely different subject can be established, provided a person of sufficient eminence and productivity is available.[52]

Nor were all the favors on the University's side as one considered the relative gifts to the unique cooperation between the Institute and the University. Thus he also reminded the Trustees that

> We have helped the University by bringing to Princeton a group of persons who possess the gifts, the learning, and the time needed to enlarge the advanced opportunities which Princeton University itself offers.[53]

Perhaps nothing reveals the extent to which Flexner's plans were shaped by the desires and necessities of the humanists at Princeton University as does his handling of the opportunity to purchase the Gest Oriental Library. Mr. G. M. Gest, collector and owner of a valuable library of Chinese classics, had offered it for purchase to the Library at Princeton, which was unable to finance it. Mr. James Gerould, the Librarian, then asked Dr. Flexner's aid. The Director investigated and found that the Library of Congress valued the small Gest Collection as second only to

its own, and had asked for but been denied a congressional appropriation to buy it. Mr. Gest was in desperate financial straits; Flexner was certain that if the Library were not purchased promptly as a unit, it would be broken up into items and disposed of.

Deeply concerned lest this happen, and also influenced by Dr. Gilman's early vision that the probable importance of the Far East after World War I would lead to more intensive western studies of Chinese culture, and by the expressed hope that the Institute and Princeton's Department of Oriental Languages and Literature might soon expand to include a representation in the Chinese, Flexner persuaded the Rockefeller Foundation to contribute half the estimated cost of the collection, and secured the permission of the Founders and the Executive Committee to pay the rest.[54] The Board ratified the action on the Director's representation that its action, in view of Princeton's interest in the field, would recompense the University in some measure for the Institute's use of its various libraries -- general, art, and mathematics. The Institute's policy was to purchase the books needed by its staff members, and to place them in the appropriate Princeton library marked as Institute property with its bookplate and listed in a separate catalog.

The Foundation's grant was conditioned by the requirement that the Gest Library remain in Princeton, available for the use of both institutions; it was given with no promise that the Institute would later undertake to develop Oriental studies. As Flexner wrote Aydelotte later, he felt that while it was useless to urge the expansion by the Institute in the early forties, it should move in that direction by the time the second world war was over, because "relations in the Pacific...are going

to be such that studies...will be timely and indeed, essential."[55] It was a logical forecast, but logic did not determine the course of history.

When the collection arrived in Princeton, there was no place to house it but the cellar of 20 Nassau Street. It was necessary to employ a custodian for it, because of air and moisture conditions. Accordingly Flexner asked and received permission from the Board to appoint Dr. Nancy Lee Swann, a scholar in the language, to catalog and take care of it. (See p. 284) Expenditure of approximately $7,000 a year to maintain the Library proved to be a target of Messrs. Maass and Veblen, who were hostile to the venture from the beginning. Their opposition was borne out by the facts that it was possible neither for the Institute nor the University to make real use of the Library during the forties, and that its usefulness required additional annual capital expenditures of approximately $60,000 a year which the Institute did not have. Messrs. Maass and Weed therefore urged that it be sold.[56]

But the University stood upon its rights, and declined to consent to its sale to any other university with an active program in Chinese literature, in the continued hope that it might some day make use of it. The completion of the new Firestone Library enabled the University to take custody of the collection, and the Institute was able then to avoid continued expenditures for it.

In November 1942, when the move to sell the Gest Library was at its height within the Board, Flexner wrote a statement of faith which bears repeating here. The letter was addressed to Aydelotte, who stood in the dangerous middle where Flexner had earned his deep scars, and was written to buoy up his old Friend.

The documents in the case completely settle the issue. We are obliged by every possible consideration of decency to the Rockefeller Foundation, to Princeton University, and to Dr. Swann, and any recommendation that looks to disposing of the library would be a disgrace to the Institute.

I do not believe it is possible or desirable at this time to figure out what an Oriental Institute may some day cost. It throws no light on our problem....

Every institution in this country that is worth its salt has grown and expanded in unexpected fashion. You did not know when you went to Swarthmore that you would get the money to finance honors work, nor did you know how much it would cost. You had faith, and faith moves mountains.

I have faith in the original conception of the Institute, as Simon had faith in his original conception of the Rockefeller Institute. Little did he dream when Mr. Rockefeller gave him $200,000 that before he retired Mr. Rockefeller would have given him between sixty and seventy millions.

Our question is not the future, which we cannot foresee, but the present, and I am much more concerned about the present than I am about the future, for upon the present the future is going to depend.[57]

CHAPTER VI - Notes

1. Fosdick, op. cit., pp. 238-240.
2. Ibid.
3. Universities, pp. 20-21.
4. Ibid., pp. 22-23.
5. Rennselaer Lee, Charles Rufus Morey; The Art Belletin, December, 1956.
6. Morey to Flexner, 4/9/34.
7. Ibid. Two of the three assistants were to work directly under and with departmental professors. The third, a Princeton M.F.A. and a classicist, whom Morey nominated to assist Panofsky, was not employed.
8. Ibid.
9. Capps to Flexner, 10/11/32.
10. Meritt to Flexner, 3/31/35.
11. Morey to Flexner, 4/9/34.
12. Panofsky to Flexner, 3/29/34.
13. Flexner to Straus, 3/11/35; 3/22/35. Straus to Flexner, 3/18/35.
14. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35, p. 3.
15. Ibid., Appendix, pp. 9-10.
16. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36. Interview with Professor Veblen.
17. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35, Appendix, p. 6.
18. Ibid., p. 8.
19. Minutes cited, p. 4. Meritt received $9,000, Panofsky $10,000.
20. Flexner to Straus, 4/24/35; 4/27/35. Straus to Flexner, 4/26/35.
21. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 4/24/35.
22. Flexner to Paul Hanus, 7/19/35.

23. Interview with Dr. Flexner. See Flexner to Riefler, 1/21/35. "Professor Veblen, who was present at the meeting, and to whom he also wrote, has come to see me and has described Frankfurter's conduct as outrageous."

24. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.

25. Treasurer's Report, Fiscal Year 1936. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, pp. 8-12, 14-15. Terms of the appointments were: Dr. Lowe: salary, $10,000, effective 7/1/36. Usual provisions for insurance and retirement. Dr. Herzfeld: salary, $4,000, of which the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars would pay half. The Institute and Dr. Herzfeld would each pay 5% on the $4,000. Usual retirement provision. Effective date, 7/1/36. Dr. Flexner was not entirely candid here; the fact was the New York University was paying Herzfeld another $2,000 for a weekly lecture or seminar. Both institutions ceased their aid in two year's time, and the Institute met the whole small salary, which proved so inadequate that effective 7/1/39 the Director raised it to $10,000. Mr. Campbell's salary: $6,000, with the usual insurance and retirement provisions. Effective 7/1/36.

26. Morey to Panofsky, November, 1935.

27. Flexner to Frankfurter, 2/21/34. See Gilbert to Flexner, 10/5/34. Merrian to Flexner, 12/4/34. Flexner to Miss Greene, 12/7/35. Leland to Flexner, 1/15/36.

28. Morey to Flexner, 9/3/35.

29. President Ellen Pendleton of Wellesley to Flexner, 1/30/36; 2/17/36. Flexner to Pendleton, 1/31/36. Morey to Flexner, 1/31/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 13. The new appointment was for half of each year, 1937-1943, at salary of $3,000. No provision for insurance. Title, Field Archaeologist, [illegible].

30. Morey to Flexner, 3/25/36.

31. Meritt to Flexner, 10/6/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 6-7, 16. Dr. Goldman was to receive an honorarium of $200 a month, with no insurance and no retirement provision. Miss Goldman was financially independent.

32. Flexner to Leidesdorf, 5/22/37.

33. Flexner to Capps, 7/13/36; 7/28/36; 10/15/36. Capps to Flexner, 7/18/36. Meritt to Flexner, 10/6/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 6-7, 16. Professor Capps was appointed for one year, with an honorarium of $200. Though it was understood that the appointment must be renewed beyond that time, it never was by formal action, but simply by inclusion in the budget. President Dodds' anger was expressed to an Institute professor.

34. Veblen to Flexner, 11/5/36. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36. Flexner to Maass, 10/30/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, note pp. 6 and 10 particularly.

35. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 4.

36. Dodds to Flexner, 12/14/35.

37. Interview with Mrs. Bailey.

38. Bulletin No. 5, February 1936, p. 11.

39. Professor Herzfeld and Professor Panofsky both "proved" the rule against part-time employment at the Institute, but only Herzfeld earned outside money by so doing. Conditions were such as Flexner employed them that he could not have got Panofsky without allowing him to help Dr. W. W. S. Cook, head of the Fine Arts at New York University; Panofsky found great stimulus in working with the New York group. As for Herzfeld, the Director could not have afforded to employ him without the help of the University with his pay for the first two years. On 3/22/37 Flexner had to inform Morey that Herzfeld would be unable to continue his weekly lecture and conferences with five or six men at McCormick Hall; with the weekly New York seminar he found it left him too little time for his own study and writing.

40. Flexner to Panofsky, 12/16/37. [illegible]

41. Minutes, Trustees' meetings, 10/8/34, p. 13; 4/28/35, p. 4. Dr. Schlunk left during the second year to become curator of a Berlin museum. Flexner permitted Morey to use the unspent appropriation to pay one of the Department's assistants in the Antioch project. Dr. Weitzmann remained on the Institute's rolls as member, at the urging of Dr. Friend of the Department. ( ) In Bulletin No. 8 (1939) Dr. Flexner announced that he had been appointed Field Mediaevalist, but that is the only record of the transaction. It was left to Dr. Aydelotte to regularize his status.

42. The three were: Mr. Campbell, Dr. Hans Swarzenski and Dr. Weitzmann. Swarzenski became a staff member as Professor Panofsky's research assistant. (Bulletin No. 6, February, 1937, p. 6.)

43. Flexner to Frederick Keppel, 10/31/36.

44. Keppel to Flexner, 11/19/36.

45. Flexner to Keppel, 11/25/36. Keppel to Flexner, 12/7/36.

46. Morey to Panofsky for Flexner, 11/17/36.

47. Flexner to Morey, 11/24/36.

48. Dodds to certain department chairmen, 11/27/36.

49. Dodds to Flexner, 4/5/37. Flexner to Dodds, 4/20/37.

50. Morey to Flexner, 2/16/31.

51. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5. See Morey to Flexner, 7/10/35; 8/2/35. Richard F. S. Starr, B. Sc. Cornell, 1924, was the recipient of part of Dr. Schlunk's unused salary. He was working at Antioch. Flexner was unaware in July that the grant was being made to him. He continued working on the project, even after receiving his Ph. D. in 1938.

52. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5.

53. Ibid., p. 6.

54. Secretary, Rockefeller Foundation, to Flexner, 6/23/36. Minutes, Executive Committee, 6/15/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 3-7.

55. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/5/41.

56. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/20/42.

57. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/11/42.

CHAPTER VII

TOO MANY GENERALS

The establishment of the three schools in their initial outlines was accompanied by events and evidence of trends in the attitudes of the Founders and Trustees which now need some explication. It should be said that when Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld pledged their financial support to create a new institution in American education, and engaged Dr. Flexner to organize and direct its first steps, all three must have realized that little delay could attend the launching of the Institute for Advanced Study if they hoped to see the vision realized before they left the scene. The donors had declined to found and endow a small "university," and they had impliedly committed their fortunes to this Institute. Why, then, as has been revealed in outline earlier, did Mr. Bamberger with Mrs. Fuld's consent suddenly decide to cease the gifts to endowment which had compensated for losses in the portfolio due to depression conditions, and added to it to permit the Institute to expand according to the orderly pattern set forth by the Director? Admittedly a man in his middle seventies might be excused if he displayed some vagaries. But to withdraw continued financial support after only two years of actual operation -- highly successful years, by public estimation -- in face of the Director's continued planning to balance the staffs in the three schools, and while the Institute needed buildings and equipment, was hardly to be expected. So far they had given slightly less than $7 million to the Institute.[1]

Why did they take the action which Mr. Bamberger announced to Flexner at the end of October, 1935? How long would they refrain from giving to the Institute for its development? Could the Trustees anticipate that other philanthropists interested in the cultural growth of the country, and the advancement of its scholarship, would feel moved to step into the breach? Could the current endowment, by skilfull management, be increased as the country emerged from the great depression?

To the first question the answer appears to be that the Founders were piqued by the action of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds in recommending the purchase of what they considered an inordinately large acreage for the Institute's site. That does not explain the matter fully, however; they seemed to be alienated more by the fact that they were not consulted before the Trustees were asked to vote on a larger land program than they had previously approved. As to the second question, the record will show that the affair might have been smoothed over, were it not that further actions contributed to their disillusionment. For Mr. Bamberger's statement was in terms of "for the present," and not final.

The third question Flexner could have answered -- and did -- from his wealth of experience with philanthropists. Men do not come forward usually to contribute to an institution to which another has given his name. This was the point of his earlier suggestion that the projected small university be named after the State of New Jersey. But Flexner did not forsake hope, as the shadows at the Institute deepened, that the Rockefeller Foundation might contribute substantially to its endowment despite the basic change in Rockefeller policy adopted by the

General Education Board in 1925 to cease giving large grants to institutions "as wholes" -- i.e., to their endowment. His later correspondence shows that he was a steady suitor for such a favor from the Rockefeller Foundation. He probably felt he had very good readon to hope, considering that Mr. Stewart, an outstanding Trustee of both Rockefeller Boards, to whom both owed much in the expert management of their investments, was a Trustee of the Institute also. This feeling was undoubtedly strengthened by that Trustee's conviction of the worthwhile aim of the Director to develop the study of economics from a new viewpoint and with the new methodology based in large part upon the pioneering work in research technology which he had himself inaugurated in this country's central banking system, and in England's. For it was a time when the Rockefeller Foundation was turning with increasing interest and generosity to the financing of new and different economic researches.[2]

What of the chances through management to increase the value of the Institute's existing portfolio? The presence of Messrs. Bamberger and Hardin as the policy-makers on the Finance Committee made success in that direction unlikely. Mr. Leidesdorf vigorously urged a liberalization of investment policy to buy equities at this low point in the country's fortunes, sure that the economy would recover and that substantial profits and greater income could be realized in equities as it did. But Mr. Bamberger was by nature very conservative, and Mr. Hardin was President of a large life insurance company -- at a time when nothing but high grade bonds and other debt instruments were considered worthy of trust. They resisted the younger man, and so the Treasurer's reports showed continual amortization of premiums paid for bonds, for many of which

during the Institute's first years there was no market. One of the crucial decisions during the first two years was lost when in August, 1932 stock market averages reached their lowest point for the depression period, Mr. Bamberger and Mr. Hardin insisted on selling more than half the Macy shares, which sold that month between $13 and $57.[3]

At the end of that month, the total market value of securities in the portfolio was $4,411,00. During the year the Founders gave some $400,000 to endowment, without mentioning it, since it was doubtless to restore the capital account to the amount originally pledged. Nevertheless, the Treasurer gave the total at market value at the 31st December, 1933 as "in excess of $4,500,000."[4]

But there had been signs that Mr. Bamberger was softening in his attitude with the startling success of the Director in the first appointments. In October, 1932 the By-Laws were amended with the Founders' consent to give authority to the Board to designate those who were entitled to countersign checks on the Institute's depositaries. Later, the rigorous annual tenure of the Director was relaxed "at Mr. Bamberger's request" when Mr. Maass moved and the Board approved that the Director and Mrs. Flexner should have the same retirement annuities as Professor Veblen's.[5]

However, there were few signs that Mr. Bamberger's investment policy would change. There was a moment in 1933 when it appeared that Mr. Stewart might become a factor in the situation. Maass wrote Dr. Flexner a hopeful letter:

> Last week I had the pleasure of lunching with Mr. Bamberger, Mr. Leidesdorf and our new Trustee, Mr. Stewart, and cannot begin to tell you of the very splendid impression he created

> and how helpful I am sure he is going to be in our affairs. The purpose of the luncheon was to review our investments, and we had the benefit of some very constructive criticism from Mr. Stewart, which is already leading to action, and will, I am certain, improve the caliber of our portfolio.

But apparently Mr. Stewart was discouraged by the attitudes revealed. He did not join the Committee on Finance if he was asked, which does not appear. Interviews disclosed that he was critical of the investment policy, even after Professor Riefler joined the Committee in 1936. He did not practice Keynsian arbitrage, as did Stewart.[6]

Before detailing the events of these years it will be well to describe briefly the general relationships which had developed at the Institute. It was clear that the deference paid Mr. Bamberger by his associates and advisers in the past was carried over into this enterprise. It appeared that despite his modesty and retiring manner Mr. Bamberger was the one who had the last word at L. Bamberger & Company. Even with Mr. Fuld, his position was as the governor to his partner's enthusiasm and initiative -- the motive power of the enterprise. Though he was known as a generous employer, who did kind things for his senior employees, it was not because he considered they had rights to his generosity, or as his employees any voice with respect to their working conditions. In this he was neither better nor worse than the other retailers of the times. Perhaps the most significant thing about his attitude was disclosed when, as he and Mrs. Fuld sold L. Bamberger & Company, they did not tell their nephews who worked in the firm, and were minor stockholders in it, until the sale was accomplished. Then he exercised his option to repurchase their stock, as had been duly prearranged, leaving the young men angry and unhappy. It is not strange

in light of his views that Mr. Bamberger did not change his attitude toward the right of the Director to consult with the faculty of the Institute, who with the Director himself were described as "employees" in the By-Laws.[7]

Indeed, the significant change in attitude on this problem occurred in Dr. Flexner who, having fought resourcefully for a moderate and reasonable faculty share in decisions in academic matters, was to turn against it decisively. But that was in his old age, and after many scars and battles. One will have to decide when the story is told whether it was his experience with a faculty or his lack of it that was responsible for the change.

Habits were established early within the Board, and even after the Founders nominally withdrew as active Trustees, Mr. Bamberger was recognized as the overriding authority in all matters: expenditures, election of new Trustees, and appointments to all the committees of the Board. The other Trustees realized that this was so, and they also knew that nothing of moment was submitted for their own approval without having first been approved by Mr. Bamberger. Moreover, they realized that Dr. Flexner, who worked closely and harmoniously with the Founder's original advisers, was the most successful pleader of the Institute's cause. He took pains to keep his powers of persuasion bright and useful; this occasioned some resort to the arts of others, as in the case of the Committee on Site, and the employment of Dr. Weyl. But despite these devices, Flexner bore the main burden of planning and persuasion, and all the responsibility for ordering the development of the Institute.

Board meetings had quickly settled into a routine. In the

order of business only a brief statement from the Treasurer preceded the Director's report, in which characteristically he reminded the Founders and the Trustees of the purposes and nature of the Institute, recited in an interesting manner how it was operating, and carefully presented every favorable mention of it in either private or public utterance which had come to his eager attention. Proposed actions were adroitly approached, explained and justified in this discourse, and general discussion, if there was any, followed his report and usually preceded his presentation of formal motions and resolutions. Later it will be seen that this departure from parliamentary order gave rise to questions which derived from discussions of matters in general and without specific details. The Trustees were aware that any appearance of dissension, any slight conflict of opinion, was likely to trouble Mr. Bamberger. Strangely enough, however, they did not seem to be bored by the repetitive nature of Dr. Flexner's reports; their attendance records were very good, with one or two exceptions. In January, 1936, when Professor Veblen's challenge of established principles calling for post-doctoral members and full-time service caused Flexner to recapitulate the purposes and policies of the Institute, he gave a complete restatement of principles, which both Aydelotte and Maass, who had been absent, greeted with praise and enthusiasm when the minutes were distributed.[8]

From the very beginning the needs of the Institute pressed against its limited financial resources. Deliberate as was the accumulation of the original endowment, there were substantial savings in the modest income from it during the first eight years, which gave a false sense of ease, perhaps, to Mr. Bamberger and Mr. Hardin not felt by their

younger colleagues.[9] These Trustees knew that the Director would have difficulty attracting outstanding men to staff the schools without assurances of ample salaries and generous retirement provisions, other things being equal. Dr. Flexner had a genuine distaste for applying direct pressure to the Founders, but did constantly apply the stimulus of his plans pointing the way for more rapid development of the schools. The homilies he delivered at each Board meeting usually emphasized the need to add staff when "men and money were available." It became a well-worn cliché. He used his arts not only at Board meetings. Numerous visits to the Founders on vacation and at home found them in relaxed moods when he could be more persuasive and they more receptive. Nevertheless, as has been seen, he was compelled to compromise sadly as he added to the staff in the humanities, taking advantage of the sorry conditions abroad, and of the personal circumstances of individuals, to appoint as professors such older men as Herzfeld at low salaries and with patently inadequate retirement allowances. As he described this phase to Professor Riefler later, there were "financial inequalities;" he had faced a grave dilemma and made his decision:

> Either we had to cease growing, which at my time of life would have been, I think, a very serious matter for the future of the Institute, or we had simply to regard our policy as one of suspense pending financial recovery or the receipt of future endowment.[10]

During this period Flexner occasionally spoke to the Trustees of his inevitable retirement or possible incapacitation, impressing them with the thought that his greatest usefulness to the Institute was his wide acquaintance here and abroad with educators and scholars and scientists, which peculiarly fitted him to recommend the first staff. Most

of the Trustees concurred. They knew Flexner had won Mr. Bamberger's confidence, and was the one most likely to gain the Founders' support for the course he was pursuing. There was a single exception; Mr. Bamberger had reservations about the Director's plans for economic research. Mr. Maass expressed the feelings of the Trustees generally when he wrote Flexner in 1937:

> With no desire to hurry you in your selections, my only concern is that the program of expansion be enacted during the period of your own activities, and this I am most hopeful you will bring about.[11]

The Institute was forced to get along without land or building for several years. The Director spoke soothingly of the benefits to learning to be derived from a measure of asceticism: e.g., "improvisation in rented quarters," from which his pride suffered deeper wounds than any other man's. He knew that Mr. Bamberger and his sister would have preferred to have a visible monument to commemorate their generosity, and were really hard put to it to appreciate the esoteric nature of the Institute, the more so since the opportunities to come in contact with the professors were usually at the social functions given by the Director and Mrs. Flexner. But he had put wise words in their mouths which proscribed impairment of capital for physical things. It was surprising that he was soon to find himself in conflict over ambitious plans for such things, not with the Founders, but with a member of the faculty, the group which had traditionally "starved," as Beard had put it, while working amid beautiful surroundings to which the substance of many colleges and universities had been extravagantly devoted.

The odds favored the physical things, simply because men of practical disposition can appreciate them more easily, while the contri-

bution of the scholar who disappears into his study and periodically produces a learned work has a highly specialized appeal. But in Flexner's case, there was another reason why the race became an uneven one; the Director temerariously brought to the Board of Trustees the Institute's most resourceful and insistent advocate for site and buildings, by arranging for Professor Veblen to be elected a Trustee. Of course he did this without realizing that, like Frankfurter, Veblen might become his adversary. Indeed, the Director appeared not to think in such terms; when he saw an able advocate for the things he valued, he could hardly wait to bring him face to face with the Trustees and the Founders, so that the man might exercise his powerful persuasions for the good of the Institute.

Professor Veblen had hardly arrived home from Europe after winning his appointment to the Institute than he engaged Dean Eisenhart in a discussion of a site for the Institute. He wrote Flexner of this interview:

> This morning Eisenhart suggested on his own motion that some kind of land trading arrangement would probably be desirable. He intends to talk about this in general terms with Duffield and some of the Trustees. He thought the Olden tract would be excellent either for use or for trading purposes. The plot he had particularly in mind for the Institute is part of the golf course just below Princeton Inn. I said I thought the part above it would be better.[12]

No one could have loved earth more than Veblen; though he disapproved frankly of much in Princeton's administration, he admired its land-acquisition policy which had caused it to gather to itself some 2,500 acres in Borough and Township. Not only that; he had been mainly responsible for designing Fine Hall, which was once pronounced "the most luxurious building" devoted to mathematics in the world.[13]

From the time of his conversation with Eisenhart the Professor was constantly pressing the Director to settle on one of the large estates in Princeton as a site for the Institute. Flexner repeatedly put this off with the plea that the Institute had no money for such an extravagance. Nevertheless, it is clear that both men favored the Olden Farm as the best possible purchase because it lay just to the west of the University's western boundary, and was connected with it by some vacant lots bordering on the Springdale Golf Club's course. By the early spring of 1934, the Director, confident that the Institute had demonstrated a real measure of success, and that the Founders recognized this and would be prepared to increase their gifts to endowment as they had given promise of doing, pressed ardently for an opportunity to develop the School of Economics and Politics, and let the issue of a site come to the attention of Mr. Bamberger at the same time. This he accomplished by inviting Professor Veblen to present in writing his reasons for urging the immediate purchase of a site, and the nature of it. Flexner acknowledged the letter with real appreciation:

> Thank you for your wise, thoughtful, and very clear letter of April 12th...I can see that it will give the Committee on Buildings and Grounds something very substantial to meditate upon. I have the feeling that what might have looked like dilatory procedure has really allowed our minds to work ...on what will become in the course of time a question of overwhelming importance. I shall bring this letter to the attention of the Committee at the earliest possible opportunity.[14]

Two weeks later Professor Veblen became the first faculty Trustee. He was promptly appointed to the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, formerly the Committee on Site.

In his memorandum the Professor said that the Institute should

purchase a large site, and that the "plant" should be near the University. These should demonstrate the institution's permanence as a "seat of learning" for the long future, and should contribute to the amenities of the community while keeping away "objectionable intruders from itself and the University." "We are all agreed it is very desirable to work in close cooperation with the University," but it was also agreed the independence of the Institute should be maintained, he wrote. If, as he foresaw, the region around Princeton was to attract a group of cultural institutions, the Institute would do well to be at its center rather than on its periphery. He said the first building should be something analogous to Harnack House in Berlin, or the Athenaeum at Pasadena, with rooms for social purposes for the faculty and members, a dwelling for the Director, and residential accommodations for visitors. The actual working quarters of the different schools might be located right on the University campus, "in contiguity to the appropriate department of the University," while in other cases, it might be preferable to locate the offices on the Institute's site. In any case, the site should be large enough to take care completely of the Institute's enterprises "in case circumstances at some time in the future should make it desirable to do so."

The School of Mathematics needed then, even in its first year, he said, a building of its own, contiguous to Fine Hall, which, with its nine large offices "with fireplaces" and its fifteen without, was already fully occupied. Indeed, while the permanent staff members of both institutions had each his own study, Veblen said, it was necessary in some cases for University instructors, Institute members and Institute professors' assistants to share rooms. He felt that, since the assistants conferred

with members on behalf of their principals, they should have privacy. To provide for the School of Mathematics he proposed that the Institute should buy or lease the University Infirmary and convert it to offices, building a new hospital for the University in a more suitable location. Or it could build a wing to Fine or Palmer Halls.[15]

Now it became obvious that the Founders grasped neither what Professor Veblen was advocating in terms of acreage, nor what Dr. Flexner needed to enable him to develop the School of Economics and Politics. For Mr. Bamberger presented a letter to the Director on the day of the annual meeting which read as follows:

> Some months ago the Founders added a sum of approximately half a million dollars to the funds of the Institute. At my request no mention was made of this fact. I desire to inform the Trustees that an additional sum has been added to bring this gift up to $1 million. The gift is made in view of two considerations: (1) that the Institute may shortly wish to acquire a site; (2) that the Director may feel more free to proceed with the organization of the School of Economics and Politics. While the same freedom will be left as to the members of the School of Mathematics, I desire to put on record my hope that the activities of the School of Economics and Politics may contribute not only to a knowledge of these subjects but ultimately to the cause of social justice which we have deeply at heart.[16]

As Mr. Maass read the letter to the Trustees, it was somewhat different; it had been edited with the consent of Mr. Bamberger. The $1 million gift was announced as "anonymous," and Maass began to read with point 2, omitting mention of a site. As has been seen, the contribution added in 1933 was apparently designed to bring the total endowment to the original pledge. The half-million now added was quite inadequate to develop the second School, as Flexner immediately wrote Mr. Victor Morawetz, whom he asked to contribute to endowment, but without success.[17]

At the next Board meeting, the Director declared that he was

firmly opposed to the procurement of land and buildings until staffing was completed. This was the first meeting attended by either Mr. Frankfurter or Professor Veblen. Both cast light on their predelictions. There were some differences of opinion as to the development of economics in the views expressed by Messrs. Flexner, Stewart and Frankfurter. Stewart favored no permanent appointment; Frankfurter now opted for an historical study of economics, as distinguished from the "clinical" examination of the "economic plague" advocated by Flexner. Professor Veblen suggested that no permanent staff be employed, but that short-term members on the same basis as those assembled by the School of Mathematics be brought in, so as not to disturb their academic connections until their suitability for permanent employment was determined.[18] The suggestion was not as ingenuous as it sounded. For Professor Veblen had favored from the beginning a school of economics organized around the comparatively new "science" of mathematical economics. He had pointed out to Flexner the rich opportunities to get men of this persuasion from among the emigrés from Germany.[19] Beyond that, however, he was intent on satisfying the needs of the School of Mathematics as he saw them, before the other schools were organized. The record of his continuous and ingenious pressures for more money for the School of Mathematics, and his unremitting effort to hasten the purchase of a site, show that, no matter how much he may have appeared to favor a representation in the social sciences and the humanities, he did not favor the developments which the Director planned.

Shortly after the October meeting, he again asked Flexner to take advantage of the beautiful weather to walk with him over various

sites. Flexner's reply was courteous but unyielding: nothing was farther from his thought than consideration of site and buildings, though he would enjoy a walk with the Professor at any time. And he added: "I shall surprise you by the willingness and speed of my activity in the way of buildings and grounds when some Santa Claus drops into our treasury the requisite funds."[20] And on another occasion Flexner observed wryly that Veblen, younger than he, who was "near the end of my tether," was yet in more of a hurry; he counselled patience.

But Veblen was as restless as the sea, painfully impatient with the Director's priorities. He failed to show any insight into Flexner's difficulties in persuading Mr. Bamberger to see and meet the Institute's needs, taking what seemed to be an attitude that if the need was apparent -- as all which had been talked about were -- it should be met, presto! Flexner admired greatly the Professor's aggressiveness in promoting the prestige of his School, and showed rare patience born of an affectionate understanding when Veblen undertook to arrange things to suit his own ideas. Thus, shortly after the tempestuous meeting at which Professor Riefler had been appointed, when the mathematician demanded full faculty government, the appointment of a sixth mathematician (and a seventh professor to its School), and immediate provision for a building for the School of Mathematics, Flexner replied with a reasoned negative to each, and made helpful suggestions for the amelioration of the needs expressed. Then he tried to make his own position quite clear:

> I am writing you as a Trustee, not as a Professor in Mathematics, and I should not even write if I were not anxious that in the long run there should be more professors on the Board. But that must necessarily depend on winning confidence -- a task to which I have devoted myself with all the ingenuity I possess ever since I first met Mr. Bamberger.

> I have always been candid with him, as I have with the Board, but I realize that every board must trust those upon whom responbibility mainly falls.[21]

This might have affected Professor Veblen more deeply had not a spirit of dissidence manifested itself after Mr. Frankfurter's outburst. (It will be recalled that Mr. Straus and Mr. Hardin opposed the beginning of the third School at the next meeting.) The problem of the seventh professor disappeared with the sudden and regrettable death of Dr. Emmy Noether in April, 1935. Flexner's answer on faculty government was threadbare by this time, and Veblen was silenced, but unconvinced. The question of special quarters for the School of Mathematics was involved in a larger one which was moving ahead; Flexner had informed the Board in January, 1935, that the Institute should soon select a site.

In April, he told the Trustees that the Committee on Buildings and Grounds was preparing to make a preliminary report, and himself brought up for consideration the desirability of establishing the several schools near the apposite University Departments. He said:

> Fine Hall is an excellent illustration of what can be accomplished through the establishment of a communal life, which does indeed require a separate building. But the several schools need not all be erected upon a single plot, and, if necessary, over a preliminary period of years, satisfactory results may be obtained in rented quarters...I hope that the Trustees and the Director will never lose sight of the fact that, like the Johns Hopkins in its glory, the Institute for Advanced Study may flourish in any sort of building or buildings, provided each school as established has assembled a group of men comparable with those who have already been brought together. (Emphasis supplied)[22]

During the spring and summer of 1935, a consensus developed that the Institute should purchase the Olden Farm and the lots which joined it to the golf course, and that cooperation with the University would be facilitated by placing the several schools of the Institute

near the apposite University departments. Flexner learned in July that some of the conjoining lots were to be sold for taxes. He promptly informed Mr. Maass, who secured permission from the Founders to take options on the farm property and to purchase the lots. During the summer Flexner conferred with President Dodds, writing Veblen on the shape of developments:

> I have had a talk with President Dodds who told me that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was very favorable to cooperation with us, and had left it to a committee composed of himself, /G. C./ Wintringer, and some other person whose name I forgot....There was general agreement on the Olden Farm and the property connecting it with the golf course. The options all run until late next fall. If worst comes to worst, and we decide to build elsewhere than on the golf course, we should easily dispose of the lots which Mr. Thomas is going to secure for us.[23]

Veblen urged that the first building should be some kind of central headquarters for the Institute: it would "set various doubts at rest in the community, and the latter would make the actual work of the particular group in question much more effective." "The latter" in this case referred to "the extension of Fine Hall" for use of the School of Mathematics.[24] Flexner's answer was that the first building should be a central headquarters, since that would enable the Institute "to offer something to Princeton." He hoped that, unless someone at the Institute were over-zealous, the two projects might be made to overlap.[25] And then, before the Institute's term opened, and, one may be sure, with Mr. Bamberger's approval, Flexner wrote President Dodds as follows:

> Since the Institute for Advanced Study located at Princeton, the Committee on Site and I have been slowly deliberating as to the possible locations which would accommodate the offices of the Institute and such additional departments as might be established from time to time. As I did not at the beginning feel myself at home in Princeton, we have proceeded in a very leisurely way.

It seemed to us of cardinal importance so to locate this building that we might be able to render Princeton something like the courtesy and hospitality which Princeton has rendered to us in Fine Hall. We have also looked ahead in order that, as the Institute developed and required additional space, we need not feel ourselves hampered -- following in this respect the wise policy which the University has long since adopted. Finally, in the interest of the sort of cooperation which we have already established, it has seemed to us all that the nearer this location is to the University, the more readily cooperative relationships could be established and developed.

With these considerations in mind it appears that the most suitable site of any considerable dimensions that could be obtained would begin at the corner of Alexander Street and the road which leads to the Graduate College. Inquiries, however, ...indicate that the two wooden houses now situated at the corner and the lot belonging to three elderly women immediately back of these houses are at present unobtainable.

It would therefore seem that the nearest point would begin with the golf course and extend towards the Graduate College and back towards Princeton Inn. If in the future it is possible to obtain the properties which I have above mentioned, a second building, if and when required, could be located on that site.

In order that the golf course may not be curtailed, and in order further that the entire section extending beyond the Graduate College should be protected for the sake of both the University and the Institute, we have obtained options on the Olden Farm and on practically all the vacant property lying between the Olden Farm and the golf course. The precise amount of ground that we need for the first building we do not know and cannot know until an architect has been called into conference.

The really important point to decide at this moment is the willingness of the University to cooperate with the Institute by allowing us to obtain the land needed, each party relying on the good faith of the other and upon the determination of both to preserve as much open space on both sides of the Graduate College as is possible so as to preserve the amenities of the situation and to shut out the possibility of any real estate development which might be objectionable. The options which we now hold run until towards the end of October and involve the expenditure of about $200,000. If the University is prepared to cede us the requisite amount of ground, the Institute would be equally willing to cede the University whatever may be needed on the plot we would possess in order to allow the extension of the golf course in that direction...

> The experiment of cooperating with the University in the field of mathematics has been so brilliant a success, and the good will manifested by the University as respects the two new schools which we are proposing to establish, encourages me to believe that Princeton University and the Institute for Advanced Study have an opportunity to give the country an example of cooperation in the field of higher education such as the country has never before experienced; and in view of the mounting costs of higher education, on the one hand, and the present difficulties of securing funds on the other, cooperation of this kind becomes more and more important and desirable quite apart from its educational value. I am sure that these considerations, of such infinite importance to higher education in the United States at a time when more and more the United States are being thrown on their own resources instead of relying so largely as previously on foreign institutions of learning, may be expected to appeal as strongly to our successors as they do to those of us who are active now.[26]

Late in November President Dodds wrote Flexner that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings of the University "would be prepared to recommend to the Board of Trustees at the proper time the transfer of the necessary land on the golf club house location, subject to whatever arrangement it is necessary to make with the Springdale Golf Club for an adequate club house elsewhere."[27]

Meanwhile, a tragedy befell the Institute. When the Committee on Buildings and Grounds made its recommendations for a site to the Board in October, 1935, it asked and received permission to acquire not only the 200 acres of the Olden Farm and the conjoining lots, which Mr. Maass estimated could be purchased for about $175,000, but also asked and was granted authority to negotiate for "two or three smaller properties...the cost of which should not exceed an additional $75,000." No discussion was recorded; the Board appropriated $250,000 as requested, to be spent by the Committee at its discretion. Allusions were made to the negotiations with the University for a building site, and at the Director's request the

Chairman was authorized to appoint five Trustees to serve with five University Trustees on a Joint Committee to consider the mutual concerns of the two institutions. Those chosen to represent the University were Dr. Wilson Farrand, and Messrs. Raymond B. Fosdick, Paul Bedford, Roland S. Morris, and President Dodds, ex officio. A month later Flexner wrote Dodds that the Institute's members were Messrs. Louis Bamberger, Aydelotte, Houghton, Stewart, and Flexner, ex officio. Mr. Hardin, who had been until recently also a Trustee of the University was to attend by invitation.[28]

It soon became apparent that the Founders were opposed to the purchase of more land than the Farm and the lots, and that they had apparently not been consulted by the Committee before it presented its recommendations to the Trustees. Flexner himself had not been informed.

Two weeks of silence ensued, at the end of which Flexner, having consulted with Messrs. Maass and Veblen, wrote the mathematician pointing out again that at a time when the new schools must be developed, every dollar spent for land came out of income for that most important growth. He did not want to be compelled to complete the schools at the expense of the School of Mathematics, "yet unnecessary investment in real estate may threaten it." And he continued:

> You are rightly insistent on the importance of additional space for the mathematicians, but we are unlikely to invest in additional space for the mathematicians if we are simultaneously confronted with the need for gradual expansion for the two schools and a considerable investment in real estate...
>
> I have...no desire to speak with finality as to the order in which these various questions shall be met. In fact, the primary responsibility for decisions must be taken by the Committee on Buildings and Grounds. Having stated my own views, I shall carry out loyally any decision arrived at by the Board.[29]

On the same day he wrote to Mr. Bamberger; he was happy that the Institute was acquiring a site, and had talked with both Maass and Veblen. He continued:

> Though I do not wish to criticize either...I think there is some danger that they will both be too enthusiastic about the acquisition of additional land. My own inclination is to go very slowly...[in order to continue] to acquire men of the highest quality.

This is the first criticism the Director had permitted himself to make of any of his colleagues. He must have had reason to think it was necessary for the good of the Institute to dissociate himself in Mr. Bamberger's eyes from the actions of the Committee, for he was not given to pettiness or to gossip. Mr. Bamberger's answer confirmed his wisdom:

> Your letter of October 28 was quite impressive, as it expressed the thought that possibly some of our co-workers in the management of the Institute were inclined to rush along with more haste than wisdom. Mrs. Fuld has repeatedly commented on a policy of acquiring so much land for an institution that proclaims not size but highest standards. This also has been my feeling.
>
> After our present commitments have been completed, our resources will not permit of further expansion at the present time. So far everything has developed beyond our fondest expectations, thanks to you. Nor have I any misgivings about the future.[30]

Flexner still had their confidence -- an important factor in his intention to overcome their displeasure and cause them to reverse the decision. And so they added their final contribution to endowment -- $994,000 -- which would serve to pay for the land and capitalize in part the salaries of the humanists. The only victory apparent in this grave situation was Mr. Leidesdorf's. He evidently asked that the major part of the gift be made in equities rather than in bonds, and accordingly several letters reached him from Mr. Bamberger noting the transfer and the deposit

in custody of some 13,000 shares of preferred and common stocks, all carefully containing reference to "Mr. Leidesdorf's request." Backstage the matter must have been a cause of some excitement, for Mr. Farrier wrote Flexner questioning the propriety of the Treasurer's serving as a member of the Committee on Finance, since it caused the paradoxical situation in which as a member he gave instructions to himself as Treasurer working under direction of the Committee. What happened to that question does not appear; Mr. Leidesdorf remained a member of the Committee for years.[31]

Not only did the nature of the final gift concede the importance of investing in equities, but during the year there occurred a turnover in some $1.2 million worth of securities, after which stocks constituted approximately 28% in dollar value at cost of the portfolio. From a ratio of 6.2% in 1934, and 14.6% in 1935, this was quite a change. Indeed, Mr. Leidesdorf's victory was a continuing but gradually manifested one; year by year the proportion of equity issues increased, so that in fiscal 1943, the ratio was 53.7%. During this period, there was quite a turnover in the portfolio, with gains and losses overall about evenly balanced from fiscal 1934 on. The results Mr. Leidesdorf was able to accomplish during those years, marked as they were by occasional refusals of Mr. Hardin to countenance further equity investments, were as nothing when he could really assume charge of the investments. Under his management capital gains of more than $4 million were made in nine years (1944-1952) for the Foundation.

But to return to 1935. From the time the Founders made their decisions the inadequacy of funds became ever more acute. Normal expansion

was out of the question. To complete a nucleus in the staffs in economics and theoretical or mathematical physics, as the Director clearly said he planned to do, was out of the question unless Mr. Bamberger changed his mind. As for an Institute building or buildings, Flexner hoped that if the golf club house location were finally made available, and the Joint Committee of Trustees were functioning well, Mr. Bamberger might change his mind. However, there is no evidence that Mr. Bamberger ever said he was willing to finance a building for the Institute at all at this time.

It soon became apparent that there were no accommodations at the University for the humanists, except for Messrs. Herzfeld, who rejected Morey's offer of space for himself and his artifacts and library, and Panofsky. The Institute succeeded in buying the residence at 69 Alexander Street, and remodeled it for use as offices during the summer of 1936. That fall it afforded offices to Professors Meritt, Goldman, Mitrany, Earle and Riefler, and Visiting Professor Capps.

The acres purchased at such a cost in harmony and to the Institute's future development were quite lovely. They were also a good investment, situated as they were near the center of the growing community, and gave assurance against the intrusion of subdividers on the University's preserve and the Institute's. But they were a non-productive investment: indeed, there was considerable expense in upkeep and taxes for the Institute to pay annually during a time when it might have used the money for other staff members more profitably. Also there is reason to believe that if the Committee had more tactfully managed its actions, with full consultation with the Founders before its report and recommendations

were placed before the Board for action, friendly consent and cooperation would probably have marked this important step, which succeeding generations at the Institute have appreciated so richly.

The Committee closed its purchases in 1936, acquiring 265 acres of field, woodland and meadow, a very small part of which was relatively elevated and bordered on Mercer Street. That Mr. Maass, a city man, had suddenly come to appreciate acreage qua acreage was shown when he reported that "the land owned by Princeton University and the Institute now comprised about 3,000 acres." The total cost of all the parcels, of the remodeling of 69 Alexander Street, repairing Olden Manor and renovating two tenant houses on the Farm, and of incidental expenses such as surveys, taxes, fees, etc., was $235,694.[32] The Hale and the Battle Park tracts -- these added straws which tested the Founders' charity -- lay to the west of the Farm, and included a part of the historic battlefield where the troops of Generals Washington and Mercer routed General Cornwallis from Princeton a few days after the crossing of the Delaware and the capture of Trenton.

That Mr. Maass was well aware of the disfavor in which the Committee was held seems to be evident in an oblique allusion in his report to the costs of administration, evidently aimed at the Director. He said:

> In principle we adhere strictly to the original decision of the Board that as small a part of our resources as is possible should be invested in or spent on buildings and grounds and as large a portion as is possible should be reserved for that part which has within a few years already made the Institute distinguished: namely, adequate salaries and retiring allowances for men of...talent and genius. This principle applies not only to the question of real estate and buildings but administration, in respect to which precisely the same policy has been pursued.[33]

As the proposal for the first building site for the Institute on the golf club house site continued to receive the careful attention of President Dodds, Professor Veblen found the School's position in Fine Hall ever more untenable. Numbers of members and graduate students both seemed to increase as the prestige of Princeton, mathematical center of the United States and perhaps of the world, continued to grow. Veblen continued to urge Flexner to supply a building for the School contiguous or adjacant to Fine Hall, and Flexner repeated his time-worn answer -- lack of funds. But he did propose a solution: the School should limit the number of members by insisting on higher qualifications in those admitted. This Veblen declined to consider, maintaining that the brilliance and prestige of the Institute's visitors attracted members in numbers which he seemed to regard as inevitable as the waves of the ocean. Nor did he favor Flexner's suggestion that any overflow could have studies at 20 Nassau Street. Plans for converting the Infirmary, and, indeed, for using part of the basement in Fine Hall for studies, were considered and rejected. Flexner sympathized with Veblen's discomfort, and never alluded to the actions which had brought the Institute to its present pass; he was on record with the Board and with Veblen himself as favoring separate and adjoining space for the School.

Meanwhile some of the Trustees, faced with the prospect of making do with limited funds, asked Professor Veblen whether his School was not admitting too many members. Veblen was quoted as replying in a manner which must have startled the Director:

> ...the economic and political conditions in the world had doubtless accelerated [the School's] growth... [His belief was] that the numbers in the School of Mathematics were

> larger than anticipated, that contrary to what might have been expected by analogy with other educational enterprises, this decreased rather than increased the responsibility of the individual professor; that the group was so large and contained so many brilliant individuals that subgroups of those interested in particular problems formed spontaneously; that each person concerned himself with his own problems and conferred with others who were interested; and that if, instead of sixty members of the School there were ten or fifteen, the professors would feel more concern for each individual, and the load of responsibility would be very much greater than it was.[34]

But the Board was seriously disturbed about finances. At the next meeting, Mr. Hardin asked why the income derived from the tuition fee was so small. Professor Veblen replied that the Institute was following the policy of the great English universities and some in this country in regarding post-doctoral students as "distinguished visitors," who gave as much to the Institute as thev received. The Director in effect challenged both positions. He

> commented that the really important question was not the collection of a small amount in fees but the admission of members so as, first, to preserve the high level which had been attained; second, not to cause any congestion in Fine Hall; and third, to leave the members of the staff abundant time for the prosecution of their own investigations.[35]

Another Trustee suggested that the Institute was spending "an undue sum in stipends in the School of Mathematics." Dr. Flexner in reply pointed to the "cosmopolitan" character of the members, and urged that the School was raising the level of "mathematical instruction"; no part of Institute expenditures was more highly productive than the money spent in this way, he thought. The minutes mentioned a consensus that no change should be made.[36]

That passage led to a prolonged interchange of letters between Drs. Weed and Flexner. The Hopkins man insisted that the $30,000 in

mathematic stipends would better be spent in salaries for two professors in any of the schools; he objected to the appropriation of the sum seven months in advance of the budget; he insisted that not the School, but the Trustees, should approve the individual stipendiaries. Flexner, battling with Professor Veblen the while over the admission of too many members, and questioning the merit of many of them, but not revealing his suspicion that the more numerous they became, the more hope Vablen had that additional space would be made available, battled equally valiantly with Dr. Weed, defending the stipend fund as a flexible obligation which could, if necessary, be cut or omitted if the financial situation became worse, but also maintaining that it was a most valuable instrument for bringing scholars to Princeton for their own and Princeton's benefit. He rejected outright the suggestion that the Board was competent to pass on individual stipendiaries. Perhaps neither man convinced the other, but it was nevertheless significant that later Flexner named Dr. Weed Chairman of the Budget Committee.[37]

Very shortly after the last discussion in the Board, Professors Alexander and Veblen addressed a memorandum to the Director entitled "Building the School of Mathematics." In it they asked him to purchase for the School of Mathematics a defunct dining club across Washington Street from Palmer Hall, on the ground that more space would be needed by the School in view of their intention to enter the fields of biology and chemistry.[38] Flexner, discounting almost automatically the proposed expansion, undertook an investigation of his own into the situation in Fine Hall, interviewing individually all the forty-one members enrolled in the first semester 1936-1937. An intensive debate ensued between himself and

Veblen, in which Flexner said:

> We have no present or, as far as I can see, future reason for taking chemistry and biology into consideration at all. It will be many years before our endowment is such that we can hope to enter the experimental sciences and, if and when we do so, some very large questions are involved going far beyond the provision of studies for the professors which those subjects need.[39]

He had found, he said, that among the forty-one members a number were working with University professors, although this was offset by some of the Institute faculty working with graduate students. Of the cited total of seventy advanced students and members at Fine Hall, thirteen were duplicated in the count, since Fellows from the National Research Council and various foundations were registered by both institutions. In his own estimatation, the space situation "reduces itself, therefore, to the possibility of procuring three large studies and two more small ones <u>for the present staff</u>."

Separate quarters for the School of Mathematics might result in the physical separation of the two groups, he warned. He repeated that it would be better to limit enrollment to about forty members "by excluding persons who have not obtained the Ph. D. degree, and who have not given plain indication of unusual ability." If the number should run above that because of the presence of, say, a Dirac, "we can cope [with that] as things now stand." He said: "there is a limit to what the professorial level can give to the post-doctorals, and it might result in the post-doctorals talking among themselves, and thereby losing what the Institute has to offer." Indeed, he had found that the members were reluctant to approach personally any of the staff members. Besides all these carefully made points, he had found that the club in question was mortgaged for more

than it was worth, and the University had need of it and two or three more buildings like it.[40] Veblen's answer was clearly a threat, in their mutual understanding:

> On thinking over your letter dated October 31 but received yesterday, I find that the expectation that our quarters in Fine Hall would be extended either on the campus proper or into a building across the street, has played a decisive part in my thoughts about the future of the School of Mathematics in its relation to the University. Since it now appears that this expectation is not be be realized, my opinion on some of the fundamental problems has changed. I have no doubt that the same will be true of my mathematical colleagues, and therefore feel that I had better consult with them before replying to your letter. I hope that this will meet with your approval.[41]

Flexner replied in part:

> I was surprised as I told you in my reply, on reading your memorandum entitled, "Building the School of Mathematics," to find that you had gone so far afield as to take in chemistry and biology without any previous communication to me in regard to this extension. Now to my further surprise I learn that your imagination has gone so far as to play a decisive part in your thinking not only about the future of the School of Mathematics but of the relationship of the Institute to the University. I feel that I should not have been presented with the problem in terms of space when, unknown to me, implications of which I had had no intimation.../were involved/
>
> I should regard any decision on that subject /i.e., consulting his colleagues/ as inopportune and ill judged. Knowledge that such a discussion had taken place would almost inevitably spread and would do incalculable harm. The relations between the Institute and the University are very intimate, and they are important to each other in ways in which you and your mathematical associates do not and cannot possibly know. A discussion on the part of the mathematicians on that subject would be futile and might be harmful. It would be like pulling up a tender plant after a short period to find out whether it is growing....[42]

He said Professor Veblen had not been candid with him in discussing an enlargement of space when what he really had in mind was a change in the concept of the School, which Flexner considered quite impossible.

He repeated what he had often said: the interests of the other two schools had been subserved to those of the School of Mathematics; now, they were to receive the first benefits of any additional funds which might be found. The growth of the School of Mathematics must be truly remarkable, "if a man like Hardy asks me directly the question as to whether we really wish a monopoly on mathematics in Princeton." The closer problems attendant upon the cooperation between the University and the School were held, the better for fruitful work.[43]

Behind the muted explosion, which apparently did not come to the attention of the colleagues of the two professors, was their feeling that to remain in Fine Hall was no longer possible to them. Both wanted to be out of it, but subsequent events showed clearly that the other four men liked their present environment. It was clear that Veblen and Lefschetz were not too friendly. Perhaps the latter resented slightly Veblen's patronizing oft-repeated assertion that he had been responsible for calling Lefschetz to the University despite opposition. It is more than likely that Veblen resented Lefschetz's authority and power as Fine Professor with certain administrative duties and prerogatives added. The situation was not improved when Lefschetz, the Department's Editor of the jointly edited and financed Annals of Mathematics, informed Veblen that the Department had agreed at his suggestion to "limit publication to papers of an original and not of an expository character," and asked whether the School would agree. The Institute group agreed, but at its next meeting inaugurated a new Mathematical Series, (presumably consisting largely of the class of material eliminated from the Annals) which it asked the Department to edit, referee and distribute in mimeographed form on a

joint basis. The Department agreed.[44] The discussion of building the School of Mathematics appeared to be closed with Flexner's letter.

On the 10th November, the faculty gathered at 69 Alexander Street in the evening, and walked to Princeton Inn in a body to present a small gift of sentimental value to the Director, who was about to have his seventieth birthday. The origin of the idea seems to have been in the humanistic group. The Director was deeply touched, and expressed his appreciation next morning in a letter to Veblen in which he sought to heal past wounds, and to re-establish their relations on a friendly footing.[45]

Early in December, however, Veblen's patience with conditions at Fine Hall broke again when he learned that off-street parking permits must be obtained by the faculty members of both institutions to admit them to the limited space outside Fine and Palmer Halls. Veblen found it demeaning to have to ask Professor Smythe for the permit, and resented the exclusion of the Institute's members from the privilege. Patiently Flexner pointed out that members might park on the streets, or walk to Fine Hall, which afforded the School of Mathematics many valuable advantages:

> the use of the Library, and janitor service, telephone service, and luxurious quarters, and what is more important than all of these...the easy opportunity for conference, cooperation, and contact with other men interested in mathematics and mathematical physics.
>
> We must make a choice -- to continue our cooperation with Princeton, ignoring everything that is not of prime importance, or set up shop alone. In the former case, we shall hope to develop a great institution; in the latter event, we shall have a small one, and the first subject to suffer would be mathematics.[46]

That irritation, too, appeared to wear away.

Meanwhile, Flexner, troubled by a kind of incredulity at Veblen's statements on the relationship between the School's professors and its members, had asked Veblen for an explanation. The Professor gave it to him under date of the 4th December. There is nothing to show that he had discussed it with his colleagues.

> The program of the Institute is to give its permanent members an opportunity to pursue scholarship unhampered by any of the handicaps which such an organization can reasonably be expected to eliminate. It is also its policy to give a similar opportunity for limited periods (usually a single academic year) to temporary members. Some of these are men or women who have recently attained the Ph. D. and who need not only the freedom of opportunity implied by their residence at the Institute but also inspiration and help from the professors. Some are mature scholars whose primary need is temporary release from routine academic obligations. In the second class of cases it is often possible to induce the university to which the scholar it attached to give him leave of absence and pay half his salary. Men of this sort derive a great deal of stimulus and help from their association with the younger group as well as from the Institute professors. The latter derive a great deal of stimulus in their work from both groups of temporary members. Indeed, many if not all of our professors will testify that they receive more from the visitors than they give.
>
> The significance of this establishment, consisting of a permanent group of scholars year by year in contact with a steady stream of colleagues from all parts of the world, is already well understood throughout the academic world. It is increasingly thought of as something which could not be diminished without serious loss to this world.
>
> It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of the stream flowing through it to the Institute itself. If this stream should dry up, there would be danger that the 'academic heaven' would approach the state of Nirvana.
>
> The funds which the Institute devotes to the stipends for temporary members are matched and probably exceeded in amount by the contributions from outside sources. Every university which grants a member of its faculty leave of absence to come to the Institute is making a contribution to scholarship of a definite pecuniary value. This is by no means always a

> routine matter...The various universities and foundations (e.g., Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rockefeller Foundation) which send young men here on fellowships are all making financial contributions to the same cause.
>
> The founders and trustees of the Institute therefore have a right to feel that their generous support of scholarship is receiving recognition not merely in the form of words of praise and gratitude, but also in the more concrete form of pecuniary support and ready cooperation.[47]

Only the first three paragraphs were read to the Trustees, and without attribution. The last two did not quite overcome such qualms as Flexner himself had voiced to Veblen in January, 1933 at the prospect of the Institute subsidizing rich universities such as Harvard, Yale and Columbia by paying half the salaries of professors asked to come to the Institute for a year. Admitting that the benefits of such an association as Veblen portrayed were bound to be mutually felt by the staff members and the visitors, Flexner might have remembered that in projecting his institute for mathematical research in 1924, the Professor had not feared nirvana. Indeed, he had suggested measures to protect his staff from the state by requiring some fixed duties to relieve the men engaged entirely in basic or pure research, such as the editing of a periodical or rewriting the Encyclopedia of Mathematics, and lectures to advanced students. The Director now had to reverse his concept of the master-disciple relations which he had expected would prevail between the professors and the young post-doctorals who would come to study with them. He presented the memorandum with a preface: the hope that better financial conditions would enable the universities to bear the entire cost of sending their men to Princeton, thus relieving the Institute of paying stipends.[48]

As he surrendered his fond dream that the Institute would be a

training ground for the young post-doctorals, of whom Dr. Millikan was to write that, with the help of National Research Council fellowships, they had put American science in the forefront in the western world, he accepted the new concept. At the next meeting Flexner noted:

> I hope that the members of the Board have examined with care in Bulletin No. 6 the list of members...during 1936-1937. I think it is no exaggeration to say that a group of this size and eminence, coming from all parts of the world to work in one or another of the Institute schools, has never been assembled before. There are workers from China, Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Italy, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, England, and from universities in.../fourteen named states/ making a total of fifty-eight members.
>
> Most of these persons hold good or important academic positions and are studying in Princeton on leave of absence. A few... are men who have had modest posts and have surrendered them... to come to Princeton. For the coming year men who have worked at the Institute have already accepted posts at Yale, Cornell, North Carolina and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and what is true of mathematics will ultimately be true of the other two schools.[49]

And at the following meeting, he found it necessary to say:

> I am sure that it is no exaggeration to say that no American institution with an enrollment of between fifty and sixty members has anything like such a proportion of scholars and scientists from institutions of learning in this...and foreign countries. The number of those who are recent doctors of philosophy is negligible and should continue to be such because it is not easy usually to gauge the capacity of a young man to pursue independent work until he has demonstrated his ability after leaving the institution where he received his doctor's degree....[50]

By far the larger proportion of the $30,000 annual stipend fund for the School of Mathematics was allocated to arrivées, mature teachers from other universities. The rest went to the young post-doctorals, whom Flexner had assumed would be the more numerous. Thus early in October, 1935, the sum of $5,250 of the $30,000 was set aside for the younger group, and Professor Weyl was given the privilege of selecting the men

and inviting them, since he was the one most interested in them.[51] When, as sometimes happened, some of the arrivées invited could not accept for the time specified, the residue of those stipends was then allocated to the younger men. In the first nine years of its operation the School counted two hundred sixty-eight individual memberships for part or whole of the academic year, some of which were held by men who stayed for several years. Of the total, one hundred twenty held positions, one hundred forty received Institute stipends, and seventy were Fellows. The cosmopolitan character of the members appeared in the fact that nearly one hundred came from abroad.[52]

Princeton University, eminent in the sciences, had held undisputed first place in the list of institutions where the holders of National Research Council fellowships chose to study, as was demonstrated by statistics drawn from a bulletin of the National Research Council and published by the Alumni Weekly. This was true of the cumulative figures for the three sciences, as well as of those for the year 1934-1935. Moreover, while the cumulative figures showed the University of Chicago holding first place in the list of institutions training the men who received National Research Council fellowships, Princeton was a close second. Of the total number of National Research Council Fellows in 1934-1935 -- one hundred two in all three sciences -- eighteen had chosen Princeton, twelve Harvard, eleven California, eleven California Institute of Technology, etc. The Fellows of all foundations including the National Research Council were enrolled in mathematics in both institutions. Ten of the twelve in mathematics were at Princeton in that year.[53]

In 1937, Professor Veblen, apparently reacting defensively to

some stimulus, perhaps Flexner's disclosures of October, 1936, suggested to Dean Eisenhart that thereafter holders of fellowships must register with one or the other institution, according to the connection of the man with whom each wished to work. The Dean agreed, and the information went out.[54] The result in the Institute's enrollment was surprising; one National Research Council Fellow registered with it for 1937-1938; none the next year, and two Fellows from other foundations in 1939-1940. This accounted in part for the drop in total enrollments in the School of Mathematics for those years: twenty-five in 1937-1938 and twenty-three in 1938-1939. But the quality of the members who came was high as the faculty took occasion to note formally in 1937: "the number of good candidates for stipends seems to be increasing, as compared with former years, and that among those to whom no stipend can be given are a number of quite first-rate candidates."[55]

Dr. Flexner had advocated "borrowing" talent from other institutions, domestic and foreign, in his Confidential Memorandum of September, 1931.[56] It was not novel. But as has been seen, he did not envision the extent to which the School of Mathematics would use the device. Two very eminent men, P. A. M. Dirac and Wolfgang Pauli, came as visiting professors in 1935-1936 and 1936-1937 respectively. They were paid salaries out of the general funds of the Institute rather than the stipend fund of the School. When the Board consented to the appointment "of another American mathematician" in 1934, it did so with a restriction: the overall budget of the School must not be substantially increased by the action. The commitment to Dirac was outstanding; Flexner sought and received special permission for calling Dr. Pauli. But after that there were no visiting

professors in the School of Mathematics; all visitors were called members, and their stipends were supposed to come out of the fund.

It became Professor Veblen's objective resourcefully to persuade Flexner to make exceptions, to permit this or that item to come from the general budget. Frequently he succeeded, but with the critical attitude the Board evinced in 1936, the chances of success seemed less likely, particularly as there was not enough money to pay the stipends of members for the other schools. Nevertheless, Veblen decided to invite three eminent European mathematicians due to attend the Harvard Tercentenary in the fall of 1936 to come to Princeton for a visit, giving the Department an opportunity to share in the invitation and the $2,000 honorarium he proposed to offer each. The Department declined, and Veblen, having told his colleagues he could get the sum from the general budget, asked Flexner. But the Board declined to authorize the appropriation, requiring that the sum should come from the School of Mathematics stipend fund. It is interesting to note that even though only two of the three came, (Hardy of England and Levi-Civita) the School spent $6,000 over its stipend fund.[57]

Professor Veblen's remark that the members formed sub-groups and conferred among themselves was no exaggeration. The Bulletins for these years show a great deal of activity among the members in lecturing, both in series and on single papers, and some conducted seminars during their stay. Not infrequently they worked with University students as well as with the younger post-doctorals. Flexner need not have worried that too many members would interfere with the Institute professors' leisure for reflection and creative thinking. As for his other concern: that the members might talk only "to themselves," it apparently was not

realized either, for they talked also with the people at the University. It was not, in Professor Veblen's view, any miscarriage of relations as Flexner had planned the Institute. However, this attitude of his is of particular interest in contrast to his eagerness during the first four years to admit as members candidates for the doctorate. However, his wish can well be understood in the light of his outstanding reputation as a notably successful guide and mentor in working with graduate students, so that both student and teacher were richly rewarded by the experience.

It has been said at the University that while the presence and activity of the many outstanding mathematicians brought by the Institute to Fine Hall were welcomed and found to be intensely stimulating, the atmosphere created by the richness of the opportunities to hear lectures and to attend seminars proved to be distracting to the graduate and other advanced students. They needed to concentrate upon studies of their own. Too often they were diverted, fearing that they might be "missing something" if they failed to attend a certain lecture, or to participate in a seminar. Dr. Infeld, a hypersensitive person, described Fine Hall's regular afternoon teas as "slave markets," where the young post-doctoral was no more eager to be "discovered" and invited to accept a position than some of the arrivées, who hoped to better their situations.[58]

It will be recalled that Professor Veblen had been from the beginning an ardent advocate of full faculty government in academic affairs, and that Dr. Flexner had on each of the several occasions when the Professor raised the issue attempted to show that nowhere in the western world

were faculties entirely self-governing; there was always a superior power to act as check, critic or stimulant, such as the Minister of Education in a German state or a Royal Commission of enquiry in England. Moreover, while the School of Mathematics was the only School functioning, Flexner properly pointed out that it would be a heavy burden for it to assume to seek and select economists and humanists. He did not overtly question the ability of the mathematicians to do so, however. But Professor Veblen did question Flexner's choice of Professor Riefler -- "a man of affairs" -- and Dr. Morey's selection of Professor Panofsky. So far as the record reveals, the Director never revealed to Professor Veblen the history of his efforts to allow the faculty to elect its own Trustees and its own members to a Committee on Educational policy, and to be a consultant to the Director. It would have been against his policy (and his pride) to disclose the position of Mr. Bamberger in these matters. It will be recalled that he had discussed the problem of faculty participation in government quite fully in his Confidential Memorandum on the organization of the Institute, concluding bravely that if academic Trustees including faculty members did not suffice to provide satisfactory relations, "Further steps can be taken if problems arise..."

When in December, 1935, he found it necessary to remind Professor Veblen that the full-time and post-doctoral policies must not be breached, it appeared he believed such a problem had arisen. He had written:

> I saw Professor von Neumann yesterday afternoon and read his minutes of the meeting of the group. In my judgment we would have made quicker and clearer progress had I been present at your meeting, for it seems rather absurd not to discuss matters of this kind, since it is obvious to me that there are

> considerations affecting the mathematicians which I may not understand, just as it is equally obvious that there are questions of moment which are bound to affect me which the mathematicians do not understand....If we are to preserve the present cooperative relations with the University, I am compelled to take into consideration factors of which no single school is probably aware.[59]

He made his feelings as to the seriousness of the problem unmistakeably clear in the same letter, thus justifying his conclusion that he should attend the faculty meetings. (See Chapter IV, p. 162)

When Professor Veblen replied that cooperation would be more difficult "under the restrictions which you are now contemplating," Flexner answered kindly that he could understand that the significance of what had early been undertaken was only slowly being realized, and added:

> Other problems that likewise go to the very root of things may from time to time emerge. Should such be the case, it would, I think, be in the interest of speedy and intelligent decision if we discussed them together rather than separately. I am certain that, if I had been present at the meeting of the mathematical group when my letter of December 11 was discussed, it would not have been necessary for Professor von Neumann to take the trouble of drawing up a minute or of submitting it to me. On the other hand, I have no love for committee meetings and do not care to participate in them unless we can save time and reach wiser decisions by means of them.[60]

There was reason in Flexner's suggestion.. His occasional consultations with Professor von Neumann as liaison with the School perhaps gave him insights he had not had before, when his communication had been with Veblen alone. Now he felt that Veblen did not always represent to him correctly the views of his colleagues, and that by the same token his views did not always get to them through Veblen. He would have a surer knowledge were he able to attend the faculty's occasional meetings. It is not clear how much of the differences over post-doctoral and full-time

standards he discussed with Professor von Neumann, but he did write to him insisting that the notice of Institute stipends published in Science must be amended to state they would be considered only for post-doctorals who had demonstrated "ability in independent research."[61] Definite gains in understanding might be realized by his attending the School's meetings; Veblen's colleagues would know more of his problems and thinking and he of theirs from occasional meetings. But he could hardly attend without an invitation from Veblen, both for his own comfort in the academic milieu, and for justification in contravening Mr. Bamberger's clear wish. In the event, he neither received the invitation, nor attended as a matter of right.[62]

But if the Director was not invited by Veblen, he could demonstrate his ability to call the whole faculty together for a discussion of great importance. And on the 10th February, 1936, he did just that, for the purpose of consulting it about no less important a matter than the proposal to appoint an associate director, an understudy to himself. The background for this action lay in his election of Dr. Aydelotte as his successor just before the Trustee visited the Founders to persuade them to drop their opposition to the appointment of Dr. Weyl in 1933. Then he wrote Mr. Bamberger that he and Aydelotte had been going over Institute matters past, present and future, and added:

> I feel that I have in him an 'understudy' whom you and Mrs. Fuld were rightly anxious that I procure. Whatever happens to me, the Institute is safe, for he and I are in perfect accord as to the principles and ideals which underlie the enterprise.[63]

From that time forward he confided extensively in Aydelotte, and also asked him to speak his own mind clearly on certain business at

Board meetings. It appears that the Founders, Aydelotte and Flexner were the only ones who knew of the arrangement. Whether it was Flexner's age, or the fact that Dr. Aydelotte faced another crisis at Swarthmore during the latter part of 1935, and called on Flexner to suggest that he was ready for the appointment as understudy, is not clear. In January, 1936, the Director told the Trustees that though they appeared to want him to remain in his position for the time being, he felt that, considering Mr. Bamberger's solicitude about the future of the Institute, it would be wise if a continuity were arranged by the appointment of an associate director on an annual basis, with the understanding that he might, if he qualified, be appointed Director. He himself was approaching his seventieth birthday, and though he was well, his health might fail. The Board thereupon approved this resolution, which he presented.

> That after seeking advice from the several professors in the Institute and from such other sources as he may desire to consult, the Director be, and is hereby authorized to submit to the annual meeting of the Board a nomination for the post of Associate Director, it being understood that this is an annual appointment and that it does not involve succession to the directorship, unless sufficient evidence of the qualifications needed in the directorship has been displayed;
>
> And be it further resolved that the Executive Committee be and is hereby authorized to arrange all further details that may be necessary in connection with the establishment of this post.[64]

Dr. Aydelotte was absent; in sending him the minutes Flexner wrote:

> It was impossible to present the associate directorship without the element of risk which I think is really negligible. I am going to get the faculty together next week and simply ask them for suggestions. I am not expecting anything of moment from them so that I shall make the nomination practically on my own responsibility.[65]

The Director did not consult the faculty members separately, but called them together instead. Of the thirteen professors who had been appointed, there were present the six from the School of Mathematics, and Messrs. Mitrany, Panofsky and Riefler. Professor Earle was still recuperating at Saranac; Professors Herzfeld, Lowe and Meritt were in Europe. Dr. Flexner recapitulated briefly the purposes and history of the Institute, explained the resolution passed by the Board, and asked his auditors for suggestions for an associate director. He encountered opposition to the idea; Professor Panofsky was probably not alone in saying that the man who would be a good Vertreter (deputy) might not have the requisite qualifications for directing the Institute. Some names were suggested, (but not recorded) and the meeting adjourned with the understanding that the faculty would meet again for further discussion and recommendations.[66] Flexner then visited the Founders in Arizona, and while there called on Professor Veblen to assemble the faculty for further discussions and to ask each man to send his recommendations directly to Flexner. He set forth arguments for and against the course he had suggested, and asked Veblen to read his letter in full to the faculty. One suggestion he made specifically:

> In choosing a person, if the Board decided to take such action, we should, I think, seek not a distinguished specialist, but rather a person of my own type, namely, one who has varied interests and sympathies, a large acquaintance with men and institutions in this country and in Europe, and profound respect for scholars and their own individual ways of solving their own problems. This sort of choice seems to me important at this stage, while the Institute is gradually expanding. A decade hence, some other type may be more useful; but while I shall present my views to the Board, with whom the ultimate responsibility lies, and in my judgment should lie, I shall not, of course, insist upon it.[67]

The faculty's response, written at the direction of the members by Professors Riefler and Veblen, thanked the Director for inaugurating what they hoped would be his future course in consulting it, and then discreetly insisted that the idea of an associate director was not in its opinion feasible. They doubted that a man of the required caliber would accept such a position on a temporary basis. The letter continued:

> We also doubt whether the duties which could be found for him to perform, in case he did accept, would be compatible with the qualities of the man who should be chosen. You have made it one of your main purposes to reduce administration as such to a minimum and to establish scholarship here on the basis of minimum interference with the faculty. Under these circumstances the Director is a sort of an artist. He must be sensitive to conditions in the University, to conditions in the Institute, and intimately aware of the deeper currents in the world of scholarship.[68]

They suggested instead that a standing committee to consist of two Trustees, two faculty members, and the Founders and the Director, be provided for in the By-Laws. This committee would make a continuing study of the field, so that when the time came to appoint a successor to the Director, they would be ready with a recommendation. The suggestion was tentative, and not for Board consideration.

The Director presided over the next meeting, which occurred on the 31st March. Professor Veblen later found two memorandums in Flexner's file, dated for the occasion; he had read one of them. The first was brief; it suggested that a decision was not needed then, but might be reached in the fall after further thought. But it objected to the formality of the committee; the Director felt the preservation of informality was more desirable:

> The trustees and faculty should therefore approach these problems rather as committees of the whole than through representatives who might easily get into the position of being attorneys,

one group for the trustees, the other for the faculty.[69]

In the second memorandum, which Professor von Neumann believed was the one Flexner read, the Director elaborated his objections to the formal procedure:

> My whole effort during these five years has been directed to preserve informality in my relations with the trustees, and in the relations between the trustees and the professors. I have tried to get you acquainted with one another in a gradual way so that a good many of the prejudices and preoccupations which exist in American institutions may never come to the Institute. Whether I shall be successful in that I do not know, but at any rate that has been my idea....[70]

He detailed some of the more onerous responsibilities of administration which he had not been able to avoid, though he had kept them at a minimum. He conceded that the faculty members were right in objecting to an annual appointment on the ground that would make it difficult to attract a man of the proper caliber, and concluded that one would have to be found who would take it on an "indefinite" basis and "on a chance." Then Flexner would absent himself after a period of training, and test the ability of the Associate Director.

> If he measures up in these trials, the presumption would be that he would be considered first...I believe that the post is so attractive, and the possibilities of the Institute are so great that some highly competent person, confident of his own ability and with imagination enough to realize the possibilities of the Institute, may be willing to be an understudy for an indefinite period -- a year, two years, or three, perhaps more, dependent upon my health and strength.

He devoted some paragraphs to a wise analysis of what the Institute really needed: not the committee suggested by the faculty, for that would tend to bring about formal and opposed positions.

> If any such feeling as I have described is brought about, the representatives of the faculty will always be outvoted...As it would be a division that you have brought about, you would

> have no reason to complain. In other words, you will exchange influence which you now possess for power which won't amount to anything. The important factors in a small institution are informality and cooperation, not power. I don't myself want power and you don't need any....There is another fallacy in representation. You all know there are divisions in every faculty: divisions between the young and the old, divisions between conservatives and progressives. If you appoint representatives, they will always represent the majority, and the minority will go unrepresented, though it may be that the minority is the wise section. If you keep the thing on the basis of influence rather than representation, an influential and correct minority may have far more influence than a reactionary majority.

The Director then asked the faculty members not to go about contrasting their conditions with those of Princeton's faculty.

> It is in our interest, as in theirs, that the University should be made as strong as possible. If therefore any question should ever arise as to whether a particular person should be invited to join the University faculty or the Institute faculty, I should without hesitation step aside in order that the University might secure him.

He added that he had done precisely that in the case of Professor Meritt, whom he had recommended for appointment only after the President at his suggestion had consulted the Department and learned that they wanted a man whose interests were more general, rather than Meritt's more highly specialized field.

> That attitude ought, I believe, to characterize every step we take. If it does, Princeton and the Institute together will have made a notable contribution to American scholarship in the form of a new type of cooperation.

He confided to them that when he had told Mr. Bamberger he was too old to organize and direct the Institute in 1930, Mr. Bamberger had said he wanted him to do it, and added that "I should do as he would do in his own business, namely, train an understudy." With a few more words in support of continued informality, and a request that the members should

continue to suggest the names of likely candidates for the office under consideration, he closed with this observation directed against the concept of formal faculty government:

> As a matter of fact, in an experience covering a third of a century devoted to improving higher education, only once, so far as I can recall, did my main obstacle lie with the trustees. It was the faculties who with their instinct for self-preservation blocked the way....[71]

The final meeting of the faculty in this series was held on the 2nd October, called by Veblen at Dr. Flexner's request. The group, now augmented by Professors Herzfeld and Meritt, abandoned its tentative recommendation, but still insisted it would be wrong to appoint an understudy. They wanted the Director to participate in the selection of his successor, and therefore suggested that he confide his suggestions from time to time to the Board and perhaps even to the faculty. The letter, again written by Riefler and Veblen, closed with the following paragraph:

> In the meantime, we have one practical suggestion to offer toward deferring the problem for as long a time as possible. We feel that the severity of the weather in Princeton in February constitutes the greatest hazard to your continued good health. Would it not be possible for you to repeat regularly the vacation which you took last winter with such satisfactory results?[72]

In a response addressed only to Professor Veblen, the Director expressed his gratification with the faculty's decision, and said he would confide his thinking to notes entrusted to Mrs. Bailey, so that he might change his mind without troubling anyone. He asked Veblen to "let Mr. Riefler see this, and use your own discretion as to communicating it to the other members of the faculty group."[73]

Meanwhile Flexner wrote to Dr. Aydelotte indicating a relaxed situation; the faculty had been having some sessions without the Director

since the term opened, and would probably have something to report soon.[74] But no word of any report to the Board remains, or of Dr. Aydelotte's attitude.

Why did Dr. Flexner direct his last letter to Professor Veblen only? The faculty had seen fit to entrust Professor Riefler also with expressing its views, but the only recognition Flexner took of the fact was a casual reference. And his treatment of the faculty itself, leaving Veblen to decide whether to inform the rest of his answer, showed an unfamiliarity with the proprieties, or an indifference. One cannot escape the suspicion that the Director was in some difficulty over having called the whole group together. This might have come about while he was in Arizona; his request for individual answers was perhaps significant. In such case, the compliment for consulting the group must have been uncomfortable, as well as the expressed hope that it set a precedent. One also is entitled to wonder why he called the professors together in the first place. It was clearly a demonstration of his power in the face of Veblen's decided opposition to inviting him to meet with the School, but it is doubtful that Flexner was interested then in a showing of such power. He may have sensed that the collective mind would be opposed to the idea of an understudy, as he himself perhaps was, and as Mr. Bamberger apparently also had been since he overlooked the possibility that his nephews might have been trained to assume the management of L. Bamberger & Company. The timing was perhaps too early to allow the supposition that, knowing the real cause for Veblen's restiveness, he sought to show the Professor that his colleagues wanted close cooperation with the University.

That speculation introduces another one of great interest. Though

the conferences ended as Professors Alexander and Veblen were proposing the expansion of the School of Mathematics as a reason for added space, the restraint and good spirit reflected in the faculty letters allow no inference that Professor Veblen had introduced the question into faculty discussions. Thus Flexner's strongest point in opposing the mathematician's threat to discuss his problems with his colleagues appears in the following passage of his letter of the 7th November:

> Should it ever become necessary, as I hope it may never become necessary, to have a faculty discussion on this point, the discussion could not be limited to the mathematical group. It would be called by me, and would be attended by all groups. I should preside and actively participate, for the very obvious reason that, leaving all else aside, I am far better informed than anyone in any one of the groups regarding the substance of the relationship. Any move that at this moment suggests that the relationship be modified, when it is the rock on which we now rest, and anything that could possibly interfere with the type of collaboration which we are trying to work out would be deplorable. In my opinion, therefore, and this is the result of very careful reflection, the whole subject should be dropped and the entire incident regarded as closed...
>
> I trust that you will not misunderstand this letter. You surely know that I set the highest value upon the services which you have rendered to me personally and to the Institute, but your memorandum and your letter have both disturbed me, and it seemed to me only right that I should put you quite candidly in full possession of every doubt that has crossed my mind since receiving them.[75]

For whatever reasons, Professors Alexander and Veblen were silent on the point for some time to come, and when it was revived, it was with another strategy.

Meanwhile, Veblen had decided to take into his own hands, and those of his associates of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, immediate action to create a social center for the Institute without reference to his position of the previous summer that the projected building on the

club house location should fill that need, and thus without any consideration of the pending plan for the University's possible final action.

"Without initiating any general discussion," he wrote Mr. Maass, he had consulted Dr. and Mrs. Aydelotte about a few simple and relatively inexpensive changes in the Olden Manor -- the old Colonial home on the Farm -- to provide rooms on the first floor where the members might gather socially and some nine residential rooms on the two top floors for visitors.[76] In December, 1936, he presented blueprints and an estimate of $10,000 to Mr. Maass for the attention of the Executive Committee, which was to meet on the 28th. Maass passed these to Flexner for the agenda, with another proposal -- a plan for Institute aid to Institute professors in building their homes which Dr. Riefler had prepared at the Committee's request. Both received the approval of the Executive Committee.[77] But the Director prepared no minutes of the meeting, and took no steps to carry out the plan for Olden Manor, writing Professor Veblen frankly that the Institute had no money for that purpose, and that the housing plan demanded all his attention.[78]

The younger professors had been able to rent homes during the depression; now that economic conditions were easier, families were returning to Princeton to occupy their own homes, and since appropriate commercial rentals simply did not exist there, something had to be done to help the new permanent arrivals establish themselves, as the University had long since discovered. Professor Veblen knew this, and so when Flexner challenged his plan he apparently did not press the social center further. But he did not fail to note the high-handed attitude. Flexner wrote:

> Let us get our minds so full of the purpose for which we exist that we will all become relatively indifferent to buildings and grounds...
>
> It is, I think, quite clear that these things dwell much less largely in your mind than they do in mine or Riefler's or Meritt's, for we are strangers to them, but I fear them...for these young men bursting with ideas and alive to opportunities who find themselves distracted...So far as housing is concerned, they have got to take a minimum amount of their time to settle their problems in a brief period once and for all as you settled yours many years ago.[79]

Whether Professor Veblen told Messrs. Maass and Aydelotte of Flexner's reasoned intractability does not appear, but it was not until August that Mr. Maass, apparently just recalling the business, asked Flexner what he had done about Olden Manor. Flexner made show of being reminded, and indicated he was consulting Mr. Leidesdorf about the expense. Nothing further happened.[80]

For by that time much had happened to the carefully laid plans by which the University Trustees had agreed to cede land at the club house location to be used as the site for the Institute's building. Flexner had reported that approval to the Trustees at their meeting in January, 1937. Mr. Dodds had confirmed his verbal information by letter in February. But by April, there seemed to be real doubt that the Princeton Trustees had remained firm.[81] After that no mention is made of the club house location. From what can be learned, however, alumni opposition to moving the club house caused the Trustees to reverse their position. Flexner called on the Founders at Murray Bay in July and it was evidently on learning this news that the Founders, who had never volunteered at any time discernible on the record to finance a building on the College Road plot, now expressed their willingness to finance one on the Institute's own property.

The Director had really called on the Founders to urge them to authorize steps in the development of the staffs in mathematical physics and economics. However, when they offered to finance the building, Flexner again found himself in the old conflict between men and bricks. While he confided good news to Aydelotte, Maass and Riefler on his progress for economics, there is in his letters no single word about the projected building. He did promise news when he met Aydelotte in September. He also informed Mr. Maass in time to plan the first steps in taking advantage of the Founders' offer, which he announced proudly and gratefully at the October meeting. The news did not become otherwise known until the Director told the Trustees:

> that the Founders wished to furnish the Institute with funds necessary to erect our first building without drawing upon the capital funds, on the income of which the Institute lives.[82]

Meanwhile the housing plan for the professors had been worked out favorably with some effort by the Director, Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass. Professor Riefler's plan had contemplated subdivision by the Institute of a plot lying between the west end of Battle Road and Mercer Street into building lots, providing street, sewerage and utilities. The lots were to be leased for fifty years, renewable at the option of the professor or his heirs. The Institute would supply funds to build the homes, and take mortgages and notes at 4½% to be amortized over twenty-five years, the Institute to be safeguarded by life and fire insurance, etc., to cover the debt.[83] After consideration by his Committee and the Executive Committee, Maass recommended approval by the Board. The rate of interest had been reduced to 4%, and the lots would be sold rather than

leased. The Institute would advance the costs of subdivision and construction to be amortized over twenty-five years. The benefits were summarized: the professors would get homes, the Institute would receive the rate of return it was receiving on high grade bonds, and would be protected from the perils of the landlord. Each professor would select his own architect and builder. No mention was made of a recapture clause. The Board approved the general plan, but ordered that when the final details were worked out, the Committee on Buildings and Grounds should secure the authorization of the Executive Committee before proceding.[84]

The interval allowed the Director to visit Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld in Arizona in February, and to persuade them to permit the Institute to sell the lots for $1,500 as had been suggested by Mr. Leidesdorf, instead of the $5,000 apparently set by the Board earlier.[85] Further action was taken by the Committee on Buildings and Grounds in March, and by the Executive Committee on its report in April. As the Executive Committee approved it, the houses were to be planned by one architect and built by one contractor; $30,000 was the limit for each; the new price of the lots was $1,500 plus the prorated costs of subdivision, and it was provided that each deed should contain a recapture clause "by which the Institute would be vested with the right to repurchase the respective properties from the owners." Interest charges were to begin with occupancy.[86]

The first contracts, with Professors Meritt, Riefler and Weyl and their respective wives, received Board approval in January, 1938. The interest charges began on the 1st March, 1938. In October each owner was called on to sign a second bond and mortgage covering his share of

subdivision costs, with interest retroactive to March.[87]

As will be detailed in the next chapter, the Director's conversations with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld at Murray Bay so encouraged him to believe they intended to resume gifts to endowment for staff in physics and economics that he was prompted to suggest and work out a new By-Law, by which a more formal budget procedure would be established. It would have done little good to propose such a thing when demands were made for funds which were not there. He hoped to persuade the Trustees to approve a provision for an annual reserve as a percentage of income, but found there was reasoned opposition from Aydelotte and Straus and others. No such provision was enacted.

But a Budget Committee was set up in the By-Laws in October, 1937, by which the Director was required to take the "recommendations" of the several schools for their needs, prepare a budget with them as submitted, and then consult about it with the Chairman of the Board and make such amendments as they deemed advisable. Thereupon the budget went to the Budget Committee of three members in addition to the Chairman, the Treasurer and the Director as members ex officio, with power to amend. No professor Trustee could be a member of this Committee. The Budget Committee submitted its recommendations to the Board. The Director had suggested in 1931 that he should consult the schools on their needs, but had received no answer. Now the Trustees had become increasingly aware of various pressures and were willing to see them met. The Director's explanation for the move was his expectation of more funds to conserve, and the need for more careful scrutiny than the Board could give the budget, as he told the Trustees. But he also confided to Dr. Aydelotte that it was necessary

to protect funds from the faculty, which tended to use up everything available, and for good purposes, indeed, but beyond the resources of the Institute to afford.[88]

The first Budget Committee, appointed with Mr. Bamberger's approval and announced in January, 1938, consisted of Messrs. Weed, Chairman, Aydelotte and Stewart, the Treasurer, and the Director.

CHAPTER VII - NOTES

1. The Treasurer's reports which are available indicate the Founders' gifts in cash and in securities at cost were as follows:

Up to and including 1/7/32	$5,324,866
Fiscal year 1933*.	404,856*
Fiscal year 1934	513,196
Fiscal year 1935	634,183
Total	$6,877,101
Fiscal year 1936	993,881
	$7,870,982

*figure derived. Treasurer's Reports for fiscal 1932, 1933, not available. But summary at 12/11/52 made derivation possible.

2. See Fosdick, op. cit., pp. 207 ff. Mr. Fosdick explained that though two of the Rockefeller foundations had spent considerable money in grants for research in the social sciences, and especially in economics, including subventions to the Social Science Research Council and the N.B.E.R., something seemed to be wrong with the programs. Therefore in 1934 he chaired a committee to study the matter. In its report it recommended the abandonment of programs in which research was an end in itself:

> "We are interested in research which is a means to an end, and the end is the advancement of human welfare... The mere accumulation of facts, untested by practical application, is in danger of becoming a substitute rather than a basis of collective action."

Fosdick says that thereafter two criteria guided the Foundation in its giving: (1) the subject must be socially significant; (2) it must be susceptible of "scientific" treatment.
This sounds much like Flexner's treatment of research in The Idea of a Modern University. It is of more than passing interest that the Foundation did not hasten to support Riefler's projected studies of November, 1935, which the Assistant Director of its Division of the Social Sciences favored.

3. The 10,000 shares of Macy common were valued at cost at $1,070,000 in the endowment. Approximately 3,400 shares were sold before February 29, 1932, when according to the Treasurer's Report, 6,599 remained. By August 31, 1932, only 1,100 shares remained. That the sale was debated in late July, with Leidesdorf and Maass opposed, seems clear from a note, Flexner to Maass, 8/2/32.

4. Report, Treasurer, 8/31/32. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/29/34, p. 11.

5. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/32, pp. 7-8. Ibid., 1/9/33, pp. 8-9.

6. Maass to Flexner, 7/10/33.

7. Interview with Walter Farrier.

8. Aydelotte to Flexner, 2/7/36. Maass to Flexner, 3/10/36.

9. See Leidesdorf to Hardin, 12/3/31. Hardin to Leidesdorf, 12/5/31. By informal agreement they turned the annual savings to capital account for immediate investment. The policy seemed to be acceptable to all.

10. Flexner to Riefler, 11/2/38. As for Professor Herzfeld's salary, he continued to receive $6,000 until 1938-1939, when Dr. Flexner adjusted it to $8,000, and then to $10,000 in 1939-1940.

11. Maass to Flexner, 8/18/37.

12. Veblen to Flexner, 10/17/32.

13. Infeld, op. cit., p. 294. A professor at the University was to comment humorously that the number of showers in Fine Hall might give some men an idea that the mathematicians did little but bathe.

14. Flexner to Veblen, 3/27/34; 4/13/34.

15. Veblen to Flexner, 4/12/34.

16. L. Bamberger to the Trustees, 4/23/34.

17. Minutes, Meeting of the Members of the Corporation, 4/23/34, p. 3. Flexner to Victor Morawetz, 4/24/34; 5/10/34. Morawetz to Flexner, 5/13/34.

18. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, pp. 6-8, 11-12.

19. Flexner to Veblen, 11/4/32.

20. Flexner to Veblen, 10/25/34.

21. Flexner to Veblen, 2/27/35; 3/2/35. Veblen to Flexner, 2/28/35.

22. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35. Appendix, p. 8.

23. Flexner to Veblen, 7/6/35.

24. Veblen to Flexner, 7/28/35.

25. Flexner to Veblen, 8/25/35.

26. Flexner to Dodds, 9/25/35.

27. Dodds to Flexner, 11/19/35. This letter was not presented to the Board until the 13th October, 1936. (Minutes, p. 14.)

28. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/14/35, pp. 1, pp. 6-7. Dodds to Flexner, 11/1/35. Flexner to Dodds, 12/10/35. No record is available of the discussions of the Joint Committee, except that Dr. Flexner told the Trustees on April 13, 1936, that the first took place at dinner at Prospect ten days before, and was pleasant and cordial. There were apparently further meetings. The meeting scheduled for April, 1937, was postponed. Whether it was held later does not appear.

29. Flexner to Veblen, 10/28/35.

30. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 10/28/35. Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.

31. L. Bamberger to Leidesdorf, 1/30/36; 1/31/36. Farrier to Flexner 1/10/36.

32. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 12-15.

33. Ibid., p. 12.

34. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/13/36, p. 7.

35. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 11-12.

36. Ibid.

37. Flexner to Weed, 10/15/36; 10/23/36; 11/17/36. Weed to Flexner, 10/19/36; 11/12/36; 11/21/36.

38. The memorandum is not available.

39. Flexner to Veblen, 10/31/36. See also Flexner, Memorandum, 10/23/36, showing results of his investigation, which may have been prompted as much by the discontent of the Trustees as by "Building the School of Mathematics." Veblen papers.

40. Ibid.

41. Veblen to Flexner, 11/5/36.

42. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36.

43. Ibid.

44. Minutes, S. M. meeting, 10/22/36; 2/23/37.

45. Flexner to Veblen, 11/11/36.

46. Flexner to Veblen, 12/4/36.

47. Veblen to Flexner, 12/4/36.

48. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 5. See Flexner to Veblen, 1/24/33. Veblen papers.

49. Robert A. Millikan, Autobiography, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950, p. 184. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, pp. 4-5.

50. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, p. 4.

51. Minutes, S. M., 10/8/35.

52. Statistics, S.M. 7/14/41. Aydelotte papers.

53. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 2/15/35.

54. Eisenhart to Flexner, 5/8/37.

55. Minutes, S. M., 2/23/37. The stipend fund was reduced in 1937-38 to less than $27,000.

56. Confidential Memorandum, cit., p. 16.

57. Minutes, S. M., 1/20/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 14. Treasurer's Report, Fiscal year 1937, Schedule 1.

58. Interviews. Infeld, op. cit., p. 299 ff.

59. Flexner to Veblen, 12/11/35; 12/20/35.

60. Veblen to Flexner, 12/19/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/23/35.

61. Flexner to Von Neumann, 11/22/35. Minutes, S. M. meeting, 12/14/35.

62. The point was important. Professor Veblen answered Flexner by saying that he had not called the meeting, but that the staff had, after reading Flexner's letter raising the questions in the first place. However, the School minutes say:

> "Professor Veblen informs the group that Dr. Flexner communicated to him his opinion
>
> a. To adopt the rule that only persons possessing the Ph. D. degree should be admitted to the Institute.
>
> b. That no part-time appointments should be made in future of assistants or stipend-holders (who at the same time undertake teaching obligations in the University....)"

And the discussion shows clearly that he did not cite the rest of Flexner's letter to support his position. It would seem natural that any discussion between Flexner and Von Neumann might disclose this.

63. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/1/33.

64. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, pp. 12, 15.

65. Flexner to Aydelotte, 2/7/36. Aydelotte papers.

66. Veblen, Memorandum (for Dr. Aydelotte), without date, a copy, giving Professor Veblen's account of all general meetings of faculty during Flexner's incumbency until 3/30/39 from 10/1/33. Veblen's papers. For this Professor Veblen took and kept various letters and memorandums from Institute files, thereby making them unavailable to succeeding Directors. Flexner to Panofsky, 2/12/36.

67. Flexner to Veblen, 3/6/36. Veblen papers.

68. Riefler and Veblen to Flexner, 3/14/36. Veblen papers.

69. Flexner, Memorandum No. 1, 3/31/36. Veblen papers.

70. Flexner, Memorandum No. 2, 3/31/36. Veblen papers. It was Professor von Neumann's recollection that Flexner had read Memorandum No. 2.

71. Ibid.

72. Riefler and Veblen to Flexner, 10/9/36. Veblen papers.

73. Flexner to Veblen, 11/2/36. Veblen papers.

74. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/8/36.

75. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36.

76. Veblen to Maass, 10/26/36.

77. Veblen to Maass, 12/14/36. Maass to Flexner, 12/22/36.

78. Flexner to Veblen, 1/6/37.

79. Ibid.

80. Flexner to Maass, 8/25/37.

81. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 2. Dodds to Flexner, 2/17/37. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, pp. 8, 9. Interview with Dr. Eisenhart.

82. Flexner to Riefler, 8/5/37; to Maass, 8/7/37; to Aydelotte, 8/17, 9/16, 9/20/37. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, p. 5.

83. Riefler, Memorandum on Professors' Housing, 12/3/36. S. E. P. papers.

84. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 10 ff.

85. Flexner to Maass, 2/3/37; to Leidesdorf, 2/12/37.

86. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 4/19/37.

87. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/24/38, p. 14 ff. Leidesdorf to Riefler, 10/14/38.

88. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, pp. 9-10, 12-13. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/19/37; to Maass, 8/25/37; to Straus, 9/29/37. Aydelotte to Flexner, 9/27/37. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/29/37.

CHAPTER VIII

DR. FLEXNER RETIRES

In the winter of 1937, the University appeared ready to allow the Institute to move the club house to another location, or to build another elsewhere and to give its site to the Institute. The Class of 1906, which had presented it to the University, and which still exerted a strong proprietarial interest over it, had steadily opposed the plan. The Founders had given no indication they were ready to relax their resolve against further additions to endowment, nor had they yet indicated any interest in financing a building on College Road.

Flexner's first step in the January meeting of the Board was to relate, as was usual with him, the various indicia of success in the functioning of the faculty: Professor von Neumann was to deliver the colloquim Lectures for the American Mathematical Society; Professor Herzfeld had won the acclaim of the Department of Fine Arts and the experts of the Metropolitan Museum for his lectures on the ancient arts of the Near East; Mr. Montagu Norman, of the Bank of England, was sending one of the Bank's officials, Mr. H. C. B. Mynors, to Princeton for a few months to study with Professor Riefler. A professor whom President Raymond Lyman Wilbur of Stanford University had sent East to study graduate education had spent some time at the Institute and had written enthusiastically about its meaning to advanced study in the United States, adding:

> I found a warm interest in your Institute among those with whom I talked all along the way. American higher education gives you and the Institute its endorsement and wishes you well.[1]

The Director was searching for space to rent which would house the libraries and collections of Professors Herzfeld and Lowe; he would be glad when the Institute owned its own building, which he said should be adequate not only for present needs but "for some years to come." As for the success of the schools then operating, he said in his most outspoken bid for money yet voiced:

> The ends which I have described have been obtained in three fields by an expenditure so modest that few persons connected with academic affairs would believe it possible. The total budget of the Institute for the current year is approximately $290,000. When one considers the budget of a university like Harvard or Columbia or Yale, which exceeds ten millions annually and is a larger sum by several millions than the total endowment of the Institute for Advanced Study, we have every reason to congratulate ourselves on what we have obtained in the way of productive scholarship and training with the cautious expenditure of a very modest sum.[2]

Aside from the perspective which this observation gave, it set the stage for his next efforts to increase the staff. In April he began what was to be an unremitting campaign for economics, although at first it included mathematical physics also. He considered the staffs in the humanities and mathematics stabilized for the time, he said, adding:

> Strangely enough, with the exception of Professor Einstein there does not appear, as far as I can learn, to be in any American institution of learning a man of first-rate capacity in this field. There are four or five in Europe, and it may be that one or perhaps two of them may ultimately be brought to Princeton to spend all his time. Under their leadership American talent can probably be discovered which will ultimately do in the field of mathematical physics what American talent is doing in. . .mathematics. The subject is one which lies very near to the heart of the mathematicians of both the University and the Institute, so that it is in no danger of being overlooked, but. . .the problem is not capable of easy or quick solution.[3]

The Director had just lost an appeal for Rockefeller funds to finance the addition of Niels Bohr and P. A. M. Dirac to the Institute's

staff for the next three years. Both had signified their interest in the plan, though Dirac's commitment to attend for the full time was not yet firm. Dr. Bohr had said he would attend for half of each year. After consideration Mr. Fosdick denied the request, on the ground that the International Education Board and the Rockefeller Foundation had subsidized the work of these scientists in their own countries. The Foundation could not see, he said, that the advancement of science would be aided by the arrangement Flexner suggested.[4]

Flexner's reports on the School of Economics and Politics for the past year had showed his embarrassment with the situation. In April, 1936, he had said that both Mitrany and Riefler were undecided about what they would do. This was a month after Riefler had demanded to know whether his program of research in finance proposed in November, 1935, would be authorized, with the staff he required, several months after the opportunity to get the support from the Founders had passed.[5] But Riefler must have become aware of that report when he attended his first Board meeting as a faculty Trustee in October, 1936, for at that meeting Flexner told the Trustees he had reports from both men which were "so thorough that it is extremely difficult to condense them." He therefore offered "to allow any member of the Board to read them in full if any one desires to do so."[6] Messrs. Aydelotte and Straus asked Professor Riefler for his, and his answer to Straus appears in the files. It was accompanied by copies of his memorandums to the Director of November, 1935, and the 13th March, 1936. He noted that work on the program was being held in abeyance pending the outcome of the studies in the National Bureau of Economic Research.[7]

Now as he reported on the School of Economis and Politics in

April, 1937, the Director said:

> The three men around whom this School has developed are in respect to endowment and experience admirable from every point of view, but it is clear that a subject like economics cannot be developed by a single person, even so able a person as Professor Riefler....From the very beginning I have urged Professor Riefler to be on the lookout for someone of the proper caliber who could be associated with him. From time to time, we have considered several persons, but, thus far, Professor Riefler's decision has been against adding anyone ...I continue to hope that, within the next year or two, one or two persons with the proper endowment and experience may be found and, if so, I shall not hesitate to bring the matter to the attention of the Board.[8]

Again, as in April, 1936, Mr. Stewart was present and Mr. Riefler was absent. There appears to have been no further clarification of the subject. But time was to show that the outstanding offer to Mr. Stewart, Riefler's former teacher, his senior and employer at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, was still pending, and that in this circumstance he had an opportunity neither to choose the staff aides or colleagues he would, nor to pursue the studies he had outlined.

The Director had called on the Founders at Murray Bay mainly with the idea of persuading them to underwrite an expansion in economics. Though he had succeeded in raising to the maximum the salaries of Professors Meritt and Riefler in January, because both were restive, he knew that Riefler's difficulty was his inability to do the research he had set his heart on doing. Flexner had a satisfactory series of talks with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, writing Riefler promptly:

> I was paying a week's visit to Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld ...I had previously sent them at Mr. Bamberger's request a memorandum which you will see later -- I don't want to bother you with it now -- outlining the future of the Institute as I now see it, subject, of course, to such changes as wisdom and experience suggest.

> I put in the very first place the development of the School of Economics and Politics. They were very much pleased with the whole memorandum and told me to go ahead. I am therefore enormously interested in your feeling that Stewart may be 'in the mood to drop Case Pomeroy and come with us.' If he has paid his promised visit, let me know whether this subject came up, and if so, how it stands.[9]

But Stewart had not paid the promised visit. Riefler would find out when he would come. Meanwhile Flexner confided something of his success to Mr. Maass; to neither man, however, did he mention the new building.

> I had a very interesting time with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, going over the past and sketching the future development of the Institute as far as it can now be foreseen. A point which I stressed...was the following: there are certain fields like mathematical physics, and economics and politics, in which, if we can find the men, we are prepared to advance now, but the resources of the Institute, -- principle and income -- should be expanded so we will have in hand money for future development and avoid expansion up to the limit of our income...This was a point of view in which Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld thoroughly sympathized. I feel that, if we can find the persons, there will be no doubt about the funds.[10]

To this Mr. Maass replied:

> The news...is of tremendous interest. I have always been confident of their intention ultimately to give us a substantially increased endowment...My only concern is that the program of expansion be enacted during the period of your own activities, and this I am most hopeful you will bring about.[11]

The Director sought to assure himself that the fine accord he had reached or approached closely with the aged Founders in the delightful cool and beauty of Murray Bay would remain in their memories, which were not as retentive as they had been. He wrote them enclosing a draft of a proposed letter to the Trustees, which evidently reflected their discussions, and clearly contemplated further gifts from them to endowment. But the burden was the conservation of those funds, in the interest of keeping the

Institute flexible and ready to expand in subject-matter or men as occasion offered. He talked in terms of an increase in income of $250,000 to $300,000 which could be profitably used within the next few years for logical development of the present schools. He told them that he was studying a by-law of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research to adapt it to the Institute's use; it would help control expenditures, and assure prompt reinvestment of any savings in operations.[12]

Flexner now showed impatience with Mr. Stewart's indecision, sending Riefler a list of English economists who had been recommended by Thomas Jones of the Pilgrim Trust, then visiting the Flexners in the Canadian woods, and asking him to comment on them for possible appointment to the Institute. The Professor discussed Jones' suggestions, noting that Stewart had not appeared, and he was writing to find out why,

> He is the most elusive person one can imagine. When I saw him last, early in July, he spoke quite confidently of going to England in the fall and of signing up Clay....That was one of the things that made me feel he had practically decided to come with us himself.[13]

Though Flexner had in the past tried to prevent anything interfering with his uninterrupted rest at Lake Ahmic, he spent this summer with reckless abandon, writing Dr. Aydelotte on several occasions of visits with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld at which they discussed the question of further endowment. His letters reflect a practical certainty that his efforts were successful.[14] He perfected proposed amendments to the By-Laws to establish a new procedure on budget and a new standing committee to handle it. But that was the only detail he confided, except that economics would be soon expanded; the other news he mentioned but would not impart until he and

Aydelotte could meet late in September. He introduced the proposed by-law to Maass as enabling the Board, "in the light of experience, to follow a more definite procedure than has been possible up to the present time," clearly in expectation of additional funds. To Aydelotte he wrote when his friend questioned a provision setting aside as an annual reserve an unspecified percentage of income:

> You know college faculties. They will spend anything they can lay their hands on, and probably to good purpose. But ...the head of an institution has to look to the future, and even to the distant future, and...to reserve something for a rainy day even though a fine immediate use could be found for it.[15]

He prepared for the October meeting with unusual care, briefing Dr. Aydelotte with parts of his prepared report, and suggesting that he speak his mind -- his own mind -- fully upon certain subjects, notably the proposed development of economics, and the new building. Aydelotte, clear in his own mind about the importance of both these things, did make his views known. Flexner began his report to the Trustees with the usual account of the professors' activities, finally telling them that he had very good news: the Founders wanted to finance a building for the Institute, without impairing its capital funds. He outlined a course of order which he thought would save the time of the Trustees and the staff, and make it unnecessary for any member of the faculty to spend time on the project:

> I propose to ask each of our three groups for a definite statement as to what accommodations and facilities they require now, and what would be a fair margin.../to/ cover needs that can be anticipated for some years to come. When these facts have been assembled and harmonized, they can be put in the hands of a competent architect....

> It is my hope...that this building should be named Fuld Hall, so as to commemorate both Mrs. Fuld and her late husband, Mr. Felix Fuld, and...Mr. Bamberger agrees....I have already mentioned this...to President Dodds, and he agrees with me in thinking that it will involve no lack of cooperation between the two institutions, each of which will continue to perform the functions for which it is best adapted, and both of which will continue to be mutually helpful in every possible direction.[16]

That he himself contemplated that Fuld Hall would house all the schools he made clear:

> I have had the feeling during recent months that we had now reached the point where a first building, accommodating the present activities of the Institute, while still maintaining close cooperation with the University, should be erected.[17]

Flexner also reported that the Founders had authorized him to "investigate the possibilities of calling in one or two eminent mathematical or theoretical physicists for the permanent staff," and added: "The same is true of the School of Economics and Politics." He would therefore look for two or three qualified economists. Beyond that, he ventured, history, languages, literature, and any or all of the natural sciences might be added. But none would be on the scale of the present School of Mathematics.[18]

Turning now to the subject of money, he noted that "a gentleman who is interested in Miss Goldman's work had offered to give the Institute the entire sum...required to complete the task on which she is engaged and to publish its results," and mentioned the receipt of $20,000 toward this end. In presenting the amendments to the By-Laws, he pointed to the need for more critical scrutiny by the Trustees than the full Board could give "as our resources increase."[19] The Board approved the draft amendments as they had been submitted with the agenda, but eliminated the provision for an annual reserve, and added the Treasurer to the members of the

Budget Committee. The Director was/now required to do what he had earlier asked permission to do -- to consult with the schools to learn their needs. He prepared the budget on the basis of these statements, and then conferred with the Chairman. They had power to amend and revise the document, after which it went to the Committee on the Budget, to consist of three members, and the Treasurer, the Chairman and the Director, ex officio. The Committee also had power to amend; its recommendations went to the Board. The Committee, announced in January, consisted of Messrs. Weed, Chairman, Aydelotte and Stewart.[20]

In the discussion period, Messrs, Aydelotte and Veblen were recorded as approving warmly of the proposed expansion, and the Board as expressing its gratification for the new building. Plans for the building received immediate attention. The School of Mathematics was first with its statement of needs, presented with considerable thoughtful detail eleven days after the Board meeting. The statement made two basic assumptions: (1) Fine Hall was to continue to be the center of mathematical activities for the Institute; (2) some of its personnel would be in Fuld Hall. Thus it was said:

> The mathematicians of the Institute are all anxious to continue and, if possible, to intensify their cooperation with the mathematicians of Princeton University. They consider therefore that such additional quarters as are provided in Fuld Hall are to be thought of as extensions of the facilities available to the mathematics group as a whole. There are several ways in which such extensions would be valuable.
>
> A number of studies could be offered to professors of the University, thereby making our relations more reciprocal in nature. It is obvious that the teaching obligations of members of the University staff will lead most of them to prefer Fine Hall, but it is not impossible that when Fuld Hall is actually in existence other considerations may outweigh this one. In particular, visiting lecturers, and professors of

> the University on leave of absence, may want to use the facilities of Fuld Hall. To make these quarters available to the University is therefore much more than an empty gesture.[21]

The School of Mathematics needed five large (18' by 24') studies, and ten smaller ones (17' by 18'); it would expect to place one or two professors there, whose studies at Fine Hall could then be used for conference rooms. More than these fifteen tooms could be "profitably and eagerly used." Should Fine Hall at some time be no longer available to the School of Mathematics, it would require twice the number of rooms in each category. Assistants' offices should adjoin the professors' studies. All clerical personnel and work should be transferred from Fine to Fuld Hall. But the School still hoped for realization of its earlier plans: "The mathematicians regard the erection of such a building near Fine Hall as the ideal solution of their problems."[22]

Another memorandum, dated the 5th November, resulted from consultation between the School of Economics and Politics and the School of Mathematics. It presented a slightly broader view of Fuld Hall's role: it was to be the center of the Institute's activities, with the hope that informal day-to-day contact between the faculties and members of the three Schools might be a fundamental factor in the Institute's future development. Cooperation with the University was still contemplated, however. The memorandum enumerated the basic accommodations which Fuld Hall should offer, and gave some standards for those which should be common to all: three conference or seminar rooms, a lecture room, a common room, a dining or lunch room. It mentioned but did not define the needs of the Director's office and the School of Humanistic Studies, details for which were apparently not completed.

The section dealing with the School of Mathematics emphasized the importance of continuing most of the School's studies and activities at Fine Hall:

> It is important that in providing adequate space for the School of Mathematics and mathematical physics we do not sacrifice objectives which are close to the heart of what the Institute is trying to accomplish. We have in the School of Mathematics at present a living embodiment of these ideals. In Fine Hall there are gathered under one roof a most distinguished group of resident scholars, namely the permanent faculties...Each year there are mingled with them a temporary group of scholars from other seats of learning all over the world. All of these scholars have at least obtained the Ph. D. level of proficiency. An important constituent represents a level of distinction as high as that sought for in the permanent resident faculty. Because of the advantages afforded by the layout of Fine Hall, this group is able to function at a high level of efficiency with a minimum of organization and mechanism. The factor of propinquity alone provides an intellectual stimulus of mind on mind through informal day-to-day contacts that would be difficult if not impossible to replace through more highly organized procedures.[23]

Stress was laid upon the crowding in Fine Hall, and the lack of suitable offices for the use of "distinguished visitors."

The School had now, however, decided to divide its staff and members between the Institute and the University. Admittedly this would compromise the opportunity for daily informal association between some of the professors and members who would remain at Fine Hall, and the people in the other schools. It was still asserted that the best solution was for the Institute to provide studies adjoining Fine Hall for all the School of Mathematics activities. If that could not be done, the next best thing was to place two members of the faculty in Fuld Hall, and the three additional theoretical physicists together with some of the members. Fuld Hall should be provided with a modern mathematics library, to cost $40,000 in the first year, and $5,000 annually after that. The

plans were designed to encourage the professors to work in their studies, instead of at home, "thus making them more accessible to students and colleagues."[24]

Plans for the School of Economics and Politics were stated very simply: one large and one smaller study for each of the three professors, and one large and two smaller rooms for each additional staff member, and for the accommodation of clerical work, books, etc. They became a little more complex, however, when Professor Veblen insisted that all rooms should be interchangeable for staff purposes: i.e., each must have the fixed blackboard and special lighting so necessary to mathematicians.[25] Professors Veblen and von Neumann estimated that the plans being developed would require 600,000 cubic feet, and cost $600,000. The Founders wisely refrained at first from setting any monetary limit on the building but awaited plans and estimates. Flexner, however, expressed fear that the plans were going to be too costly as he heard them discussed informally.[26] Mr. Maass as Chairman of the Committee had embarked on the difficult task of securing plans from several selected architectural firms without breaching the rules of the American Institute of Architects against competitions. The Institute retained each of five firms to make plans on the basis of a close study of the Institute and the statements of its needs. Mr. Bamberger advanced $50,000 to meet these expenses.

By the end of January, 1938, Flexner allowed himself to make a very firm statement to the Board:

> The time has come when, in my judgment, funds should be made available so that this School /the School of Economics and Politics/ can...be enlarged.[27]

This followed the usual impressive recital of Institute activities. He returned to the need for developing the School of Economics and Politics, pointing to the foundation of the National Institute for Economic and Social Research in England under the leadership of Sir Josiah Stamp, and the endowment of Nuffield College at Oxford, as well as other events showing the determination of the English to gain more knowledge in these fields. Twice he alluded to his imminent retirement, and said that before that should happen, he hoped to see the School of Economics and Politics made equal in strength to its sister schools. It was true, he admitted, that "We shall probably never reach the degree of certainty in the social sciences that we seem to have attained in other realms, but that is no reason for refraining from the attempt." This probably was directed at the essence of Mr. Bamberger's reluctance. He quoted no less an authority than Professor Einstein as saying that the Princeton "is the Paris of mathematics" at the present time -- the "fashion." How long would it remain so?

> 'With our present group,' he said, 'perhaps twenty or twenty-five years. Then as men drop out, they must be replaced with younger men who approach the subject from a different point of view, for mathematics, like every other science, is a changing science and in order to keep in the lead we must be prepared, as the physicists and chemists and biologists are prepared, to modify our point of attack...'[28]

Flexner wrote Aydelotte, who was absent, something more than the minutes of that discussion reveal:

> Stewart led off an admirable discussion of the present state of economic teaching and theory in this country and Europe and an exposition of the service the Institute might render if it developed economics as it developed mathematics. Riefler followed. Veblen and others took part. You will find in the minutes a brief indication of what was said. Of course, the kind of development that Stewart urges will require additional endowment, and I have had a brief talk with Mr. Bam-

> berger...I am going to New York on Tuesday to see Stewart ...to go further into the thing with him. I shall then try to see whether the various foundations are disposed to contribute towards the capital sum, for without fresh capital we shall simply have to wait.[29]

To the Trustees Flexner said that while he hoped gifts would come,

> I feel that I shall have to devote a considerable part of the remainder of this year to procuring the funds needed to bring...the School of Economics and Politics up to the level of the School of Mathematics, for under no circumstances should we take any steps to help the two later schools at the expense of the first through which the Institute has really made its initial reputation.[30]

Flexner's trip was unsuccessful; neither the Rockefeller Foundation nor any other appeared willing to contribute funds. Perhaps the discussion with Stewart revealed clearly what appears with fair certainty to have been understood at the end of the previous summer: that Mr. Stewart was indeed, as Riefler had said, preparing to come to the Institute. But the president of Case, Pomeroy and Company died in the autumn, and Stewart assumed his office for a period of months. Despite the Foundation's interest in the social sciences, it is understandable that Mr. Stewart would prefer to set the pattern for any expansion in the School, which made it natural for the Foundation to withhold any assistance for the time being.

Dr. Flexner found it necessary at the January meeting to advert to the awful examples of race prejudice being practised by Hitler, and to the need to resist the evils of bigotry and intolerance whenever they appeared in the United States. He continued:

> There is no fitter arena in which this battle for decency and tolerance can be fought than is furnished by institutions of learning. I have myself no fear for the future of American universities on this score. Faculties...have practically without exception long since risen above denominational or racial prejudice...Decisions unfavorable to this or that person are often based upon merely the enforce-

ment of high standards, and it is frequently a face-saving gesture on the part of the unfortunate individual to attribute his ill success to intolerance. Our own American boards of trustees have been singularly and uniformly loyal ...to the terms on which endowments have been placed in their keeping.

There is no instance, as far as I know, in which a board of Trustees has violated either the will or the wish of a founder. In the case of our Institute Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld set their ideals high, and I do not believe that anyone connected with the Institute for Advanced Study in any capacity whatsoever will ever forget or lose sight of the noble words contained in the letter to their Trustees which marked the beginning of the Institute:

> 'It is fundamental in our purpose, and our express desire, that in the appointments to the staff and faculty as well as in the admission of workers and students, no account shall be taken, directly or indirectly, of race, religion, or sex. We feel strongly that the spirit characteristic of America at its noblest, above all the pursuit of higher learning, cannot admit of any conditions as to personnel other than those designed to promote the objects for which this institution is established, and particularly with no regard whatever to accidents of race, creed, or sex.'[31]

There was, unfortunately, a reason for this homily, as there usually was when the Director's reports mentioned something which seemed to be quite irrelevant to the regular course of business. During the preceding holidays he had been consulted three times, he wrote Aydelotte, by the "two most useful Trustees" of the Institute, about their fear that Princeton University was basically anti-Semitic. They did not suggest that the Institute leave Princeton, or cease its scholarly cooperation with the University's faculty. They suggested instead that as a safeguard against a possible invasion of such prejudice within the Institute at some time in future when the Founders and Flexner were no longer there, the faculty should elect its own Trustees. Indeed, one of the two men said that he believed the School of Mathematics should be moved out of Fine

Hall as soon as Fuld Hall was completed. The Director assured them that he had found no evidences of anti-Semitism among the officers of the University, with whom he had worked closely. He had opposed election of professor trustees by the faculty on the ground that it would not achieve the purpose for which it was being urged, and repeated the arguments he had expressed earlier to the faculty itself: viz., it would tend to promote within the Board a division of interests in a legal sense, whereas Trustees should be concerned with the interests of the Institute as a whole. Furthermore, it would tend to promote academic politics, in which inferior men -- if there were ever any at the Institute -- might gain superior position; such politics might split the faculty. As for the School vacating Fine Hall, he had said he felt the decision must be left to each man, for two professors had already said they wanted to remain close to Palmer Hall. But if the Institute moved for such a reason, Panofsky and his members would have to leave McCormick Hall, without whose facilities art-historians could not work in Princeton. Having thus answered the two Trustees, Flexner confidentially consulted not only Aydelotte, but also Weed, asking their opinion as to the charge against the University, and their ideas of what to do.[32]

Dr. Aydelotte agreed in general with the stand Flexner had taken, but suggested that perhaps behind all this there was a meaning: i.e., that the faculty should be given more voice in the management of academic affairs. He noted that anti-Semitism was on the rise in the country, but thought it was not strong in educational institutions, and not a real factor at Princeton. He suggested rotation of faculty members as Trustees for three-year terms, or some such device as meetings between faculty and

the Board on such matters as the proposed withdrawal from Fine Hall.[33] Dr. Weed, Flexner told Aydelotte, took the same attitude as to the existence of prejudice at Princeton as he had, and agreed generally with the Director's answers to the Trustees, except that he was inclined not to favor faculty trustees at all. Flexner pointed out the difficulties of the rotation idea. First, few professors would be interested in or able to contribute to the Board's work. Second, the useful professors were needed for longer terms. Professor Veblen's first term was drawing to a close just as his advice on the building of Fuld Hall was most needed. Mr. Bamberger valued the services of Riefler on the Finance Committee, and felt that he contributed a great deal to it. Besides, several of the Faculty would be retired before they got a chance at being a Trustee on any rotation basis. But Flexner's relief over the consensus that Princeton University was not notably anti-Semitic was so great that he was inclined to minimize Aydelotte's caution.[34]

He wound up his comments by speculating on what could have stimulated such an approach on the part of the two Trustees who had consulted him, who were not mentioned by name but appeared beyond doubt to be Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass. Obviously, it was not the kind of solution to the problem (if they had been aware of Princeton University's quality of thought) which they would be likely to think of themselves. That Flexner doubted the concern originated with them is shown by his one observation as to their motivation:

> It is in the highest degree unfortunate that anyone's experience in practical business here in New York should have led him to raise with me these questions...but now that they have been raised, it is most fair to me and to my successor that such fears and suspicions be faced while I am here to combat them.[35]

Who, then, could have raised the spectre? The question, not asked, was likewise unanswered. But the record is not yet complete.

That there was some anti-Semitic sentiment at the University was probably true. But its extent and strength seems not to have been remarkable or noteworthy. It was Flexner's conviction that one faced such manifestations with cold reason and a determination not to let emotion color the vision as to their extent or depth or to affect one's own actions. Thus he had overcome the combative concept of the Founder's first intent in choosing a philanthropy for the benefit of Jews preferentially. Flexner conceded that some prejudice was probably felt by occasional members of the alumni and faculty, but he could not believe that this constituted an indication that cooperation with the University should be sacrificed, with all its patent benefits to both institutions. Besides, he knew -- no one better -- that some hostility there derived from the early staffing activities of the School of Mathematics. Since he himself had led this in taking a most valuable faculty member from the University in the person of Veblen, there was little he could say about Veblen's continued drawing upon the fount. But as his friend Capps had said frankly, Flexner had "robbed" the University of one of its best men; when that number increased by two, with the accompanying destructive intrigue, it can be understood that even today there is a distinct resentment against the Institute for that episode, and a feeling of chagrin that it could happen and Princeton could not interfere.

One continuing reminder of what was interpreted as an effort to placate the University for something -- those who arrived on the Institute's faculty later than the first three appointees would have no reason to know

what -- lay in the subsidizing of members who worked exclusively in and for the Department of Art and Archaeology when the Institute was pinched for funds. Enough has been said of that in Chapter VI to indicate that this was a particular problem to the humanists who had to rely upon their own or the Director's efforts to garner money from the foundations for stipends, and to underwrite publication costs of their books. The Director bore most of these burdens, which were as distasteful to him as to anyone. But it stood for all to see that to a certain extent the Department of Art and Archaeology called a brisk tune -- and the Director danced. This afforded a perfect opportunity for anyone to interpret the situation according to his own lights.

The winter of 1938 found the Director taking strenuous measures to avoid spending funds which had not been budgeted. He had to deny the School of Mathematics a sum for the salary of a brilliant scholar for three to five years of residence whom he wanted to see at the Institute as much as did the School. He asked that all lapsed stipend funds be returned to the Treasury. He wrote Professor Veblen:

> I hate more than I can say to place a limitation of this kind on you and your group, but in the...financial situation we have to hew to the line. I myself regret that we have embarked on a building project, though we undoubtedly need a building and I can see that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld would like to see us housed.[36]

But Flexner felt hopeful after visiting the Founders in February; they seemed cordial to his plans for economics, but offered no definite help. To Flexner's account of these meetings which showed some discouragement, Maass wrote:

> As to funds, they will ultimately come, as I have always assured you, even though one cannot now predict when they will be donated.[37]

But at the end of March, strong action seemed to be warranted in the view of certain members of the Finance Committee, in order to increase the income of the Institute and to broaden the base of its investments. The Executive Committee approved a measure which provided that securities ordered sold by the Finance Committee could be endorsed by the Treasurer and any other member of the Committee, or, in the absence of the Treasurer, by any two members of the Committee. Since Leidesdorf, Maass and Riefler constituted a majority of the Committee their power to order such transactions was clear. The minutes show that the meeting took place in Mr. Maass' office; the resolution was signed by all the appointed members: Weed, Chairman, Edgar Bamberger, Leidesdorf and Miss Sabin. Maass was a member ex officio. No mention was made of the presence of the Founders. Notice was duly waived by the signatories.[38] The action was unusual and disturbing. Flexner wrote Veblen the next day that he had conferred at length on finances in New York and Newark, and added:

> In view of the steady decline in the income from securities and the inevitable indefiniteness regarding the amount that will be required to build Fuld Hall, I am under the necessity of recommending to the Budget Committee...a budget from which every possible item has been excised...Nothing will come out of our current income towards the payment for the new building, but indirectly we are nevertheless affected by what may prove to be a considerable non-productive investment.[39]

Subsequent events made it clear that this meant the Institute must now advance the construction costs of Fuld Hall from its slender capital, although it was apparently still understood that the Founders would reimburse it. But since the plans were not yet complete, and no agreement had been reached with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld as to what amount they would be prepared to pay, the situation was distinctly uncomfortable.

Meanwhile, Flexner continued to exercise his persuasions on Mr. Bamberger to support expansion in economics. He quoted scripture, sending the annual Report of the Rockefeller Foundation in which Mr. Fosdick had said that, difficult as it would be, the Foundation must develop the social sciences. Flexner added:

> I think of our problem day and night, and I cannot avoid the conclusion that there is no institution in the world which enjoys the advantages that we have...for we have no routine obligations such as create difficulties in colleges and universities.[40]

He told the Founder that he was seeing the President of the Rockefeller Foundation to ask for financial aid. The fruit of this visit was merely a letter from Mr. Fosdick to Mr. Bamberger congratulating him and Mrs. Fuld on the Institute, and encouraging them in its further development.

The Budget Committee met on the 7th April. Mr. Houghton, who had reviewed the recommendations with Dr. Flexner, sat with the Committee, which "scrutinized the proposed budget, item by item." The minutes reported:

> In view of the distinction which the Institute has obtained, it was the opinion of the Budget Committee that the total expenditures contemplated were modest in the extreme. The Treasurer stated that two independent outside agencies had conservatively extimated the probable income of the present endowment for next year: one at $328,000, the other at $330,000. There is, of course, a chance that, unless business improves, the income may fall below the estimates ...The question, therefore, arose as to how the situation should be met in view of the fact that no one can be absolutely sure. Several decisions were arrived at:
>
> 1. The Chairman of the Board is of the opinion... that the present financial situation is primarily political rather than economic.
>
> 2. The voting of the proposed budget...cannot create a deficit of any considerable proportion, if any.

> 3. If a deficit actually exists at the end of the year, the following year's budget should be decreased unless additional funds are procured.
>
> 4. In view of such financial uncertainty as exists, no commitments should be made.../for/ stipends for the year 1939-40, now or at the October meeting.
>
> 5. Stipends for the year 1938-39 represent commitments made.../by/ the Board in October, 1937, and cannot now be modified; but in case any stipends already awarded for /that year/ lapse, no additional appointments should be made, but the sum saved should be returned to the Treasurer.
>
> 6. The policy which the Board has pursued in previous years, namely, passing a budget which is well within the calculated income of the Institute, is sound, but on the other hand, gradual development of an institute which within the period of five years has shown such vitality cannot be and should not be prevented.
>
> 7. On the basis of the foregoing consideration the Committee recommends that the budget for the year 1938-39 be fixed at the sum of $330,000.[41]

The Founders were not present, nor was Mr. Stewart. Messrs. Houghton, Maass, Leidesdorf and Flexner attended as members ex officio. The estimates included no provision for additional staff, and showed the use of some $16,000 in grants from foundations.

The Board met eleven days later, and again Mr. Bamberger was absent, as were five other Trustees and Mrs. Fuld, who had been too ill to attend any meetings after January, 1937. Dr. Flexner made the record again for the Founders:

> Whatever may happen in Europe, America will not 'go to the dogs' and if it does, then it is immaterial whether funds are in the possession of individuals, or corporations, or foundations, or educational institutions, for the loss which overwhelms one...will overwhelm all.[42]

Therefore, he had decided it was the duty of the Institute to "go forward ...placing the School of Economics on a more adequate basis."

> Through good fortune, such as I had no reason to anticipate with assurance, though for seven years I have eagerly looked forward to it, we can in the near future probably associate with ourselves in the department of economics two or three men/...of genius, of unusual talent, and of high devotion./ I am not prepared to state the absolute amount which will be needed to secure them...but the amount will not at first, in my judgment, exceed annually $50,000 or $60,000 in addition to our present expenditures.
>
> I propose, therefore, to ask the Board to authorize me to take such steps as may be necessary to place...economics upon a basis approximately equivalent to that of the other two departments. That will involve getting the men and raising the funds.[43]

A discussion followed, in which six Trustees participated: Aydelotte, Riefler, Weed, Hardin, Veblen and Maass. Only the first two are reported as having spoken in favor of the Director's intention to present a resolution. Because of the obvious lack of a consensus favoring his plan, it was apparently not proposed. Mr. Riefler's remarks presented a new reason and program for economic research, indicating that he knew he would never be enabled to study the depression period:

> There is a special timeliness about developing economic study at this time because various countries are engaged in different types of economic experimentation. But nowhere is there a group of detached and highly trained scholars who are in a position to study their methods and their results....To understand what is actually taking place would be an enormous service to every government in the world. Schacht, for example, has in Germany done things nobody believed could be done....What has been the...real result? No one knows...[44]

The Board authorized the Director to travel in Europe to "find out what they are doing, how they view the problems, and...to establish cooperative relations."[45] The Director sailed on the 11th May and returned at the end of June. He interviewed men in Geneva, France, and England. He was tired and discouraged, and wrote memorandums which, while they showed he welcomed the knowledge he was getting, and appeared

to receive complete confirmation of the wisdom of his planning, also commented on the fact that he had for the past thirty years been on annual tenure, spending much of his time "tramping around the universe." It caused him to speculate on the merits of professorial tenure in the United States, where a man was safe whether he produced or not. He concluded he would favor transplanting the English system to America; men did their work on five or seven year appointments, secure in the knowledge that if they produced, the term would be extended.

From Alexander Loveday, head of the Section on Transit and Economics of the League of Nations, and Harold Butler, Director of the International Labor Organization, he received approval and support for what he was trying to accomplish in the Institute's economic program. Each said that such work might be done in very few countries: the United States, Great Britain, Sweden, perhaps the Low Countries. But in Germany, Russia and Italy, economics was subordinated to arbitrary political doctrine. In England A. D. Lindsay agreed with the "clinical" idea, but found it difficult to conceive how a man could be at once in and not of the worlds of government and finance; he must not err by spending his time "running around," nor yet be content to sit in an office to study documents and statistics. Flexner was reminded of Riefler's excellent concept of the Institute as a "center of stimulus" for the organization of researches, reaching qualified men and institutions where they were and weaving their contributions into the central scheme. Here Flexner observed to himself:

> I am convinced now more strongly than I ever was before of the soundness of taking men like Riefler and Stewart, who know theory and who have had practical experience, and putting them in a position...where they are free either

> to read and study at Princeton, or to go out with one another or with their own advanced workers to observe, on the spot, practical difficulties and problems.[46]

Flexner was encouraged to write Veblen of his hope that, "with the help which has been freely and candidly given, we may do something worthwhile...in economics."[47] He had been in Europe a month, part of the time with Riefler and Stewart in England, when he received a letter from Maass which read in part:

> At this stage I think I must say to you that I hope you are making no commitments in connection with the Department of Economics, for Mr. Bamberger seems a bit hazy about what, if any, agreement he made with you regarding his obligation in connection with its explansion. I am sure, when you return, you will be able to clear up in his mind whatever doubt may be lingering there regarding the nature of his discussions with you...for I know that you will feel that you want them cleared up before you incur any direct obligation. This, of course, does not mean that he is opposed to the expansion plan, but merely that as he discussed the matter with Leidesdorf and me, we did not get from him the same idea as we had from you as to your understanding with him.[48]

What the state of his understandings with Mr. Bamberger was when he left is not known. Nor is it apparent that he had not already offered positions to Messrs. Stewart and Clay by this time. And whether he was informed there for the first time that Stewart expected and even exacted the appointment of his friend and associate, Robert B. Warren, on the same terms as his, is not certain. But evidently Flexner's doubts were chilling when he received a letter from Riefler, still in Europe, saying that

> Clay is taking your offer <u>very</u>, <u>very</u>, seriously. He said that he had never really contemplated it before, but that suddenly it had become quite real, that he felt like accepting it at once, and the only thing that kept him from it was his general worn-out condition -- he felt he really ought to wait until after his vacation before he made up his mind.[49] (Emphasis his)

Riefler said that Clay was overcoming his wife's reluctance to

leave England with the reflection that they could spend the long vacations at home. To this Flexner replied he would expect Clay to "domesticate" himself in the United States if he accepted.[50] Though Riefler disagreed with this idea, he imparted the information as best he could to Clay at Flexner's request. In the event, Clay did not decide to come before the "peace" of Munich, and thereafter could not leave.[51]

On the return trip to the United States, Riefler had good opportunity to observe Stewart in company with Warren and Leo Wolman, an economist of Columbia, and one of Stewart's companions in the old group around Thorstein Veblen. Flexner's letter informing Riefler that Stewart had accepted his appointment crossed the following from Riefler in the mails. Flexner's letter was an obvious effort to cheer Riefler because of the "close association you will have with your teacher and friend, whom you love and trust and admire."[52] Riefler's message, on the contrary, was freighted with explicit misgivings, which one feels had been made known to Flexner long since.

> I saw a great deal of Wolman and Warren and Stewart together ...and feel that you should consider seriously adding Wolman as well as Warren to the group. This differs radically from my original suggestions, because at that time I was trying to work out a group which would be able to focus on all the varied problems of the economic scene from a rather unified point of view, mainly finance. It was from this point of view that I wrote the recommendations which I submitted to you. Personally I feel that these recommendations represent the most effective type of activity which we could undertake,
>
> It is now clear, however, that I failed to convince Stewart. Consequently I do not want to impede the setting up of an effective unit in economics by continuing to make recommendations in terms of an objective which has already been more or less passed by. The most important requirement after all is that the Institute possess a group that can work together effectively. If additional appointments are made in economics they should carry out this group idea,

> otherwise it would be better to turn the endowment to other uses...
>
> I was continually struck...with how much more ready Stewart was to enter into free and open economic discussions with Wolman than with anyone else with whom I have observed him in recent years. It made me realize as never before how much the interplay of his mind with Wolman's meant to him.
>
> If he is to work effectively again in our field, he simply must have this kind of interplay and I think we should do all we can to give it to him.[53]

This reached Flexner in the Canadian woods just as he was making a supreme effort to rally Mr. Bamberger to his standard. He seemed crushed by it; he would have to rest, he said, before thinking further of the matter, for decisions taken then would have to be lived with for a long time, and it was best to consider well before going further. The thought was a bit late.

His letter to Mr. Bamberger was truly inspirational as to the success he expected from Stewart's re-entry into academic life at the Institute. He reiterated that no institution ever had the opportunity enjoyed by the Institute to penetrate into the inwardness of economic facts. He did not mention his offers to Clay and Warren. His appeal was emotional as well as practical. He capped his arguments with the following:

> You have both demonstrated your faith in me many, many times ...Now, in probably the last field which I shall initiate, I need your faith once more...After long years of waiting we have secured a leader who is universally regarded by those most competent to judge as the ablest person in Europe or America. I believe in Stewart, in his wisdom, his judgment, in his modesty, and in his absolute devotion to the search for truth....
>
> I write this letter with a good deal of emotion. I realize that I am no longer young, and it has not been easy for me to wait, but I realize also that we must start with the best....That we have accomplished now by being patient and in being satisfied with nothing short of the best....[54]

Mr. Bamberger's answer was reassuring:

> From the past you are aware of my propensity for letter writing, but today I could not refrain from personally acknowledging yours of the 16th. Mrs. Fuld and I enjoyed this one even more than usual, not only in your announcement of Stewart's message to you, but rather the youthful enthusiasm that seemed to me to pervade the entire letter. We also feel that the Institute is entering on a new chapter of its work. Let us hope that our past success will continue. Thanks to you...[55]

When the Board met in October it was clear that Flexner had reached an accord with the Founders about the financing of the new staff members. It was also clear that the work of the three economists was to be based in part upon the fact-finding work at the National Bureau of Economic Research, for he read a letter from Dr. Willitts complimenting Mr. Riefler for his "imaginativeness, inventive-mindedness and experience" which had made the Bureau's researches at Hillside a marked success. Without specifically adopting the suggestion recently made by Riefler changing the period of investigations in finance from the controversial era of the inflation of the twenties and the depression to contemporary phenomena in pre-war Europe, Flexner announced that the Bureau had $670,000 for the gathering of data, and that he had accepted a suggestion from it that the theoreticians might be brought to Princeton to develop and then to report on the studies cooperating with the faculties of the Institute and the University.

Flexner's biographical sketch of Stewart was not particularly enlightening; the main achievement in international finance which he referred to was that which had been publicized: his participation in the Committee on Reparations under the Young Plan for the Bank for International Settlements. It was clear he knew no more than that. Mr. Warren, he said,

had graduated from Hamilton College, taught briefly in Constantinople, and had then studied history and economics under Taussig at Harvard. His close connection with Mr. Stewart for the past sixteen years in "practical affairs" made him, Flexner said, familiar with both theory and practice. Then the Director gave notice of financial support of the appointments:

> I realize, of course, that additional financing will now be required, and I am fortunately in position to assure the Board that the requisite sum of money will be forthcoming whenever they enter upon their active duties -- probably not before January 1, 1939.[56]

After some further remarks on the same subject, notably that the University had just called Dr. Oskar Morgenstern, formerly of Vienna, to its work in economics, he nominated Stewart and Robert B. Warren to be professors of the Institute in the School of Economics and Politics, but without presenting the resolutions embodying terms of their employment. Discussion followed, in which Drs. Riefler and Aydelotte spoke in favor of the appointments. Mr. Maass then said that

> Mr. Bamberger had had some hesitation about the part of the Institute in trying to bring order out of chaos in the field of economics, but that after having gone over the subject with the Director and others he had become convinced that this is a noble effort which the Institute is about to undertake.[57]

Mr. Bamberger went a step further, speaking for himself and saying that

> He had been in doubt as to whether the School of Economics could bring about substantial results; that it was his understanding that the teaching of economics in our universities had thus far not given satisfactory results; but after discussing the matter at length with the Director and others, and after hearing the remarks of Mr. Riefler and Mr. Aydelotte, he realized that the results of this experiment might inure to the benefit of the whole world, and he was convinced that the Institute was not only justified in undertaking the task, but ought to undertake it. He assured the Board of the cooperation of Mrs. Fuld and himself.[58]

The minutes next placed Mr. Veblen on the record:

> Mr. Veblen expressed his pleasure at this move in economics and said that it would be welcomed warmly by all of his colleagues.[59]

Thereupon, the resolutions for the appointments with their terms were presented and adopted.[60] It was significant that both appointments were at the maximum salary rate, which had not been granted for an initial appointment since Dr. Weyl's second appointment. Though that might have been justified for Stewart, there was little to support it for Mr. Warren, whose record and accomplishments certainly fell far short of his sponsor's. Moreover, it was obvious by this time that neither the Founders nor the Rockefeller Foundation were giving endowment to meet the expenses just incurred; the contributions were to be to income account evidently. An exceedingly dangerous and unstable arrangement, considering his uncertain memory and the almost capricious reactions to events of which Mr. Bamberger seemed presently capable. Perhaps it was in recognition of these facts that Mr. Leidesdorf circulated a very detailed statement of Institute finances, and that Dr. Weed suggested

> the Institute should publish once a year a financial statement showing a schedule of its securities, as is common practice with philanthropic and educational institutions.[61]

Since this evidently was not a motion, no action was taken then.

Peace hovered briefly over the Institute. Flexner wrote happily to Miss Goldman at Tarsus giving her the good news:

> We have received a gift, entirely independent of other resources, which will enable us to construct the first building of the Institute and will provide a fund to maintain it. We also have assurance of independent funds for the development in the field of economics. The last

meeting of the Board was therefore a memorable one, and I am sending you a copy of the news release.[62]

Until Flexner had left for Europe, no monetary limit had been set on the building. It was virtually certain that the Committee would choose Mr. Jens Frederick Larson of Hanover, New Hampshire, as architect. Shortly after Flexner's departure Dr. Aydelotte reported something definite to Maass.

> Mr. Bamberger stated that all the plans and estimates he had heard went far beyond the figure which originally he had in mind. I asked him what this figure was, and he said $300,000, including the $50,000 which he had already given....He would really like us to build for $250,000, retaining $40,000 for furnishings which, with the $10,000 spent on these four architects already would make a total of $300,000. I think Mrs. Fuld is less concerned about economy, but she is extremely anxious that no decision should be reached which would trouble Mr. Bamberger.
>
> My own thought is that we should...cut down our plans to fit this estimate...The only thing I can think of is to lessen the size of the central building...leaving off the wings...[63]

On hearing this news Professor Veblen established the priorities as he saw them; to satisfy the needs of the humanists first, of the School of Economics and Politics and adminstration next, then accommodations for the temporary members, and finally, space for the School of Mathematics. Aydelotte suggested that 69 Alexander and the Olden Manor be used. For it was obvious that the sum Mr. Bamberger mentioned was far below costs of current plans.[64] But Mr. Maass encountered such stern opposition from Professor Veblen when a reduction in the size of studies was mentioned that he found himself unable to proceed with the economies he knew must come, and counseled awaiting the return of Flexner. Mr. Bamberger said that if his figures were observed, he would give something for maintenance

and upkeep.[65]

Flexner's first conversation with Mr. Bamberger on his return from Europe yielded the information that $100,000 more would be allowed, including an amount needed to capitalize costs of maintenance and upkeep.[66] Reduction of features of the current plans was still necessary. The Director disposed of the bogeyman which had paralyzed Maass earlier; Professor Veblen's statement that if the studies were not made "attractive" and large the staff would prefer to work at their homes. Veblen and Alexander were occupying two of the largest offices in Fine Hall, and Veblen had greeted Flexner's first comments with the observation that environment undoubtedly had a more profound effect upon him than upon the Director. Flexner now wrote: "Weyl is happier in a room smaller than yours, and Johnny is productive in a room smaller than Weyl's." A room of one's own, he thought, was more important than an oversized one.[67] But Veblen continued to maintain that the professors' studies must be large enough to accommodate spontaneous meetings, thus proving their value to mathematical thought. Nevertheless, some of the larger studies were reduced in size in the economizing which proceeded as the Committee on Buildings and Grounds decided formally on the 21st July to select Mr. Larson and his plans.[68] Before that happened, however, Flexner suggested that Mr. Maass arrange a meeting between the Founders and Mr. Larson. Mr. Bamberger seemed to appreciate the consideration, and Mr. Larson was able to persuade the Founders of the virtues of his plans.

There was a brief flurry between Aydelotte, Flexner and Maass in September, occasioned by Mr. Larson's belief that the Fuld Hall would be

better placed just off Mercer Street, rather than in the low-lying meadows of Olden Farm. This would entail the purchase of the Maxwell property, which had a four hundred foot frontage on Mercer Street just west of the professors' housing lots. Dr. Flexner started the discussion; he was willing to pay from the Institute's own funds the $200,00, asked by Mr. Maxwell. The three men agreed to take the matter up in the Finance Committee meeting of the 22nd September, but Mr. Bamberger's mood forbade.[69] For another demand was being made on the capital of the Institute at that time.

It will be recalled that Professor Veblen had suggested in 1932 that his and his wife's pensions be insured to guarantee the amount above that expected from Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. Flexner had duly investigated the cost, and probably reported it to the Board. or at least to Mr. Bamberger whom he had informed of his inquiry. The insurance was not purchased, and no specific word indicates when the decision was made, or how it was received by Professor Veblen. Suffice it to say that when Flexner caused Veblen to sign his letter of the 1st December, 1932, that insurance was mentioned, but not as a commitment of the Board. Now, however, with the Institute's modest capital strained by outlays for Fuld Hall, and with grants to income instead of endowment promised to meet the expense of the new appointments, the Professor began to feel insecure. Therefore he arranged with Mr. Maass to submit a plan for insuring his and Mrs. Veblen's pensions similar to one the Institute had approved and substituted for its commitment to enable Weyl to purchase protection for his wife.[70]

Mr. Maass consulted an insurance broker of his acquaintance, and submitted the first of his plans to the Finance Committee in May, 1938, and then to Mr. Hardin. The Newark lawyer was cold and indifferent, expressing his lack of interest and sending the papers back without his approval.[71] Again they were the subject of discussion in September, and the Finance Committee without acting on them apparently instructed the Treasurer to set aside a reserve of $10,000 annually against these liabilities of the future. When Maass told the beleaguered Director this, he answered that if part of the inadequate income were to be so disposed, "some other director will have to do it. I am heartily sick of these trivialities."[72]

However, the reserve was established. At the end of October the Committee again was asked to consider the matter whereupon, it requested Professor Riefler to investigate the status and prospects of the other professors in benefits from Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association, for which he sought data on their ages, salaries, their dependencies, etc. At the same time Mr. Maass also asked Mrs. Bailey for like data for his broker. Flexner declined to take the time to consult Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association for its estimates, and suggested that Riefler consider the pension situation of the three professors of the School of Mathematics who had been promised the large pensions. He said he did not want to reveal to anyone outside the Institute the inequalities in conditions of employment with which he had been compelled to effect the various appointments, and that the simplest solution to the actuarial problem would be to leave unfilled the positions of Professors Einstein and Veblen on their retirement, if it became necessary to find the money for their

pensions. Riefler's report, based on inadequate information, satisfied the Committee that the annual reserve and the possibility of saving salaries to pay pensions would solve the problem.[73] This was the last solution in the world to appeal to Professor Veblen, and there is reason to believe he brought the issue before the Board for review in January.

Professor Veblen became concerned lest the Committee on Buildings and Grounds was forgetting the School's request for a modern mathematical library for Fuld Hall. Just before the October Board meeting he asked the Director to bring the matter again to Mr. Maass' attention. Flexner replied that funds were not available; it would be unwise to disturb Mr. Bamberger now with another demand. Moreover, "if money can be obtained from outside sources, it shall go into men and not into books or fixtures or buildings." He gave additional reasons: "We are concerned with the...devising of expedients which will keep the Institute and the University interlocked. This is the wish of President Dodds, Dean Eisenhart, and the Princeton Trustees, as well as the understanding which I have with the Founders..." He opted for a Ford car to move passengers and books between Fuld and Fine Halls, and the use of some rooms in Fuld Hall by research workers of the University, "and the continued occupation by some of our men of rooms in Fine Hall, McCormick Hall, and elsewhere."[74]

The Trustees heard that the contract for construction of Fuld Hall had been let to Hegeman-Harris of New York on a cost-plus basis at an estimated cost of $312,000 (approximately 52½¢ per. cu. ft.). Mr. Maass had worked hard and resourcefully to get the four plans from different firms, and to rationalize the different positions of Founders and faculty on the ultimate plans. Flexner complimented him fulsomely in speaking

to the Trustees on the work he had done since project Fuld Hall had begun.[75] Now he was to complain to Flexner that though he was entirely competent to handle the legal contract, Mr. Bamberger had decided that the firm with which one of his nephews was connected should do that, thus, said Maass, "adding insult to injury." The Director sought to soothe the lawyer's wounded feelings, saying it was perhaps natural that the Founder would want to help a relative, and that Mr. Bamberger meant no reflection on the Chairman of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds.[76]

The effort to see things clearly and coolly was now being hampered by an apparent hostility toward the Institute on the part of Mr. Farrier, who as confidential assistant to Mr. Bamberger was in a position to make relations difficult. Thus a question arose over Mr. Bamberger's refusal to sign a check for some incidental expenses incurred by Mr. Larson, whose contract provided that he be reimbursed for money out-of-pocket for travel, phone calls etc. in connection with the building. Maass brought that matter to Flexner's attention, saying that he and Mr. Leidesdorf had decided to pay such items personally. But Flexner responded angrily that they were not to do so. He suspected "our friend," and said he would take them from the petty cash account, since they were legitimate and duly contracted for.[77] In an earlier action Farrier urged amendment of the By-Laws to provide for more formal procedures in waiving notices of Committee meetings and noting attendance. Flexner replied that most meetings of the Executive and the Finance Committees were unassembled, and business was usually transacted by telephone. Changes in the By-Laws should be taken up with Messrs. Maass or Hardin. But he assured Mr. Farrier that when a "matter of real importance comes up you can be sure

we watch our step." Undoubtedly Farrier was still disturbed over the action of the Executive Committee of the 29th March, 1938, recounted above. The manner in which this action was taken showed that tempers were short, and strains great as between the office of the Founder and Mr. Maass and even Dr. Flexner.[78]

Flexner, Leidesdorf and Maass were all conscious now of a certain disenchantment with the Institute on the part of Mr. Bamberger's confidential clerk. It would have been the part of wisdom for the Director to realize that such strains occur in every human institution. But Flexner was showing his age and his fatigue, and seemed less and less able to smooth the ruffled feelings of others, who seemed now at this time of crisis, when commitments were being made for which no money was visibly available, to be particularly active and troublesome. But that there seemed to be an active intent to embarrass the Director was shown in a move initiated by Professor Veblen in the School, as reflected by the following item in the minutes:

> The group believes it desirable that Professor William W. Flexner of Cornell University spend a year at the Institute, and authorizes Professor Veblen to cooperate with Dr. Abraham Flexner in making arrangements for such a year. Emphasis Supplied.[79]

The result of that "cooperation" appears in a letter Veblen wrote to Dr. Aydelotte later asking his help in securing a Guggenheim fellowship:

> Young /William/ Flexner never got a National Research Council fellowship because his father /Simon Flexner/ was Chairman of the Board which awarded these fellowships... His uncle will not allow funds of the Institute to be used for a stipend for him in Princeton...His work is just at a point where he would profit greatly by a year at such a place as the Institute.

The issue was still unsettled in January, 1939, when Professor Veblen, vacationing in Florida, wrote Flexner that he wished to see him about William Flexner with a personal angle to the problem of William Flexner's wish to come to the Institute for a year.[80]

The two men met on the 20th or the 21st January, just before the Board met, and apparently not only continued to disagree on this issue, but also found another and more important difference of opinion. For Professor Veblen renewed his old demand for more voice for the faculty in academic decisions. Flexner refused. They agreed to disagree with a finality they had never before experienced.[81] Characteristically, the Director brought the latter issue before the Board in a report on the unique nature of the Institute, which, unlike a university, could best function as "autonomous, self-governing groups" in which no school could well legislate for another, because each "has been able to advance in the ways best suited to its subject." He continued:

> To be sure, at long intervals some point of general interest may arise on which the faculty should be brought together and consulted, and its views or conflicting views should be transmitted to the Trustees, but anything more than this would be the first step in forming a routine which might ultimately choke what is today the outstanding merit of the Institute....
>
> The preservation of the autonomy of the schools of the Institute, the absence of regulations adopted at faculty meetings, -- both these seem to me to distinguish the Institute from a university and to be of inestimable importance to its free and effective functioning. No rules have been laid down, and no rules necessarily applicable to all three schools or within each school applicable to all individuals alike should ever be laid down. If we cling to the principle that no one will be asked to join the faculty who has not already demonstrated high intellectual quality, we need have no fear of stagnation or chaos.

> The same informality is characteristic of the relations which are developing between the Institute and Princeton University. No effort has been made, and no effort should be made, to reduce these relations to formal shape....
>
> It may be asked what under these circumstances is the role of a director...It may at any time be his most important function to have the final word -- after conference inside and outside the Institute -- in the matter of faculty appointments, though the presumption is strong that the members of a given school are the best and the proper judges.[82]

Flexner then discussed the devices by which some unity had been achieved despite the physical separation of the faculty members, giving credit to the school secretaries, and the administrative mechanics of his own office. He added:

> This will all be made easier when the various parts of the Institute are gathered together beneath the roof of Fuld Hall, but, scattered as we are, with improvised quarters and facilities, we have lived happily and cooperated effectively...[83]

Just when the decision had been taken to bring all the School of Mathematic's faculty to Fuld Hall is not clear, but it may have arisen out of the discussion which followed. This is the first mention of such a complete unification in Fuld Hall. It is possible that Professor Veblen now made it clear that he wanted the School of Mathematics to leave Fine Hall. It would have been characteristic of Flexner's manner of recording actions at Board meetings to have mentioned the momentous decision in just this way, considering his passionate advocacy of "devices to keep the Institute and the University interlocked." (See p.399) Certainly Professor Veblen was the only one among the Trustees, except possibly Mr. Maass, the one of the two with whom Flexner had conferred the previous winter about bigotry in the University, who had voiced a wish to see the School leave Fine Hall.

Having had his say, the Director asked for discussion. The minutes recorded first Professor Veblen, who said:

> while agreeing in the main and particularly with the strong emphasis on the autonomy of the three schools, /he/ thought that occasional meetings of the faculty would be advantageous inasmuch as they would familiarize all members of the faculty with matters concerning the Institute as a whole.[84]

Dr. Weed seemed to favor that idea, suggesting that the faculty as a whole might well agree on the appointment of the personal assistants to the professors! Dr. Carrel "emphatically" upheld the Director's views: informality, absence of rules, autonomy of the schools, were, in his opinion, the principles necessary to distinguish a living and growing institution from one which would otherwise "harden and grow old." Dr. Sabin agreed generally with Flexner and Carrel; continued selection of the best scholars could be assured as at present "through consultation by the Director with help and cooperation from outside authorities." She then said:

> It is possible, however, that occasions may arise when certain general matters affecting everyone might be handled more wisely through discussions of the faculty with adequate opportunity to present the...views of the faculty to the Director and to the Trustees. This could be brought about as occasion arose, without previous formal organization. As an example...she instanced the discussion of a plan for retirement...

adding that of course that problem had been settled at the very begining of the Institute.[85] The minutes continue:

> Mr. Riefler stated that the fundamental importance of the directorship lay not in administration as such, which Dr. Flexner had reduced to a minimum, but in the selection of personnel. The power, standing, and value of the Institute...were inseparably tied up with the quality of the persons called to professorships...Mr. Riefler had been amzaed at the spirit of loyalty to each other and to the Institute which permeated the Institute....

> The point made by Professor Veblen which impressed him most was the extent to which some of the professors appeared to be ignorant of what the Institute was doing. When it was necessary to restrict the budget last year, for instance, the questions asked by the professors indicated less familiarity with the Institute and its problems than he had thought possible. It was his hope that the completion of Fuld Hall ...and the gathering of all of the professors under one roof ...would remedy this situation. Under these circumstances, he...would not be in favor of disturbing the existing situation.[86]

Mr. Hardin and Mr. Maass agreed with the last statement of Professor Riefler; when the faculties were gathered together, the problem would disappear.

That the Director was deeply troubled by the actual debate was shown by his closing in which he said he

> had no objection to the faculty's meeting whenever it pleased, but that in his opinion, any regular machinery ...would annoy the most productive and fertile minds... and tend to increase the influence of those who were intellectually less important....He had no desire to participate, just as he did not attend the meetings of those composing the several schools because he did not wish... to interfere with the utmost freedom of expression. Therefore, should the faculty choose to meet, he would not attend unless...for some such specific object as Dr. Sabin had specified.[87]

This discussion was ended, but the issue was now formed.

Mr. Leidesdorf was absent, but his report showed that due to falling income, a deficit of approximately $6,000 was incurred during the first six months of the year, which would remain at year's end. Mr. Hardin noted thatthe market value of investments was $7.9 million. The minutes then recite:

> At the meeting held October 10, 1938, it was suggested that the Institute should publish once a year a financial statement. After discussion, on motion, it was
>
> RESOLVED, That a summarized financial statement be published in the annual Bulletin of the Institute.

It was to appear later (see p.) that the Treasurer's reports at the end of each fiscal year were not sent to each Trustee. Notice was given that at the next meeting of the Board the Trustees must consider a proposed amendment to the By-Laws eliminating all members ex officio of standing committees except the Founders and the Chairman. Mr. Bamberger had asked for this. Stipend funds were voted in reduced amount for the following year.[88]

It would seem to be almost certain that Professor Veblen's request for insurance of his pension was brought up and discussed. It has been seen that controversial issues were muted in the minutes. But Dr. Sabin's reference to the subject was unlikely under any other circumstances. Most compelling to the conclusion, however, was that Mr. Maass moved a belated amendment of the minutes of the Executive Committee of the 8th September, 1933, concerning the Institute's insuring Mrs. Weyl for her pension should she survive her husband.[89]

Mr. Maass noted an earlier request from the Founders that the annual meeting, which was to be followed by the dedication of Fuld Hall, be deferred until sometime in May when more clement weather would permit both Founders to attend. May 22 was selected.

The consequences of the Board meeting were grave and immediate:

1. Professor Veblen's wish for the School of Mathematics to leave Fine Hall was to be realized.

2. The Founders' intention to reimburse the Institute for the cost of Fuld Hall and its furniture was now in doubt.

3. Professor Veblen's appeal for insurance of his excess pension was now denied by the Board, if it had not been by the Finance Committee

in November, 1938.

4. Mr. Bamberger's intention to give the Institute money for the new accessions to staff in economics had apparently been abandoned.

These decisions were manifested in the following actions:

1. Flexner asked Professor Veblen to consult with his colleagues on how to "keep up...the School's active relationship with the Princeton Department of Mathematics after Fuld Hall is ready for occupation. When you come to a conclusion I shall be happy to talk with any one or more... who may be charged with explaining your ideas."[90]

2. Mr. Hardin consulted Mr. Maass about the Institute's eligibility for a Federal Housing Administration loan, and they agreed to seek permission from the Finance Committee to apply for one.[91]

3. Dr. Flexner dispatched the following appeal to Mr. Fosdick:

> ...The moment that Stewart...agreed to come to the School I acted at once, because I had been hoping for years that this would come about...The addition of Stewart and Warren means an increased budget for this second half-year of possibly less than $25,000...I have an offer of $25,000 annually on condition...that I procure an additional and equal sum....

Flexner said he hesitated to approach Dr. Willitts, the newly appointed Director for the Social Sciences of the Foundation, because he was so busy with his new duties. But he hoped to see Willitts before the annual meeting of the Foundation. He added:

> I am loath to approach Mr. Bamberger at the moment, for the reason I told you yesterday. I know that he wishes to see our new building completed, paid for, and its upkeep provided for before he goes further -- a conservative but understandable state of mind.

Mr. Fosdick refused.[92]

The need to seek funds for Economics assured by the Director

in October was undoubtedly due to Mr. Bamberger's withdrawal. In the circumstances Fosdick's refusal was perhaps natural. Because Mr. Stewart was the new Chairman of the Board of the Rockefeller Foundation, there was probably some embarrassment at the idea that the Foundation might be the sole support of the work in Economics at the Institute.

The faculty of the School of Mathematics held a meeting on the 3rd February and determined upon the following points, which were promptly given to Dr. Flexner by Professors Veblen and von Neumann.

> 1. The assumption was that each professor would have a large study with an adjoining office for his assistants. They asked that immediate assignment of rooms be made on the architect's drawings.
>
> 2. "It is understood that our general policy will be to hold mathematical lectures and seminars in Fine Hall, and that we desire that facilities in Fine Hall be provided so that we can continue without interruption our present relations with students and faculty of the University."

To this end they asked that "a sufficient number of rooms in Fine Hall" be assigned to the School rather than to individual professors, and that it be understood "that each professor may if he wishes spend a part of each day in consultation with students and professors of the University." Assignment of these rooms might best be left to the Department, though it was said that since the Physics Department was interested in such arrangements, "it might well be consulted."[93]

Dr. Flexner then called a meeting of the full faculty for the 6th February to discuss with them the allocation of space in Fuld Hall. Professor Veblen later described events at that gathering to Dr. Aydelotte:

> At this time Fuld Hall was under construction and the question of the allocation of rooms in the building was under discussion; this raised the question whether

> certain professors would move to the new building or whether they would retain the quarters which they had heretofore been using on the University campus and elsewhere. The discussion of these matters led to some rather frank remarks about the relations between the Institute and the University. Some of these remarks were considered by Dr. Flexner to be ill-advised and he declared more than once thereafter that there would be no further meetings of the faculty. The general question of the role of the faculty in the administration of the Institute had been very much on his mind for several years and this particular experience seems to have crystallized his opinions. Dr. Flexner had embodied some of his views on these questions in his report to the Trustees at their meeting of January 23, 1939. He circulated this report to the members of the faculty about a month later.[94]

This was indeed an interesting account, considering what actually happened. The "frank remarks" Veblen alluded to was a charge by Professor Alexander that anti-Semitic sentiment existed at the University.[95] It was the tactic designed to cloud reason with emotion; it defied rational discussion at that particular time and in the circumstances. Presumably the meeting broke up without any decisions. What purpose could Alexander's declaration serve? It could discredit the Director's emphasis on the need to cooperate with the University, and cast an ugly light upon his aid to the Department of Art and Archaeology, making it appear as an ignoble effort to placate bigotry instead of one to make up to the University some of the debt the Institute owed for its first three mathematicians. One can hardly avoid the conclusion that Veblen had held the threat of such a statement over Flexner from October 1936, when he said he was going to discuss with his colleagues relations between the Institute and the University. (see p. 333) It was too bad that Flexner had not made it necessary for him to come out with it before, instead of living in constant fear of it. (It will be recalled that Flexner expressed suspicion that it was not the experiences of "the

two most important" Trustees in New York which caused them to raise the questions of anti-Semitism at Princeton.) It was sad that one of the early efforts to meet with the faculty for discussion of common problems should have been so managed that it posed a great question as to whether this faculty deserved to be consulted. For according to another faculty member, a humanist, there was no contrary opinion to Alexander's expressed. The members of the School of Mathematics, which had so steadfastly in its planning for Fuld Hall insisted on keeping its main center of activities at Fine Hall for the value of the cooperative enterprise, now were silent, giving the impression that they had wanted to separate from the Department.

Flexner lost this most important round in a long battle with Professor Veblen. What could the latter's motives have been in causing so painful a pass? In the first place, he broke the steady consensus of his School colleagues. They could hardly now opt to continue their main activities at Fine Hall. What good would that do Professor Veblen? It would cause his colleagues to move willingly into Fuld Hall. Space there was not too liberal, and he wanted each professor in the School to have preferred conditions. If the School were to be divided as between the two Halls, they might later find themselves at a disadvantage. He wanted a mathematical library now; the School would have it. By keeping all his colleagues together, he could face the future as he had the past with a unified force of six, as against ten members of the other Schools who were either centrifugally inclined or so intent on their own work as to be seemingly indifferent to the needs and attitudes of others. Thus at this time when he was determined to win place for the faculty voice in academic affairs, he could be assured of the leadership.

Last, but not least, Professor Veblen had decided that the Director must go; and any way to get him to discredit himself was useful to that purpose. To strike him where he was vulnerable was good tactics even if it was also bad taste and poor ethics. Flexner was well aware of Veblen's overwhelming interest in managing the disposal of rooms within the Institute's new home, and determined that the other schools should receive justice in the apportionment of space for their professors and members. Moreover, he was dedicated to the unity of scholarship itself, and inclined to put the eminence and prestige of Princeton as a world center for mathematics indivisibly at Princeton, and not at either the University or the Institute.

The faculty meeting, following so disastrously the Board's session, caused the Director to prepare to retire. It was a wise decision, which his friends supported. He asked Aydelotte, his chosen successor, to recapitulate for him the history of their long association and friendship, presumably for the hometown paper at Louisville, where they had first met.

Aydelotte's essay on their friendship, some five or six pages of narrative, was sent the Director on the 21st February. It described a friendship which started in 1905 between a young teacher of English in Boys High School at Louisville and his senior by twelve years who was the successful headmaster of his own tutoring school. At that meeting Flexner gave Aydelotte a key to the study of Greek which, after hard work, enabled him to qualify for a Rhodes scholarship, which he won. Long after that, Flexner and Dr. Buttrick were able during the late teens to advise Aydelotte with respect to various college presidencies which were offered to him when he was an outstanding teacher

of English at Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Ultimately he chose Swarthmore against Flexner's advice, and made a huge success of his work there by introducing the Oxford system of working for honors. In this he was aided by a grant of matched funds from the General Education Board which Flexner suggested he apply for; these led to an increase of $4 million in Swarthmore's endowments, some of it raised during the depression, and much of it with Flexner's aid. Then Aydelotte wrote:

> I came to know you so well that when, at the end of 1927 Lord Lothian asked me to suggest an American to be called to Oxford to give the Rhodes Trust Memorial Lectures, I replied instantly that you were the man he should approach. You...gave your famous lectures on universities at Oxford in April and May, 1928. We had been in Egypt and Spain and returned to hear the last lecture.
>
> It has always been a matter of the greatest delight to me that by an extraordinary coincidence the fruits of these lectures were sent to Mr. Bamberger and resulted in your being called by him to organize the Institute for Advanced Study. My pleasure in these events was greatly increased by your invitation to me to act in the beginning as one of the Trustees in the new venture, which has already made so valuable a contribution to the development of higher scholarship in the United States. Meanwhile, your book Universities has exerted a more profound influence in the country than you have any idea. It came at a moment when it was much needed, and there is equal need today for the revised edition which you have in mind.[96]

Their great moments in American educational reform had come during their close friendship. Flexner planned the Lincoln School for the Columbia Teachers College in 1915 with some advice from Aydelotte; the President of Swarthmore received aid from Flexner in promoting the establishment of the Eastman professorship at Oxford. On the other hand, it seems that Aydelotte worked independently of advice from Flexner in planning the work of the Guggenheim Foundation, which was

organized in 1925 to give fellowships to promising post-doctoral students for another year of study at an institution of their own choosing, without depending on their academic associates for decisive recommendations. In their correspondence, Flexner was "dear Dr. Flexner," and Aydelotte, "dear Aydelotte." The younger man was the disciple; Flexner the respected master, even when, as has been seen, the master came to the disciple for comfort and aid in dealing with a wounding adversary, such as Mr. Frankfurter proved to be in 1934 and 1935. Now Flexner acknowledged Aydelotte's memorandum with warmth and deep affection:

> Thank you very, very much for your letter and memorandum of February 21. I have no old engagement books, but I have a very definite memory of every one of the incidents which you describe. I need not say that in all my dealings with men in the field of education -- and their wives -- I have no memories that are more delightful and more satisfying than those which come through my association with you.
>
> Do you realize that without you there would have been no Institute for Advanced Study? For this Institute is a direct outgrowth of the Rhodes Lectures and you were the one human being alive who would ever have had the temerity to recommend me -- educational heretic that I was and am -- at the time you were asked for the suggestion for an American lecturer. The Rhodes Lectures gave me a really marvellous opportunity and enlarged my vision as it had been previously enlarged when first I went to Germany for a prolonged stay. Hardly a day passes but that I think with gratitude of your part in the use to which I have been enabled to put what will probably be my last active years. With a thousand thanks...[97]

Clearly this was written in contemplation of his retirement, presumably by the end of the fiscal year.

At the same time Mr. Houghton wrote the Director of his own intention to resign, and Flexner replied that he was himself doing so. Houghton then wrote:

My resignation is in your hands...I certainly could not remain on the Board if you were not present also, as Director. I confess, however, that I look forward with dismay to your separating yourself from the Institute. You have, in fact, been the Institute. It owes everything except financial support to your wision and your wisdom and your executive direction.[98]

When Flexner returned on the 17th March from a cruise to Bermuda, where he had sought some rest, he found that the faculty had met several times, as he had said it should, and had presented a series of moderate requests to him under date of the 15th March:

Dear Dr. Flexner:

You have been kind enough to send the faculty your report made to the Trustees at a meeting on January 23, together with the comments which the members of the Board made thereon. At a recent informal dinner certain aspects of this report were discussed by the professors of the Institute, and we were requested to give you an account of the conclusions reached.

The Institute has now developed in its three schools to a point where its character can clearly be seen and appreciated, and the most important problem from now on, in our eyes, is the stability of what has been achieved by the generosity of the donors and your own creative insight.

This stability will depend upon the wisdom and deliberation with which future Directors are chosen. It is the unanimous opinion that this choice should be preceded by a preliminary consultation with the faculty.

It is equally essential in the opinion of a majority of the faculty that no professor be appointed without a similar consultation with his future colleagues.

We understand that both the responsibility and the final choice in each case rest with the Director and the Board of Trustees. Their action should, however, in our opinion, be preceded by a consultation with the faculty which should be made effective by allowing adequate time for the consideration and inquiries which are necessary in each case.

The professors earnestly desire that the above conclusions be conveyed to the Board of Trustees. We should like very

much to talk these matters over with you, and to add any information which you may desire concerning the opinions expressed.

Yours sincerely,

A. Einstein
Hetty Goldman
Marston Morse[99]

The Director interviewed Messrs. Einstein and Morse separately, apparently giving Morse to understand that any such demands would be severely disturbing to the Founders.[100] On the 30th March the two professors addressed their colleagues as follows:

We are enclosing a copy of the letter of March 15 which we sent to Dr. Flexner in accordance with your request that we convey to him the opinions expressed at our dinner on March 13. Morse and Einstein have seen Dr. Flexner individually at his request, and talked matters over. We obtained no assurance from Dr. Flexner that he would convey the contents of our letter to the Board of Trustees.

Sincerely yours,

A. Einstein
Marston Morse[101]

Later Professor Morse told them that the Director had added the following to what he had said: "The professors are the natural and logical advisers of the Trustees of the Institute."[102] This was unsatisfactory to the faculty, and other meetings followed.

When the Board convened on the 22nd May, several important absences were noted: the Founders had not appeared, nor had Mr. Leidesdorf, nor Mr. Straus. Miss Sabin had retired to Colorado, Dr. Carrel attended no meetings after January, 1939, though he did not resign, and was not dropped from the Board until 1942. Professor Riefler was in the Mid-West with his ailing parents.

Whatever had been Flexner's intentions about the time of his retiring, it was now apparent that he wanted to receive appointment for the next year.[103] His account in the minutes of the May meeting demonstrated more than his usual care to present a record which might reassure the Founders, even though truth was fractured. Thus he reported the faculty's attitude as conforming with his own statement in the January minutes:

> At long intervals some point of general interest may arise on which the professors should be brought together and consulted, and their views or conflicting views should be transmitted to the Trustees.

He continued; the faculty had met three times, he was informed, to consider the minutes of the last Board meeting.

> The only comment made on the report was a reiteration of this sentence. To this comment I venture to add that the professors are the natural and logical advisers of the Trustees. On the other hand, the responsibility for the conduct of the Institute remains in the last instance with the Trustees whose freedom to take advice, to select among various suggestions, or to act on their own responsibility cannot and should not be formally abridged. Nothing in the internal situation of the Institute or in world conditions now calls, in my opinion, for any change whatsoever....In the event of a world catastrophe we can readjust and still preserve the professors and the conditions which make them happy and effective members. 'Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof.'[104]

The Board reappointed the Director. There appears to have been no discussion. It passed a budget showing a deficit of $43,000 ($53,000 with the reserve for pensions, which Flexner consistently failed to show). It approved Mr. Maass' position on the proposed By-Law amendment urged by Mr. Bamberger which would eliminate the Vice-Chairmen as members ex officio of the standing committees, by tabling it.[105] Also on Maass' motion, the

Board extended to its officers the right to endorse securities ordered moved by the Finance Committee. A final indication of Mr. Maass' intention to step into a position of greater power and control in the Institute's affairs was shown when Flexner consulted him about committee appointments. The Vice-Chairman rejected Flexner's suggestions.[105]

The Director knew as early as the 4th May that the Founders would not attend the meeting or participate in the dedication of Fuld Hall. Mrs. Fuld had suffered an accident earlier which hospitalized her for some time and caused her brother deep concern. Whether she was still actually indisposed and unable to attend is not clear, however, for Flexner had evidently counted on their presence until the date mentioned. Then he made plans which did not include them. He asked President Dodds to make the main address as early as the 15th April; Mr. Houghton was to accept the building formally from Mr. Maass on behalf of the Institute, and Miss Lavinia Bamberger, sprightly sister of the Founders, agreed to seal the cornerstone, as her brother and sister wished. The guests, consisting mainly of the Trustees and the faculty members and their wives, together with a few outsiders, were invited to luncheon at Princeton Inn following the ceremony. The ceremony was much like Hamlet with neither Hamlet nor his mother on stage.

Mr. Houghton opened the meeting with regrets that the Founders were both "unfortunately suffering from temporary indisposition and unable to be here today." He continued"

> If Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld could be here today, could look over these years with us, and could recognize what their generous bounty alone has made possible, they would be well assured, I think, in all happy certainty, that they

have done for America something so rich in promise, something so potentially full of usefulness and of influence, that it will keep their memory warm and green for a thousand generations to come.[107]

Mr. Houghton then introduced President Dodds, whose brief remarks are repeated here in full.

The prevailing philosophy of the nineteenth century was one of optimism, of unfaltering confidence in idealism and faith in progress. The relative despair and pessimism of the moment may perhaps be largely explained by what we have learned as to how difficult progress is, how little hope we can place in the inward, driving, inevitable laws of nature and of men to force us on; and the realization that the earlier philosophy of predetermined and inescapable progress was wrong has brought us into more confusion in my mind than necessary. How to work out of it is a question.

Never, however, has society been spending so much in physical and material resources and so much manpower in what may be called the organized search for knowledge and for advancement of learning. Literally millions of dollars are being spent annually on research, not only in industrial life, academic life, pure and applied science, and the humanities, but on the immense forces organized in the search for truth. That is something new in the world's history. No longer do we depend on the individual scholar. We now organize and we are learning from that how difficult it is to discover a new truth, how expensive indeed a new idea is, and when we think of the vast sums of money being devoted to the advancement of learning, to the widening of the frontiers of knowledge, and measure against these sums the result, we are apt perhaps to be discouraged. What we are learning is that the discovery of truth is a tremendously expensive and wearying process calling for blood and sweat and the best efforts and best patience of the race.

Research has suffered from excesses of competition. Whatever may be the public's attitude regarding the advantages of competition in industrial affairs, the facts are that we are suffering from waste due to competition. What we need is combination and cooperation, and this Institute, coming to Princeton and heartily welcomed here, represents an experiment in cooperation with the University towards common ends and common methods. I believe that the experiment is an extremely important one, because if it is successful -- and there is no reason to believe that it will not be successful, since it meets the fundamental needs of the time --

> its success when fully demonstrated will be a standard to which the wise and the just in other institutions can refer. I hope that this cooperative arrangement, which has already meant so much to the University and as a precedent will mean so much to science and scholarship, will be influential in bringing about a degree of cooperation and mutual aid in the field of scholarship which is still, unfortunately, too much lacking.
>
> And believing that as sincerely as I do, I wish the Institute success and prosperity with all my heart on this significant day, which represents not only the establishment of the physical corporate nature of the Institute but also represents a great deal of patience on Dr. Flexner's part in postponing the building so long, because it gives a tone and form to what I have tried to express in words. Grateful as we are for the kind words of Mr. Houghton, we feel that we will be jointly cooperative to move on from strength to greater strength in what I have termed an experiment of great importance to mankind.[108]

Mr. Maass gracefully acknowledged the speech, and then formally presented the building to the Chairman of the Board, who accepted it on behalf of the Institute. Miss Lavinia wielded the silver trowel, speaking the conventional words: "I declare this stone to be well and truly laid." Dr. Flexner did not speak. Available photographs indicate that there was nothing in the way of a rostrum or speakers' platform outside the bleak and untidy early stages of construction. They also show the Director standing alone within the scaffolding amid the "bricks and mortar" and other paraphernalia of construction, looking bitterly unhappy and discouraged, as though he doubted the reality of the spiritual and intellectual edifice of which the building was to be the outward symbol.

Later, a note from Mr. Maass thanking Flexner for his letter expressing appreciation of the lawyer's part indicated that relations between the two men had become severely strained. Gone was the old informality and the assumptions of ready understanding: Maass wrote:

> It was extremely courteous and thoughtful of you to write me such a pleasant letter regarding my participation in the ceremonies...Working with you...has been a great joy, and I hope it will continue to be so for both of us.[109]

But that was not to be. Five days later Messrs. Mass and Leidesdorf told the Director that they felt he must retire. They had been visited by Professors Earle and Einstein, who evidently persuaded them that the welfare of the Institute made that necessary. Details of the conversations are not available, but it is clear that the professors did not presume to speak in the name of the whole faculty, for no consensus had been expressed.[110] Twenty-one days later Dr. Flexner had not yet given his answer. Mr. Maass called for it. Flexner informed Mr. Leidesdorf that after consulting certain disinterested men in Princeton, and his brother Simon and Mr. Hardin, he had decided to do nothing for the present.[111] This impasse precipitated conflict and intrigue which endured throughout the summer.

It had been well prepared on the faculty side. Veblen had apparently introduced the discussion of faculty rights in January with the knowledge and approval of "a half-dozen of us," as Earle wrote Aydelotte.[112] These professors were agreed that Stewart and Warren were not qualified academically by degrees or experience. Professor Veblen had known with the other Trustees that Flexner intended to bring Stewart to the faculty if and when he could. But he had heard nothing of Mr. Warren. Veblen had, however, voiced his approval of their appointment before Flexner presented the formal resolutions noting their salaries at the maximum rate. That, and the fact that Flexner had not consulted either Earle or Mitrany about the matter -- indeed, had kept his intentions a secret -- told

Veblen that now was the time to strike. At about the same time Miss Goldman reminded Flexner that when she was appointed with a small honorarium she was led to expect a regular salary when money was available. Now, she wrote, two economists had been appointed; money which might have been used in part for her salary had gone for another purpose. Flexner replied that his commitments to the economists had been outstanding for several years. Miss Goldman's became the most glaring example of the salary inequities, as Professor Herzfeld received an increase to $10,000 effective 7/1/39. She had independent means, and could afford to work without salary.

Veblen now employed carefully calculated means to rally to his own standard his school colleagues and the several dissidents in the other two schools. This required some variety in issues and great finesse in method. For what Flexner had always said was true -- most of the professors were so busy with the delights and labors of the studies they loved that few could be interested in administrative problems.

The surest appeal to the older members was a charge Veblen made which accused Flexner of having imperiled the solvency of the Institute, while at the same time absolving the other Trustees of blame. Professor Veblen told most of the faculty members (but not the other faculty Trustees), that the Director had presented the nominations of Stewart and Warren as temporary, and then showed them in the minutes as permanent.[114] The others would have no way of checking the truth of this statement; it was so serious that conversation about it was fairly restricted. They did not know that Veblen had so alienated Mr. Bamberger in January in insisting on faculty participation that the money the Founder had promised to give to defray the cost of the economists was now not forthcoming.

Veblen's story would be borne out by a deficit which he knew occurred in the first six months of the year, and which would grow considerably larger during the latter half. Meanwhile, stipend funds were reduced.

His story was sufficiently compelling to impress Professor Einstein, whose dependency on the solvency of the Institute was, like that of Veblen and Weyl, greater than that of the other faculty members because of their handsome pension rights. But to all the older men, whose job opportunities were less than those of the younger ones, it was a serious matter. That Veblen was able to put Professor Einstein in the forefront of the campaign in the faculty was a masterful achievement. For Einstein was known as one who had been indifferent throughout his academic career to academic politics and administrative matters, except where, as in the instances which have been earlier described, he felt that his ability to carry on his work was threatened. His position among all the faculty members was very high: his probity, his independence of thought and judgment, his signal achievements, and his prestige made Veblen's triumph indeed a great one. But Einstein did not engage in intrigue, nor did it appear that his conduct was influenced by his earlier differences with the Director. He felt, as did others in the faculty, that great as had been the Director's contribution to education and the advancement of knowledge, he was now tired and spent, incapable of further leadership in Institute affairs. And so Einstein presided as host and chairman at a dinner held at Nassau Tavern on the 10th April, at which the retirement of Flexner was evidently discussed, but no consensus was sought or registered.[115]

After the dedication of Fuld Hall, the professors left for their

summer vacations. Two, who went to Europe, left their proxies in case action might be taken during the summer.[116] Snortly before Professor Earle was leaving Princeton for the sanitarium at Lake Placid, where he was to go for a short rest and examination before joining his family at Corey's in northern New York State, Dr. and Mrs. Flexner invited him to lunch. On Professor Veblen's advice he did not appear, but instead sent two letters which Veblen helped him to draft. Since these became the main documents in the successful effort to cause Flexner's retirement, and summarized Earle's and Veblen's reasons for it, they must be set forth here. The first was rather formal. It read:

> My dear Dr. Flexner:
>
> After the most careful deliberation I have come to the conclusion that no useful purpose could be served by my coming to lunch with you and Mrs. Flexner today. From what you told me, and from what I learned from Professor Meritt in two long interviews, I gather that the subjects to be discussed are the administration of the Institute and the prevalence of dissatisfaction and disaffection in the Faculty. During the past two or three years I have frequently and with the utmost frankness expressed to you my views on the problems of the Institute; anything which I might add would only be in further support of what I have already said. As to the Faculty, there is indeed a critical situation which no single member can adequately describe. And as I feel that I already have done my share in trying to explain the fundamental causes of this situation, there is little that I could add at this time.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> Edward Meade Earle.[117]

The second letter was quite personal; it was addressed to

> Dear Abe:
>
> The enclosed letter is very formal, so that I am adding this purely personal note.
>
> You will understand, I am sure, that I have come to the

decision that the proposed discussion at lunch today would be unwise only after the most careful consideration. It is not that I wish to avoid any responsibility or to shirk any friendly service however unpleasant. It is rather because it is my firm conviction that your own best interests and the best interests of the Institute would be better served by my not coming.

You asked yesterday that I tell you the truth without fear or favor. As a matter of fact, that is precisely what I have been trying to do in innumerable conversations during the past three years. I have expressed to you my alarm on a number of points, more specifically: your policies vis-a-vis Princeton University; your refusal to admit the existence of anti-Semitism in this community; your openly expressed contempt for fellow-members of the Faculty, sometimes taking the form of personal abuse; your insistence upon dealing with us (except the mathematicians) as individuals and not as members of the several schools or of the Faculty as a whole; your resistance to a measure of Faculty participation in vital decisions; your refusal to transmit to the Trustees a respectful and modest request for such participation; your procedure in the most recent appointments in the School of Economics and Politics, which violates every tenet of long-established and universally respected principles of scholarly communities; your marked favoritism toward individuals (including, doubtless, me myself) and toward certain subjects, notably economics; an increasing tendency to make ex parte decisions.

It has not been pleasant for me to tell you these things, and it has not been pleasant for you to hear them. It would have been easier for me to tell you what you would have like to hear -- namely that all is well in the best of possible academic worlds. If I were to see you today and discuss all of these matters again, nothing new would be added. I know from bitter experience that you do not welcome criticism, however friendly, which expresses disagreement with some of your policies and attitudes. What I -- who owe you so much and who hold you in so deep an affection -- feel and see is felt and seen in more marked degree by other members of the Faculty. I could at best express only a small amount of the prevailing disaffection.

Please believe me that all of this proceeds from one who still would make every decision primarily from the point of view of what is best for you and for the great reputation which you have built up over the years.

Always affectionately,

Ed.[118]

The Director did not answer then, but later, in answering Professor Earle's message on his retirement -- a kindly letter which expressed the professor's affection for the older man, and acknowledged his rich contribution to higher learning, as well as his "help, encouragement, and affection" during the historian's long illness -- Flexner commented on it in part:

> The contents of your longer letter written June 9 are in a large measure unfounded, as both Princeton and Institute men assure me. In so far as they are personal to me or to anything which I have done, I shall not defend or explain them to anyone, but there is one sentence which, in my judgment, is loaded with danger to you. You say, 'I have expressed to you my alarm on a number of points, more specifically your policies vis-a-vis Princeton University,' etc. At the risk of causing you pain, let me say that I have no recollection of any discussion with you on that point. Without just such a vis-a-vis relationship there would be no Institute. At great risk you were called to the Institute for the purpose of developing scholarship. The ideas underlying the Institute and its relationship with Princeton University were never, and are not now, a part of your concern. What would happen to the Institute if sixteen men or more each felt himself free, in the babyhood of a new institution embodying a new ideal, to ventilate his views instead of concentrating on his subject?
>
> I do not believe that you really or fully understand what our relations with Princeton are, and there is no reason why you should, outside your own field. All you need to know is that you were asked to join the Institute because of my confidence that, in cooperation with Princeton historians and publicists, you might add to the world's store of knowledge....You are here to advance scholarship and to conduct in good faith an educational experiment. You were not and you are not expected to be its architect in whole or any essential part....
>
> If you are willing to accept that relationship, you are in the right place; if you are not willing, you are in the wrong place....
>
> The Institute is no place for anyone who is dissatisfied with its policies or its relationships....If you are not perfectly happy here, there may be other institutions in which you would be happier.

> Do not think for one moment that I speak in anger or in harshness. I am carrying out a great and explicit trust, which I was not free to modify....[119] /Emphasis his/

These widely spaced communications bridged the summer of bitter conflict.

During that period, Professor Earle, by virtue of his having joined issues with Flexner, became the tactician in the struggle, while Professor Veblen was the strategist. He had stimulated Earle, still febrile and insecure, to take the front role with Professor Einstein in the conference with the "two most important Trustees," and now in direct engagement with the Director. His seven years of frustrating contention with Flexner had suddenly been given voice by the erstwhile invalid, who had been active for only two years, of which one was largely devoted to travel. Professor Einstein was summering in New England, and out of communication with both Earle and Veblen until their campaign seemed to be bogging down, when Veblen got the physicist's address from Fine Hall and wrote him for help to get it on the tracks again.[120] Before Einstein took any steps, however, success crowned their efforts, as will be related. It should be noted that Aydelotte was not an active conspirator, but unknown to Flexner, he was privy to the strategems of both sides as a confidant to his old friend on the one hand, and to Earle, Maass and Veblen on the other.

Dr. Flexner had invited him to Canada for the first week of July, and at Maass' suggestion, Aydelotte accepted. He candidly counseled Flexner to retire; he was too tired and unwell to continue in office and should resign. But he yielded to Flexner's pleading, and showed some willingness that Flexner should serve until the end of 1939-40. Thus he

would not be forced out. Moreover, he would by staying oversee the installation of the faculty in Fuld Hall, which was to take place about the 1st September, and would thus prevent Professor Veblen from seizing upon an undue amount of the best accommodations. For, as he sharply reminded the Professor on several occasions following the faculty meeting, the other schools would also have "distinguished visitors" to take care of. An evidence of Flexner's hope that Aydelotte would dampen the ardour behind the campaign for his retirement exists in his having forwarded to Aydelotte a request from a publisher for a book on "How to Get an Education in College." Aydelotte, already well aware that the fires would not subside, begged off on the ground of his many pressing obligations, among which was no mention of the directorship of the Institute.[121]

Before his visit to Flexner, Aydelotte learned what Earle had to say about the degree of authority he had from the faculty to speak for it. Earle had sent to Aydelotte and to Maass copies of his letters to Flexner, and in addition had composed and sent to both a series of five demands outlining what he wanted in the way of faculty participation.[122] Meanwhile, he was able to write Mr. Maass: "I am not unmindful of the fact that you have expressed your desire to have the cooperation of the faculty in these trying days." To Aydelotte he now wrote in answer to a question, saying that eleven, and perhaps twelve, of the sixteen professors would likely vote their lack of confidence in the Director. In relating this to Veblen, he informally asked "the Lord to forgive me for arrogathing so much to myself," as to speak for his colleagues who had not considered or voiced a consensus."[123]

One of his greatest embarrassments, he wrote, was his effort

to convince Stewart that the whole thing was more than "a tempest in a teapot," as the economist insisted on calling it. Earle wrote Aydelotte of his problem in this manner:

> We have not wanted to offend him by saying that the appointment of him and Warren was objectionable on its merits, as well as on grounds of procedure. And it was these appointments, added to everything else, which made the situation no longer tolerable.[124]

Aydelotte's indecision was a serious threat to Earle; he greatly feared personal reprisals from the Director should he preside over the Institute during the coming year. Therefore the professor set himself to stir the flames. The heat he engendered exacerbated his own febrile condition. He used two techniques: one was to imply, without actually saying it, that he had reason to believe that Professor Einstein would resign if Flexner remained as Director for the new term.[125] The other was more serious, since it involved gossip outside the Institute which might erupt in an academic scandal at any moment. Earle wrote Maass and Leidesdorf that he had learned from a staff member of the Rockefeller Foundation that Flexner was attempting to defeat certain applications for grants which Earle had pending for members of a seminar. This was indeed serious if true, but serious also if it were not because it showed the intrigue was not confined within the Institute.[126]

So far Mr. Hardin had acted, Aydelotte said, more like personal counsel to the Founders than as a Trustee. Flexner, the Founders and Hardin were rather close; now, however, Maass asked Earle for permission to show his letter to "another Trustee." This Earle gave by wire.[127] Meanwhile he had written Maass that it appeared the grants were coming through anyway. Now he pressed Maass to show all his letters to the other

Trustee, whom he knew to be Hardin, and added another letter to make up for the failure of his most dramatic charge. In this he explained that though he had loved Flexner as a father, the change in the man over the past two years made his retirement imperative unless the Institute were to be harmed. Here he spoke of Flexner's hostility to criticism; his growing eccentricies, his capacity for self-deception, which "made him untruthful." And perhaps the crowning complaint: "He has lost his grip on the affairs of the Institute, and is altogether unable, I believe, to handle the details which will go with our occupancy of the new building."[128]

The correspondence caused Mr. Hardin to fear greatly that adverse publicity might eventuate, and though Mr. Bamberger had told Flexner to do nothing undignified or precipitate, Hardin decided it was best for the Director to declare then his plans to retire. Accordingly, Flexner wrote each Trustee confidentially that he would ask to be relieved of his duties at the close of the Board meeting on the 9th October.[129] Professor Veblen's acknowledgment was a model of forthrightness:

> I have your letter of the 12th signifying your intention of retiring from the directorship of our Institute. It is easy to imagine some of the conflicting emotions which must accompany so important an occasion, but I hope that the deepest of these is a sense of satisfaction at the extent to which the Institute is an image of your original plan. It seems to me that there are very good reasons for expecting it to hold true to those original purposes for a long time to come.
>
> With cordial wishes for your continued health and happiness...[130]

Just before Aydelotte was to return from Mexico, where he received and acknowledged Flexner's confidential letter announcing his intended resignation, the Director called Stewart to Magnetawan to inform him fully of the situation, and to persuade the economist to act as

his liaison with Aydelotte as his chosen successor. There Stewart read Flexner's mail, received his observations, and took down his instructions in handwritten notes which remain and were confirmed by the economist. Mr. Bamberger had acknowledged Flexner's service to him and his sister with brief but meaningful praise:

> You came into our lives at the moment we needed you most -- I assure you there is nothing we would not do to preserve our friendship.[131]

Aydelotte sent warm and cheerful greetings and congratulations. Houghton wished to resign on the 9th October, too. (Here Stewart wrote a private note to himself, which revealed completely his knowledge that the faculty situation was serious indeed.) It was also clearly revealed that Flexner had talked with Aydelotte some years ago as his choice for a successor, and that Mr. Bamberger wanted Aydelotte. Mr. Bamberger now said that "someone had been talking too much," and that "it was very wrong of Maass." If the Institute were to receive more money from Mr. Bamberger, the succession must be assured. Indeed, Mr. Bamberger had told Flexner personally that he and his sister were well pleased with their "investment," and "will continue their support." It was Flexner's hope that the Trustees' special committee would choose Aydelotte without consulting the faculty; that as soon as he had resigned and Aydelotte was appointed, the three faculty Trustees should resign. In view of Mr. Houghton's wishes, he should be succeeded -- presumably by Weed, -- as Chairman. Flexner was to continue as a Trustee, and would act as Mr. Aydelotte's "adviser." Flexner wanted, needed, and expected to receive a considerable sum from the Rockefeller Foundation for the social sciences in the Institute.[132]

Earle and Veblen now turned to the important matter of faculty participation in the selection of a successor Director. Earle had forehandedly presented Mr. Maass with a list of suggestions for future procedures which would give the faculty a voice in decisions of academic importance. There were five points: (1) Future directors should be chosen by a joint committee of Trustees and faculty; (2) The Trustees should establish a retiring age for faculty members and the Director; (3) The appointment of future members of the faculty should be only upon nomination by the whole faculty; (4) Faculty trustees should be selected by the faculty, if faculty members were to continue to serve on the Board; (5) There should be better consultation with the faculty in preparing the budget, so that favoritism, and emphasis upon "cooperation with Princeton University," such as involved the Institute in the Antioch excavations, could be avoided.[133] No action had been taken on these "suggestions." Veblen asked Earle to send them to Einstein, and to suggest his help in gaining recognition for them. This Earle did.[134]

But Veblen had visited Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass at Elberon with Miss Goldman late in July or early in August; shortly afterwards he wrote Earle that the insistence on secrecy over the coming retirement of Flexner was being so faithfully observed by Mr. Maass that it would be impossible to select the Director by the cooperative method.[135] This did not stop Earle. He insisted that Aydelotte should take up the cudgels for his plan, finally to learn from the President of Swarthmore that Flexner had just told him Mr. Bamberger wanted him to succeed to the office. Earle said he had no objection to that, but still insisted on the new method as a matter of principle, complaining to Veblen that they were

faced by a fait accompli. He said that Aydelotte told him he had insisted on talking with the Swarthmore faculty before accepting the appointment from the Trustees, and would prefer to do the same here, but that he feared Mr. Bamberger would oppose any such suggestion.[136]

Then Stewart wired Flexner that Professor Riefler had committed himself to see that there would be prior consultation with the faculty, and that it must be done.[137]

The Director thereupon planned to talk with the professors himself. Mrs. Flexner wired Stewart and Riefler confidentially, saying her husband's physician feared the consequences of such a course. Accordingly, Mr. Houghton undertook to spend the afternoon of the 7th October at Princeton, interviewing the professors and informing them of what was contemplated.[138]

However, before such amicable arrangements were made, and before the Director had made his decision, Professor Veblen had made some overtures to Mr. Maass for a meeting between some of the Trustees or the full Board with himself, and perhaps Earle and Einstein. His correspondence with Earle at that time was marked by exquisite irony. He praised the historian by telling him that he "gathered from Aydelotte that your letters have been very helpful in bringing matters to a head."[139] When he suggested that Earle engage Einstein's support of his plans for faculty participation in the selection of a successor director, he cautioned Earle not to send the physicist the rest of his correspondence: "he doubted Einstein would want to see /it/." He may have suspected that the letters to Flexner of the 9th June might have rankled, or that Einstein might resent the implications

that he would retire if Flexner were not displaced by the new term. And Veblen added the supreme touch:

> If there is a Trustees' meeting, it would probably be well for me to have copies of your letters to Flexner, Leidesdorf and Maass in my possession, in case I am challenged on details...

But he intended to keep "to generalities," if it were possible, he added. And he closed by urging Earle to obey the advice of his physicians and to "take a good vacation."[140]

Professor Einstein, remote from the Trustees and the whole situation, answered Earle's plea for support for a new procedure now as follows:

> Unfortunately, it seems impossible for the faculty to cooperate in the election (sic) of the new Director because the most active Trustees are acting in perfect secrecy and are trying to avoid that anything becomes known before the retirement becomes official.
>
> It seems to me, therefore, most important that a certain agreement of a majority of the Trustees is reached concerning a list of persons who would be acceptable as Director. Unfortunately Veblen and Aydelotte cannot be active in this respect since their names should appear on this list.[141]

Mr. Houghton consulted Mr. Bamberger to learn his wishes for program for the Board meeting, which Mr. Bamberger gave as follows:

> I am glad to comply and wish to say since Dr. Flexner is anxious to be relieved of his responsibilities I feel that his resignation should be accepted. I believe that the Board should adopt a suitable resolution expressing the gratitude and admiration which the Trustees feel for his great work in planning the Institute and conducting it since its inception.
>
> My understanding is that the Board should then appoint a committee to nominate a new Director. If you approve I should be glad to have you serve on this committee and should like to have in addition to yourself Mr. Hardin and Mr. Leidesdorf.

> I understand that you would like an expression of my wishes in regard to Dr. Flexner's successor. On that point I wish to say that Mrs. Fuld and I are in perfect accord in suggesting Dr. Frank Aydelotte. We have known him for some years and feel that he has the ideals and qualifications to direct the Institute most capably. I understand that you feel that the members of the Faculty should be consulted, and I am glad to learn that you are willing to undertake this task. I believe you are the best person to do it, and I hope that you will do so in whatever way you think proper. I trust, however, that it can be done before October 9 so that the Board will be in a position to take action on that day.
>
> In conclusion I wish to express best thanks to you for Mrs. Fuld and myself for your interest and help in this important matter. We consider the Institute fortunate in having you for Chairman of the Board.[142]

Mr. Houghton agreed, asking only that the memorial resolution go over to January, to allow ample time for its preparation. He told Mr. Bamberger that in deference to Dr. Aydelotte's wishes, he would remain as Chairman until his successor was chosen.[143]

During the excitement of the summer, war came to Europe. Einstein was the only one to mention this in all the correspondence which is available, saying he felt better since England and France had decided to fight Germany.[144] Flexner mentioned the war at the meeting, saying that it made the Institute for Advanced Study more essential than ever. Thus did the microcosm and its affairs dominate men's thoughts.

The meeting witnessed Flexner reporting and speaking as Director until he announced his retirement, and Aydelotte was selected as his successor. Apparently he prepared the minutes to that point, the new Director preparing them from that point on. The one significant difference noticeable is that from that point the word faculty was spelled with a capital. So it will be in this documentary.

Flexner had prepared and placed in each Trustee's hand a copy of his Confidential Memo of 9/26/31, so that the Board could reread it after the passage of years and agree with him that he had followed his chart closely. He said that he had not changed his mind as to the impracticability of faculty government. But he added that "in so far as experience has proved me wrong, my successor should do differently." He conceded that the Director would now have "a more intimate and fuller knowledge of the workings of the Institute than was possible during the years when we were scattered..." He suggested that his successor "should not hesitate to depart from precedents which I have set, if, in his judgment, the Institute can thus be made more effective for the purpose for which it was designed." He urged that the "experimental" character of the institution be preserved.[143] Then he resigned, and quickly the action was accepted, and Mr. Houghton appointed himself, Messrs. Louis Bamberger, Hardin and Leidesdorf as the special committee to recommend a successor. The committee withdrew, and when it reappeared, Messrs. Aydelotte and Flexner left the room.

After the Board approved Mr. Aydelotte as the new Director, the two men returned, and Mr. Aydelotte accepted the position:

> I appreciate deeply the honor and responsibility which the Trustees have conferred on me, and much more because of the fact that the Trustees acted only after prior consultation with members of the Faculty. In my judgment that is the only sound procedure for making such a selection as this.
>
> I have been a Trustee of the Institute for Advanced Study since its beginning and have constantly been interested in its welfare. I can, indeed, trace my connection with it further back than its actual beginning, since it chanced that I first suggested to the Rhodes Trustees that Dr. Flexner should be invited to deliver the Rhodes Memorial Lectures

> in Oxford in 1928. It was in these lectures that he first outlined the need for an institution of this type in the United States, and it was that statement, I believe, which caused Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld to devote their fortunes to this purpose.
>
> I believe strongly in the soundness of Dr. Flexner's plan, and I congratulate him upon the admirable beginning which he has made during his ten years as Director. I receive your invitation to succeed him with great enthusiasm and also with great humility. I can only pledge my best efforts to measure up to the opportunity which your decision has thrown open to me.
>
> I must ask your permission to delay my formal acceptance until I have time to place my resignation in the hands of the Board of Trustees of Swarthmore College, to take effect as soon as my successor is chosen. My first responsibility is of course to Swarthmore, and I must continue the duties of my office there until that time, although from now on I am confident of being able to spend one or two days each week in Princeton.[146]

The meeting closed appropriately enough with a list of gifts to the Institute in the nature of memorial decorations. Miss Lavinia Bamberger presented bronze plaques of Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, and received the "hearty thanks" of the Board. A group headed by Judge Irving Lehman of the New York Court of Appeals and Chancellor Harry W, Chase of New York University presented the Institute with a bronze bust of Professor Einstein, the work of Konenkev. Mrs. Flexner gave a bust of her husband by the same sculptor. The Trustees expressed their appreciation. Though all these works were artistically worthy, and historically appropriate, all save the bas relief of Mr. Bamberger and Einstein's bust have been relegated to storage.

Mr. Houghton was able to announce the news of the retirement of Flexner and the succession of Aydelotte some five days later. Flexner dispatched the following wire to Dr. and Mrs. Aydelotte:

Heartiest congratulations and best wishes. I am extremely happy. 'May the Lord bless you and guide you, and may he let the light of his countenance shine upon you and give you success.'[147]

Aydelotte answered with equal warmth:

Deeply appreciate your warm-hearted telegram. Delighted with report of Dr. Flexner's release. Look forward with humility and enthusiasm to task of carrying out his great dream on foundations he has laid. Marie joins me in much love to you both.[148]

In between these Flexner wrote Aydelotte rather interestingly as follows:

I had a long talk yesterday with Veblen -- brought about quite accidentally -- about the /faculty/ dinners and about his advice to Earle not to lunch with me. He said not a word in self-defence. He said things, however, not one of which was true. I do not believe that he is wilfully dishonest, but he is a queer duck with what Stewart calls 'a twisted mind.' I am determined that you shall not be embarrassed by him as I have been during the past six months. The way in which every member of the faculty spoke to Mr. Houghton and the letters and messages I am receiving from them show conclusively, as you will see, that Veblen is absolutely self-deceived. He had, I suspect, not a motive but an ambition, which, fortunately, the Trustees have disappointed ....

I said to Dodds that you have one great advantage over me -- you are in your own right a scholar and can be one of the humanistic group. I, alas, have never been a scholar, for two years at the Johns Hopkins...do not produce scholarship, though they do and did produce a reverence for it which I am now leaving in safe keeping with you....

I should not be doing my duty by you or the Institute if I failed to give you warning of these facts. Veblen wants power. Maass wants importance. You will have to make them both realize from the start that you are master -- not, of course, a despotic master, but a master who insists, as I unfortunately did not, that he is to participate in every meeting, whether of the faculty or of the several groups.... The position of my successor is in one sense stronger than mine.[149]

Was Flexner saying in that last sentence that Aydelotte would not be bound as he had been by the attitude of Mr. Bamberger toward the faculty which he had displayed in the pre-history of the Institute? Undoubtedly this was part of it. Otherwise, both men knew that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld had warmer affection for the Aydelottes personally than they had ever felt for Dr. Flexner.

Dr. and Mrs. Flexner remained in Princeton until mid-November, and he had the satisfaction of sitting for that brief time in the office of the absent Director in the building which he had wanted and needed, but of necessity opposed as long as possible because of his determination to build a fine faculty first. He enjoyed informing Aydelotte in Swarthmore of the many messages of congratulations and praise which flowed in to them both. Then, really in ill health, the Flexners went south, first to Williamsburg and then to the Johns Hopkins Hospital, where both were patients after their grueling experience. For Mrs. Flexner had suffered every pang her husband did. One must grant Flexner a degree of insight into the overwhelming importance of physical and material things to Professor Veblen, without which it is doubtful if the mathematician would have been willing to wage the campaign to unseat him as Director at this particular time. And yet it was that very insight, and the determination to defeat Veblen's ambition, which caused Flexner to misread the strength of Veblen's influence over Earle, and the sound reason with which Earle, having written his letters, stiffened his intent through fear that his lot would be impossible with Flexner as Director another year. The Director was forced into an undignified and unreasonable insistence on keeping

an office which his health and temper no longer made it possible for him to keep in the interests of the Institute itself. In so doing, he invited whatever humiliation he suffered. His failure to calculate the odds correctly was his failure to understand how academic politics could work without an expressed consensus of the faculty; how one man, working with the support of another, and with the overall general conviction of a just and generous man, based on misinformation, could prevail, no matter how well recognized was his own record of accomplishment.

Dr. Aydelotte conferred with Mr. Bamberger shortly after the Flexners departed, and informed him of the next steps. These were to take care of Dr. Flexner's future financial status, and also presumably to acquaint the Founder with his plans to give the Faculty a certain status as an organized body. Then he met the Executive Committee of the Board, proposing that Dr. and Mrs. Flexner's pensions should be increased to $12,000 and $6,000 respectively, and that his salary would continue through the 31st December; that he be called Director Emeritus, and be elected to a life trusteeship. He was also to have an office in Fuld Hall. All were effectuated except the life trusteeship, which Flexner renounced at the next annual meeting since it would involve an amendment of the By-Laws in conflict with the provision by which in 1933 the Founders were made Honorary Trustees for life.[150] Also, Flexner thanked Aydelotte for the office, but accepted instead one made available to him by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the Guaranty Trust Building on Fifth Avenue in New York.

The meeting of the Faculty was decorous and restrained. Aydelotte announced his intention of calling them together two or three times

a semester, as occasion demanded. Meanwhile, he would be kept in touch with their thoughts, needs and feelings by a standing committee, to consist of three professors to be elected annually by their colleagues. One may imagine Professor Earle's surprise, and even chagrin, to hear Professor Veblen suggest that the Director should appoint the committee, instead of its being elected. This the Director consented to do, after consulting the professors of each school and choosing a representative from each according to their advice. The first members he announced in January: Miss Goldman, and Messrs. Stewart and Veblen.[151]

The memorial resolution to Dr. Flexner was drafted first by the Director, and submitted to a committee of the Faculty (Meritt, Riefler and Veblen) and to the Executive Committee for suggested changes. It was approved after much dickering in the Faculty group -- indeed, according to one of the participants it took one nearly all-night session to come to terms -- and finally was approved as a Joint Resolution of Trustees and Faculty in January. It reads:

> The Trustees and Faculty of the Institute for Advanced Study take the occasion of Dr. Flexner's retirement to record in this joint resolution their sense of permanent indebtedness to him. The character of the Institute has been determined by his faith in the role of the creative scholar in society. It is this that led him, when he undertook to organize the Institute, to concentrate first and foremost upon the search for individuals, to insist upon complete freedom for those individuals in the pursuit of their scholarly objectives, and to endeavor to surround their lives with a dignified environment. These ideals, deeply held, account for the boldness of the Institute's plan, the flexibility of its arrangements, and the severity of its standards. He built the Institute around its scholars and did not try to fit them into a pre-arranged institutional plan.
>
> The embodiment of his ideals in the Institute constitutes the latest phase of a career which spans the period, from

> Gilman to the present time, during which Armerican education and scholarship achieved maturity. In that career his experience was long and varied, first, as a successful teacher, then, as a brilliant investigator of educational and social institutions, and subsequently, as a wise administrator of philanthropic funds. All this experience he placed at our disposal. Whatever prestige the Institute enjoys or may enjoy in the future, whatever service it may render to scholarship, will be based upon the foundations established by Abraham Flexner. Exegit monumentum aere perennius.[152]

During the holiday season Flexner, at Aydelotte's request, worked with a New York Times reporter who had been told to get a story on what the Institute was actually accomplishing. It was hard going, as Flexner admitted in a letter to Aydelotte, but finally, he said, he hit upon a phrase which seemed to open the door to an understanding: each professor "was working on the frontiers of knowledge." Flexner said he told the reporter of "the work of Einstein, Lowe, Merritt and von Neumann, all pioneers and adventurers." And then he wrote:

> The Old Year goes out today. What a year it has been! And the New Year comes in. I hope it may bring peace and decency for us all. But for you and Marie I have a special wish. I trust that this new adventure on which you are embarking may mean an easier and happier period than you have ever known. The Institute is still only in its beginnings. You will get many a thrill as it grows. And there is no one alive to whom I could more confidently commit its further upbringing. A Happy New Year to you both, and to it, and a long succession of them.
>
> I have seen Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld; both are well, and well content that the directorship has paased from my hands to yours...
>
> Heartfelt greetings.
>
> Ever affectionately,
>
> Abraham Flexner.[153]

CHAPTER VIII - NOTES

1. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 2.

2. Ibid., pp. 6-7.

3. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, p. 4.

4. Flexner to Fosdick, 3/19/37; 4/14/37. Fosdick to Flexner, 4/13/37.

5. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/13/36, p. 2.

6. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, p. 8. Professor Mitrany's report not available.

7. Riefler to Straus, 10/19/36. Riefler's home files. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/26/36, asking for both reports.

8. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, p. 3.

9. Flexner to Riefler, 8/5/37. The memorandum is not available.

10. Flexner to Maass, 8/7/37.

11. Maass to Flexner, 8/18/37.

12. Flexner to Louis Bamberger, 8/6/37. The proposed letter follows:

To the Trustees:

We have had recent conferences with the Director of the Institute respecting the future of the Institute and the importance of conserving such funds as the Institute may receive in order that, when the opportunity for expansion or growth in a basic field arises, the Institute may be financially able to support advance.

We are grateful to the Trustees of the Institute for the extreme care which they have exercised in developing the Institute within a few years to a point where it has already won international recognition. We are naturally concerned that it shall maintain permanently the standards upon which it has been conducted and that it shall restrict its activities to fields and subjects of fundamental importance, raising its standards whenever the development of higher education in America makes such elevation of standards possible. We wish to impress on the Trustees and their successors the importance of so conserving the endowment of the Institute that, as advances become advis-

able and feasible, funds will be at hand with which to support them.

In our recent conferences with the Director it was made clear to us that additional income to the extent of $250,000 or $300,000 could be employed within the next few years for the logical development of the Schools now in existence, provided personnel equal in capacity and ability to the present personnel of the Institute can be found. But the possibilities of usefulness on the part of the Institute will not end with this expansion. It leaves out of account such important subjects as history, literature, etc., as well as the experimental sciences. Fortunately the Institute need not undertake to develop any subject unless it possesses the requisite funds and can find the proper persons.

This we regard as fundamental to its spirit and ideals; this letter is written by the Founders in the hope and expectation that the Trustees and the Faculty will keep continuously in mind a long-range policy of development either in fields now cultivated or in new fields in which development may be deemed important hereafter.

Unspent income should normally at the end of every year, in our judgment, be added to the capital funds of the Institute, thus gradually increasing the income available for the purposes of the Institute as it expands in future years.

With deep appreciation for the services of the Trustees and the Faculty, we are

Very sincerely,

13. Flexner to Riefler, 8/10/37. Riefler to Flexner, 8/13/37.

14. Flexner to Aydelotte, 8/17/37; 9/16/37; 9/20/37. Aydelotte files.

15. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/27/37.

16. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, pp. 4, 5.

17. Ibid., p. 11.

18. Ibid., pp. 5, 6.

19. Ibid., p. 9.

20. Ibid., pp. 12, 13. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/24/38, p. 14.

21. Faculty to Director, 10/21/37. School of Economics and Politics files.

22. Ibid.

23. Faculty to Director, 11/5/37. School of Economics and Politics files.

24. Ibid.

25. Veblen to Flexner, 11/17/37.

26. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/4/37.

27. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/24/38, p. 6.

28. Ibid., p. 7.

29. Flexner to Aydelotte, 1/27/38. Aydelotte files.

30. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/24/38, p. 9.

31. Ibid., pp. 10-12.

32. Flexner to Aydelotte, 1/15/38. Aydelotte's confidential files. The Director asked that this correspondence be destroyed, but Aydelotte failed to comply.

33. Aydelotte to Flexner, 1/23/38. From a rough handwritten draft, Aydelotte confidential files.

34. Flexner to Aydelotte, 1/27/38. Aydelotte papers.

35. Ibid.

36. Flexner to Veblen, 1/26/38; 1/29/38.

37. Maass to Flexner, 2/28/38.

38. Minutes, Executive Committee, 3/29/38.

39. Flexner to Veblen, 3/30/38.

40. Flexner to Louis Bamberger, 4/4/38.

41. Report, Budget Committee, 4/7/38.

42. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/38, pp. 5 ff.

43. Ibid., p. 6. Flexner had conversed with Stewart on plans for economics on the 5th April, according to handwritten notes of Stewart which, conditioned on his possible acceptance of a professorship at the Institute, made clear that he wanted two additional permanent

appointments -- "to be selected by agreement between faculty and Director" -- with the approval of the Board, to be made within an agreed time. Also, there would be a full-time lecturer or visiting professor, and four research associates, preferably to be financed by outside funds. With this program understood, Flexner was "to consider with Princeton University the extent and time of possible changes in the economics faculty, and possibly some adjustment of present graduate fellowships to meet financial needs of the associates above mentioned." Stewart papers.

The latter part of the memorandum is interesting as a reflection of Riefler's earlier plan for cooperation between the two institutions in research on finance. There was no clarification of program of studies here, though that may well have been verbally understood.

44. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/38, pp. 9, 10.

45. Ibid., p. 11.

46. Flexner, memorandums on interviews. 5/19/38; 5/20/38; 5/25/38; June, 1938; 6/7/38; 6/15/38; Alexander Loveday to Flexner, 10/17/38.

47. Flexner to Veblen, 6/11/38.

48. Maass to Flexner, 6/14/38.

49. Riefler to Flexner, 6/27/38.

50. Flexner to Riefler, 7/6/38.

51. Flexner to Stewart, 10/13/38.

52. Flexner to Riefler, 7/16/38.

53. Riefler to Flexner, 7/14/38.

54. Flexner to Louis Bamberger, 7/16/38.

55. Louis Bamberger to Flexner, 7/19/38.

56. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/38, pp. 5-11. See Aydelotte to Hardin, 4/13/44, Aydelotte files. Aydelotte wrote: "Mr. Bamberger had, before I came to the Institute /as Director/ promised to give $25,000 per year, matching $25,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation, and...I was encouraged to believe that Mr. Bamberger would increase this amount to $50,000 matching $50,000 from the Foundation."

57. Ibid., p. 11.

58. Ibid., p. 12.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid., p. 13. Terms: salary of each man, $15,000, with the usual provisions for retirement and contributions to T.I.A.A. Effective when they took up their duties, probably early in January.

61. Ibid., p. 14.

62. Flexner to Miss Goldman, 10/31/38.

63. Aydelotte to Maass, 5/26/38.

64. Aydelotte to Maass, 5/28/38.

65. Maass to Aydelotte, 6/1/38.

66. Flexner to Aydelotte, 7/2/38.

67. Veblen to Flexner, 7/22/38. Flexner to Veblen, 7/26/38.

68. Aydelotte to Flexner, 7/26/38.

69. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/20/38. Aydelotte to Maass, 9/21/38. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/23/38.

70. The Weyl contracts were two: one insuring Mrs. Weyl's life, indemnifying the Institute should she die, and the other providing a pension to her of $5,000 per annum should she survive her husband and remain his widow. Both were single-payment policies, costing approximately $150,000, on which sum the Institute received annually between 3 and 4%.

71. Hardin to Maass, 5/9/38; 5/11/38. Maass to Hardin, 5/10/38. Hardin papers.

72. Flexner to Maass, 9/21/38.

73. Maass to Mrs. Bailey, 10/31/38. Riefler to Mrs. Bailey, 10/31/38. Flexner to Riefler, 11/2/38. Riefler, Memorandum to Finance Committee, 11/4/38. The premises of Riefler's analysis were faulty, in that they did not include Flexner's own large pension claim, of which he was not informed.

74. Veblen to Flexner, 10/4/38. Flexner to Veblen, 10/5/38.

75. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/38, pp. 13, 14.

76. Maass to Flexner, 10/17/38. Flexner to Maass, 10/19/38.

77. Maass to Flexner, 10/14/38. Flexner to Maass, 10/18/38.

78. Flexner to Farrier, 9/21/38.

79. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 11/5/38.

80. Veblen to Aydelotte, 11/19/38.

81. Dr. William Flexner of Cornell came as a member 1939-40, without stipend from the Institute. It seemed that Professor Veblen was not, after all, interested in the young man's work, for when the annual Bulletin was published in April, 1940, William was distressed to see that though the lectures of other members were noted in its text, nothing was said about his own. (Of fifty-eight men listed as lecturing, four were Institute professors, thirteen, members, and three, assistants.) William Flexner wrote Dr. Aydelotte an anxious letter, on which Aydelotte asked Veblen to comment. Veblen replied:

"Regarding W. Flexner's letter, all I can see to do is to assure him that you have heard from me that he has made a full contribution to the year's activity of the Institute in mathematics. In fact this would be true in view of what I know even if he had given no lectures. It is likely that there will always be omissions of this sort, especially when the lectures are given in university courses which make no report to us.

How strong an argument this is against having this material in the Bulletin I leave for you to decide." (Veblen to Aydelotte, 6/13/40) Emphasis supplied.

Later, when the accord between Flexner and Aydelotte had broken, and Aydelotte consulted Veblen for possible reasons for Flexner's animosity, Veblen cited Flexner's favoritism toward certain men, including William Flexner, his nephew. (See Aydelotte's notes.)

82. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/23/39, pp. 4-10, passim.

83. Ibid., p. 8.

84. Ibid., p. 10.

85. Ibid., pp. 11, 12.

86. Ibid., pp. 12, 13.

87. Ibid., p. 13. Professor Riefler proposed to add the following to Mrs. Bailey's notes:
"With respect to the current problem raised by Professor Veblen, namely, the desirability of greater faculty participation in administration, he had not finally made up his mind. He had had no previous experience with academic administration, when he came to the Institute, but had been sympathetic at that time with faculty

participation. (Riefler to Bailey, 2/1/39.) But he was evidently persuaded to withdraw his amendment.

Professor Veblen asked that he be recorded as speaking approvingly of autonomy for each school, and that statement was added in the minutes. (Veblen to Bailey, 1/31/39.)

88. Ibid., pp. 14-16. Stipend funds voted for 1939-40 were $17,500 for the School of Mathematics, and $10,000 for the School of Humanistic Studies, instead of the $30,000 and $19,000 for the current year.

89. Ibid., p. 16.

90. Flexner to Veblen, 1/30/39.

91. Hardin to Maass, 1/28/39. Maass to Hardin, 1/30/39. Hardin papers.

92. Flexner to Fosdick, 2/9/39. Fosdick to Flexner 2/21/39.

93. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 2/3/39.

94. Veblen, Memorandum for Dr. Aydelotte, recapitulating faculty relations with the first Director. Veblen papers. See Aydelotte to Veblen, 9/24/40. Veblen papers.

95. Interview with Alexander.

96. Aydelotte to Flexner, 2/21/39, with memorandum covering the main events of their association of thirty-five years. Aydelotte files.

97. Flexner to Aydelotte, 2/23/39. Aydelotte files.

98. Houghton to Flexner, 2/22/39; 4/5/39. Flexner to Houghton, 3/22/39.

99. Einstein, Goldman and Morse to Flexner, 3/15/39. Veblen, Memo. cit. Also, School of Economics and Politics files.

100. Flexner to Morse, unsent letter, 3/18/39. Veblen papers.

101. Einstein and Morse to colleagues, 3/30/39. Veblen, Memo. cit. Also School of Economics and Politics files.

102. Veblen, Memo. cit., p. 28.

103. Flexner to Riefler, 5/10/39.

104. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/22/39, pp. 1, 2. The faculty had met on the 13th February and the 13th March, according to two of its members.

105. Ibid., p. 9. In an amendment adopted at Mr. Bamberger's request by Members of the Corporation, on 4/24/34 (p. 3), two Vice-Chairmen had been provided for so that there would always be an officer present at meetings of the Board and standing committees as a substitute for the Chairman. Now, their right to attend committee meetings was suggested for elimination by Mr. Bamberger or Mr. Farrier, probably because of the part Mr. Maass played in the Executive Committee meeting of 3/29/38.

106. Flexner to Maass, 5/27/39. Maass to Flexner, 5/31/39.

107. Houghton, Opening Address, dedication ceremonies at Fuld Hall, 5/22/39.

108. President Dodds, Address at dedication ceremonies.

109. Maass to Flexner, 5/31/39.

110. Earle to Aydelotte, 6/25/39. Earle papers.

111. Flexner to Leidesdorf, 6/29/39.

112. Earle to Aydelotte, 6/15/39. Earle papers.

113. See Flexner to Aydelotte, 7/16/39, cautioning him to keep Stewart's acceptance secret, since he did not want Earle and Mitrany apprised of it. Aydelotte files. Miss Goldman to Flexner, 4/29/39. Flexner to Miss Goldman, 5/3/39.

114. Interviews with Professors Veblen and von Neumann.

115. Interviews. Veblen, Memo. cit.

116. Earle to Aydelotte, 6/25/39. Earle papers.

117. Earle to Flexner, 6/9/39. Earle papers.

118. Earle to Flexner, 6/9/39. Earle papers.

119. Flexner to Earle, 10/19/39. Earle papers.

120. See Veblen to Earle, 8/9/39. Earle papers.

121. Aydelotte to Flexner, 7/25/39. Aydelotte files. See also Flexner to Veblen, 2/10/39; 2/14/39.

122. Earle to Maass, 6/25/39. Earle to Aydelotte, 6/25/39. Earle papers. "Not all men," wrote Earle to Aydelotte, "are as courageous as some." Thus Professor Lowe won't want to hurt "the old man;" Morse had "to go to bed after a bout with him." But he thought the following would vote for Flexner's resignation "if the faculty should be called

together and asked to voice its opinion: Einstein, Morse, Veblen, Alexander, von Neumann (personally indifferent but loyal to group) Weyl, Mitrany, Goldman, Herzfeld, Earle, and probably Panofsky (unreliable) and Lowe. Einstein held Lowe's proxy; Earle, Mitrany's. Meritt, Riefler, Stewart and Warren "are, as you know, in a special category."

123. Earle to Maas, 6/18/39; to Veblen, 6/28/39; to Aydelotte, 6/28/39. Earle papers.

124. Earle to Aydelotte, 6/28/39. Earle papers.

125. See Earle to Aydelotte, 6/25/39; to Maass, 7/21/39. Earle papers.

126. Earle to Maass and Leidesdorf, 7/21/39. Earle to Veblen, 7/22/39. Earle papers.

127. Maass to Earle, 7/24/39. Earle to Maass, wire, 7/25/39. Earle papers.

128. Earle to Maass, 7/23/39; 7/26/39. Earle papers.

129. See Flexner to Hardin, 7/29/39; 8/7/39; 8/12/39. Hardin papers. Hardin to Leidesdorf, 8/2/39; to Flexner, 8/2/39; 8/9/39. Hardin to Louis Bamberger, 8/9/39. Louis Bamberger to Hardin, 8/11/39. Hardin papers.

130. Veblen to Flexner, 8/18/39. Veblen papers.

131. Stewart, handwritten undated notes. Mr. Stewart read them and confirmed a copy during an interview on 2/6/56, as notes taken between the 17th and 25th August at Magnetawan. School of Economics and Politics files.

132. Ibid.

133. Earle to Maass, 6/18/39. Earle papers.

134. Veblen to Earle, 8/9/39. Earle papers.

135. Earle to Veblen, 8/5/39. Veblen to Earle, 8/23/39. Earle papers.

136. Earle to Veblen, 9/4/39. Earle papers.

137. Stewart to Flexner, wire, 9/11/39. School of Economics and Politics papers.

138. Houghton to Flexner, 10/5/39.

139. Veblen to Earle, 7/30/39. Earle papers.

140. Veblen to Earle, 8/9/39. Earle papers.

141. Einstein to Earle, 8/28/39. Earle papers.

142. Louis Bamberger to Houghton, 10/2/39.

143. Houghton to Louis Bamberger, 10/5/39.

144. Einstein to Earle, 9/6/39. Earle papers.

145. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/9/39, pp. 6, 7.

146. Ibid., pp. 13, 14.

147. Flexner to Dr. and Mrs. Aydelotte, 10/16/39. Telegram. Aydelotte files.

148. Aydelotte to Dr. and Mrs. Flexner, 10/18/39. Telegram. Aydelotte files.

149. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/17/39. Aydelotte papers.

150. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 11/24/39. Aydelotte consulted Mr. Bamberger by telephone and letter (11/19 and 11/20 respectively). Louis Bamberger responded 11/21/39 non-committally on the increased pension, and said he would be unable to attend the meeting. Actions ratified, Trustees' meeting, 1/22/40, p. 1. (Mr. Bamberger was present.)

151. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/24/39. Aydelotte to professors, 1/16/40.

152. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/22/40, pp. 1, 2.

153. Flexner to Aydelotte, 12/31/39. Aydelotte files.

CHAPTER IX

A PERIOD FOR CONSOLIDATION

Dr. Aydelotte served as President of Swarthmore College and Director of the Institute until he was released by the appointment of his successor at the end of fiscal year 1940. During the months of double duty, he and Mrs. Aydelotte commuted between Swarthmore and Princeton, spending the first three days of each week at the College and the second three in Princeton. He cheerily told the Trustees that his busy schedule had required the abandonment of some of his extra-curricular activities, so that he had actually found more time for reading in the evenings than he had enjoyed for some years. That observation may clarify the extent to which Aydelotte gave of his time and energy to public activities, social, educational and civic. Even so, he continued to serve as American Secretary to the Rhodes Trustees, President of the Association of the American Rhodes Scholars, Trustee of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, and Chairman of the Educational Advisory Board of the Guggenheim Foundation, all of which he had been doing for some years.

Dr. Aydelotte came to the Institute with a fine reputation for bold and successful pioneering in the English system of "reading for honors" which he had initiated in the United States. Under his leadership Swarthmore came to be well known as an excellent college in the liberal arts. He had keyed its admissions and activities to educate the most ambitious and educable students. He called it "breaking the academic

lockstep" in a book so entitled, which described a triumph over that dreary business of gearing educational effort in the colleges to students of mediocre talent and little intellectual ambition. His policies had not always been accepted cordially by Swarthmore alumni, or by all the members of the Board of Managers, many of whom opposed the elimination of inter-collegiate sports, and his drive for intellectual progress. Dr. Flexner had stood with him through some of these more formidable challenges during his nineteen years as President, and meant it when he expressed the hope that his friend's life as Director of the Institute would be easier and more rewarding than it had ever been.

Perhaps no single episode better reveals the new Director's essential gallantry and courage, or the nature of some of his trials, than one recounted after his death by his good friend and colleague, Dr. Brand Blanshard:

> Once in his years at Swarthmore when he was much in need of a vacation, he decided not to take it in the interests of the college. At that moment his Board of Managers became anxious and critical about where he was leading their institution, and wondered whether he was their man. It was typical of him that when he heard this, he reversed himself and took off with his wife for Egypt and inner refreshment; if the Board wanted to review his work, they would do it without any intercession from himself. The sequel was that one of their number caught up with him in Spain and asked him earnestly to come back. He gaily came.[1]

This was the occasion when on their return home the Aydelottes arrived in Oxford to hear the last of Dr. Flexner's Rhodes Memorial Lectures, which, as Flexner said later, only a man courageous enough to recommend an "educational heretic" could have made possible.

It was characteristic of Dr. Aydelotte that though he had wanted to become a member of the Quaker Meeting from his earliest days

at Swarthmore, he did not ask for admission until the day he resigned, lest it interfere with the freedom of the Board in dealing frankly with him. Needless to say, he was welcomed warmly then, familiar figure that he was on the front benches.

As the Managers of Swarthmore contemplated his leaving in 1939, they found his many achievements impressive and his presence endearing. Their parting resolution mentioned some of these things. He had enlarged and strengthened the Faculty; this they knew by the "annual calls of other institutions upon our Faculty for professors and even for presidents, thus proving the distinction of those with whom President Aydelotte has surrounded himself." They attributed to him Swarthmore's advance in educational standards, which had resulted in wider and more thorough scholarship; the pioneering in honors work, since adopted by many American colleges; the return to intra-collegiate sports "for sport's sake," which he achieved by curtailing gate receipts. He and Mrs. Aydelotte had cemented closer relations between the Faculty, the students, and the administration by their social graciousness. He had greatly augmented Swarthmore's endowment. He had devised, promoted and supervised effective standards for the selective admission of students on the basis of their ability and initiative. Scholarship grants had increased substantially during his term. He had initiated and enforced full sabbatical leave, and had insisted on better salaries, and on retiring allowances for the staff. He had reorganized the college library. Together the Aydelottes had brought the College "closer to the ideals of its founders," and had strengthened its work to "make useful citizens, full of intellectual curiosity, but with measured balance."[2]

The new Director was known among his associates as generous and understanding, warm and kind. Temperamentally, he was sunny and cheerful, optimistic and hopeful. He did not judge men freely, and was charitably inclined in dealing with their shortcomings. Moreover, he was courageous. Having set his hand to a policy or program, he carried it out with vigor and intelligence. At Swarthmore he enjoyed understanding and loyalty from his Faculty. He dealt with them in ways which they understood and approved, consulting them before taking his decisions, and then standing firmly, knowing that he had their approval.

In many ways, Flexner's choice of his old friend and battle companion in the educational wars of the times was extremely fortunate for the Institute; not least of these was the cordial friendship which the Aydelottes enjoyed with the Founders, which Flexner always encouraged. This promised something for the security of the Institute after the upheaval of 1939. Perhaps no one could have described the new Director's quality better in that context than Professor Einstein, who once remarked to William O. Aydelotte, his son, that it was rare "to find someone who is devoted and independent without vanity -- rare to find a man of capacity without vanity."[3]

It need hardly be said that the new Director's qualities were deeply appreciated by the Institute Faculty. They had not much hope that their grievances and discontents could be alleviated promptly, but they seemed more willing to bear them, knowing that Aydelotte was not responsible for the things which made them unhappy. Quite humanly, they took their present positions for granted, forgetting in the engrossing present their earlier eagerness to become identified with the Institute for

Advanced Study, and their joy at fulfillment. Some there were among them who kept a balanced judgment, and most would have conceded that the first Director deserved full credit for the conception of the Institute and its brilliant initial realization. All would probably have conceded also that no man of seventy-three could hope to continue to direct so live and demanding an enterprise. The professors felt that Aydelotte would do what he could to give them the things they needed -- members' stipends, assistants, as well as complete freedom to do what each wanted. The atmosphere had changed for the better. Injured sensibilities gave way to quiet gratification. Men worked more or less contentedly with what they had, and made the most of it.

Professor Earle wrote Mitrany early in 1940; he had heard that "whatever uncertainties upset Mr. Bamberger in the spring" seemed to be disappearing. This was probably due to the fact that Mr. Bamberger had just given $25,000 for economics for 1940.[4] The beginning of regularized relations between the whole Faculty and the Director was welcomed by all; it accorded better with the traditions to which most had become accustomed. As he appointed the first Standing Committee, Aydelotte wrote each professor as follows outlining his policy:

> I hope that the Committee will serve to economize my time and the time of the Faculty by advising me on various routine matters connected with the routine administration of the Institute, such as assignment of rooms, possible economies in the administration of Fuld Hall, expenditures for library service, and other matters affecting the Institute as a whole, as distinct from problems concerning the various Schools or the work of individual professors.

> I expect to change the membership of the Committee from year to year, and it may well be that after a few years' time the need for such a committee will no longer be felt.
>
> Meanwhile I wish to make it clear that I shall be accessible to each member of the Faculty individually at any time, and prepared to hear at length any concern anyone may feel in regard to his own work or to the welfare of the Institute as a whole.[5]

For the first year of the new administration the Faculty and its Standing Committee concerned themselves mostly with housekeeping problems in Fuld Hall. Under Faculty management light lunches were served in the Common Room. Faculty wives took care of the week-day teas in the same room, which Aydelotte told Flexner served a valuable function in promoting social intercourse. The Ford car owned and operated by the Institute was busy transporting men and books, mostly between Fuld and Fine Halls. The Department of Mathematics had assigned three rooms at Fine Hall to the School of Mathematics, and Institute Faculty and members continued to use the library, common room and Professors' Room as before. For these privileges the Institute paid the University $4,000 in 1940, and, at Dean Eisenhart's suggestion, reduced the agreed $3,000 per annum to $2,000 per annum for the next five years.

It soon became apparent that more extensive dining facilities were needed at Fuld Hall, which, as Flexner had pointed out, was relatively isolated. The Faculty asked Dr. Aydelotte to seek authorization from the Board to complete the fourth floor according to the early plans, which had been dropped because of the need to economize. Accordingly a dining room, Board room and kitchen were completed and equipped in 1940. The Board Room was to be used by Trustees and Faculty only, for meetings, formal dinners, etc.; it came close to satisfying in concept Lowe's and

Veblen's yearning for something resembling the High Table at Oxford. The Faculty took full managerial and financial responsibility for meals, hiring a concessionaire. As war came, with its servant problems and rationing, Faculty members did much of their entertaining at Fuld Hall; it helped their wives, and "sweetened" the concession.

The Faculty bought a radio for the common room which was operated only on Saturday nights, when occasionally there were dances for the younger members. The Faculty had a bowling green in the meadow before Fuld Hall; it put a bench or two for the comfort of bowlers and onlookers under the old cherry tree. The Standing Committee decided to forbid the entry of dogs to Fuld Hall, and took steps to separate canines from masters. Professor Veblen, a wood-chopping philosopher, led a corps of the more active members in clearing the Institute woods of dense underbrush. Various civic organizations, lacking a meeting place, sometimes asked for the use of the Common Room. The Standing Committee took jurisdiction, and ruled out organizations devoted to propaganda, granting applications of others on occasion. At the end of Aydelotte's second year, the Faculty asked him to call regular meetings at the beginning and end of each semester, and to schedule three Faculty lunches each term. It suggested also that the Director ask the Trustees to make available housing for temporary members, a serious need which was not to be settled until 1946 because of the war. All requests were granted.

The School of Mathematics was first to ask Dr. Aydelotte to aid in bringing members to it during the war. Professor Veblen alluded to the research in "the uranium affair" mentioned in the New York Times of recent date; he had heard in Washington, though it was "secret," that the

government was working on this research, and asked whether Aydelotte thought Mr. Bamberger might be willing to finance calling Drs. Bohr, Pauli and Dirac as theoretical physicists who might help the experimental physicists with their work. He apologized for intruding on Aydelotte's busy schedule -- a rare grace-note for him. Aydelotte felt it would be inopportune to ask Mr. Bamberger, but did take the subject up with Mr. Stewart, succeeding thus in getting the Rockefeller Foundation to finance membership for Bohr and Pauli. When it appeared that Dr. Bohr felt he must remain to protect the German refugees at his Institute in Copenhagen, the Foundation financed memberships for Carl L. Siegel, mathematician, and Kurt Gödel, mathematical logician.[6]

The School of Mathematics planned well in another respect; it gained its objective of a modern mathematical library in Fuld Hall when Mr. Bamberger, with his sister's enthusiastic support, gave the Institute $100,000 to be spent in four Annual instalments to purchase working libraries for the Institute. Dr. Alfred Brauer, Professor Weyl's assistant and a competent mathematical librarian, devoted part of his time for a year to the assembly, and virtually completed the task for Mathematics. Dr. Flexner had asked Dr. Aydelotte to see that the new funds should be spent to complement, and not to duplicate, collections in Princeton's various libraries, hopefully to offer reciprocal advantages to the University, and the Director agreed.[7] But with the approach of war, and the restrictions it impossed on the movements of "enemy alien" scholars at the Institute, who were forbidden access to the campus, it was probably just as well that the School of Mathematics library was organized to duplicate a part of the excellent library at Fine Hall. The School of Economics and Politics was hardly ready to acquire

more than very small working libraries, since aside from Professor Riefler, who was still working at Hillside, and Professor Earle, who conducted a seminar in the foreign and military policies of the United States, little research was being done. Four of the five humanists had accumulated their own collections and libraries; Professor Panofsky continued to work at McCormick Hall, using the Marquand Library, and buying the books he needed which were not there.

When Dr. Aydelotte took office he encountered a strange and disturbing disarray in the economics staff so recently completed. The financial situation caused by that action demanded the Director's immediate attention. He interviewed Dr. Willitts of the Rockefeller Foundation, then asked Dr. Flexner to inform him what had been done to secure funds. The reply follows in part:

> I spoke to Fosdick as soon as Stewart and Warren agreed to come, and he told me that cooperation in this field was something that would make a strong appeal to the Foundation.

Flexner said that he had approached Dr. Willitts for the first time in September, 1939, when the new Director of the Division of the Social Sciences had had an opportunity to settle into his position. Willitts asked if Flexner had any objection to his speaking about the need for money to Professor Stewart and received permission to do so. Flexner continued:

> As he /Willitts/ was new to the job, the question necessarily dragged. I had hoped that favorable action might be taken in December so that you would be relieved of all care on the subject of money, but I feel sure that from what Fosdick and Willitts have said, and the high opinion both have of our economics group, they will cooperate and render the question of finance an easy one for you[8]

Flexner enclosed with his letter an excerpt of one from Fosdick to Stewart dated the 18th July, 1938, given him by the latter and expressing great enthusiasm over the fact that the Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation was going to work with Flexner at the Institute for Advanced Study. It was a time when the Foundation was most active in the social sciences, and Fosdick was responsible for a great deal of that activity. The excerpt shows little indication that Fosdick would have been reluctant to help the Institute financially to realize its great potential in the field of his interest:

> I didn't have time in the elevator the other day to tell you how glad I am that you are going to team up with Flexner. It will give you complete freedom for the kind of thing you want to do, and I can imagine that under your leadership the Institute will make as significant a contribution to creative thinking in economics as it has made in mathematics. The thing for which I was trying to capture you really did involve at least some elements of administrative responsibility, and it provided no opportunity for personal participation in research. Flexner's position, however meets both these objections, and, as I say, I am genuinely delighted that what seems like an ideal situation has opened up for you -- delighted too, that the Institute is going to have the advantage of your wisdom and guidance. Your position there will make your relations with the Foundation even more valuable, and I am looking forward with immense satisfaction to our teamwork together in the social sciences and to what I hope will be a closer tie between the Institute and the Foundation.[9]

This sounded optimistic enough. One cannot escape the conclusion that Mr. Fosdick had been impelled by some consideration other than economy to withhold funds from the Institute for economics when Mr. Bamberger decided he was not going through with his promise of $25,000 per annum in matching Rockefeller funds. Not unlikely the reason for denying Flexner's request of the 9th February, 1939, lay in Mr. Stewart's embarrassment in the situation. There was another factor, which the economist

was free to admit: he believed firmly in observing reasonable principles in administration, one of which was that rules of retirement should be made and observed. He had just become Chairman of the Foundation due to Mr. Rockefeller Jr.'s reaching the retirement age current in the Foundation. Dr. Flexner was now past holding together the forces in faculty and Trustees which he had successfully dominated for ten years. It was unlikely that Mr. Stewart would agree that funds should be granted by the Foundation until he retired.

Naturally, Aydelotte asked Riefler what he was doing. The Professor had no recourse but to recite his own history, sending the Director a copy of his memorandum of the 13th March, 1936, which had presented his complete program and the promised cooperation of the necessary non-private agencies to make it possible. (See p. 243) Riefler described what had happened; how Dr. Flexner had not given him the necessary approval ultimately, and how the National Bureau of Economic Research had adopted parts of his program. He continued:

> I would no longer recommend the organization of the research program at Princeton due to subsequent developments at the National Bureau of Economic Research. I still recommend unreservedly that the Institute concentrate its work in economics in finance for the same reasons set down at length in that memorandum. On the basis of subsequent experience in developing the Institute's activities in economics, I would have to stress an aspect of advanced work in finance which is implied rather than explicit in the memorandum, namely, international finance.
>
> My own activities...have been devoted almost wholly to carrying out the objectives there set forth. My procedures, of course, have been flexible and adapted to what was feasible...

After describing the work going forward at National Bureau of Economic Research under his supervision, and his contacts and work with committees of

the League of Nations Secretariat in international economics and finance, he said:

> This outline indicates the general program which I have had in mind, together with the adaptations that have been forced by time and circumstances. Despite those adaptations, it represents, I believe, a consistent development toward objectives stated at the beginning in a fairly precise form.
>
> Now that Walter Stewart and Robert Warren have joined us, the situation is different. They are not committed to this program of course, but are as free as I have been to project their work in the direction they deem most effective. Nevertheless, they are both of the type envisioned in this program: i.e., they are economists highly specialized in finance, national and international, and their interests cover very much the same range of interests as were outlined in my original memorandum of 1936. While I cannot speak for them, I would consider their activities covered also. For example, the outline of activities suggested by Professor Warren in his letter of December 8th to Joseph Willitts, indicates types of activities falling within the general pattern.[10]

The valuable statistical compilations, and the analyses which emerged from those studies which Riefler was supervising, as well as of the others which followed, were distributed not to the public for its use, but only to the agencies, public and private, (mostly the latter) which sponsored and supported the work. Thus the Comptroller of the Currency, the Director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Reserve Board, and various insurance companies and private banks and the Rockefeller Foundation were put in possession of important materials which, had the Institute handled the program, would probably have had public dissemination.[11] As for his work with the Treasury, the economist said that it gave him "in these days of crisis and official secrecy...almost the only means by which the economist seeking to work at an advanced level in international finance can obtain relevant material,

to become familiar with relevant problems and make an effective contribution."[12]

Professor Warren apparently felt it necessary to explain his plan for work in the light of Riefler's statement. He described himself as one whose "inclination, habits, and previous life all lead me to a proclivity toward /the/ international aspects of finance." Then he added:

> Nevertheless, it is my personal intent to devote my major interest to certain fields of individual rather than group e effort.

These he had explained in his letter of the 8th December to Dr. Willitts; the nature of his thinking is evident from the following:

> In addition, from time to time, I expect to encounter individuals who are pursuing alone studies initiated by their own curiosity. It is my hope to discover more of these and to afford them some sort of effective assistance. Indeed, I think I can do this sort of thing better than the formal group research; and I feel this so strongly that I may withdraw entirely from participation in organized or group projects.[13]

At the same time, Mr. Warren seemed to eliminate the possibility of bringing members to the Institute and working with them. "The lack of a library really makes that sort of thing impossible...Yet if we had a library, I am inclined to think that I should welcome such people in small numbers. I believe it would help my own studies if I were in contact with a number of persons considerably younger than myself." Here was a remarkable admission from a man who had just placed himself, or had been placed, in a position where it was improbable that he could teach, admitting candidly that he wished beyond everything else to teach, to enjoy contact with young minds, to help them and himself with the mutual

stimulus and the constructive activity of mind working upon and with other minds.

The statement was very true. Shortly before he died Professor Warren was asked in an emergency to teach a group of Princeton students. One of the Princeton economists has said they loved him as a teacher, and he enjoyed them greatly. They called upon him during his last illness at Princeton Hospital. It was the kind of fulfillment for which Warren had probably longed always. As it was, he worked hard, thought originally and deeply, and embodied most of the results in memorandums addressed to Walter Stewart; they did not reach the public.[14]

As Aydelotte applied to the Rockefeller Foundation for money to meet the costs of research in economics, Dr. Willitts asked and received his permission to talk it over with Mr. Stewart. What occurred is not apparent. Riefler was unfortunately given the task of preparing the formal application for the group, and presented the program entirely in terms of international finance. He made no mention of individual plans, such as Warren's to do special translations and interpretations of Central European economic materials, or to inaugurate a half-year Chronicle of Economic history, or to write on contemporary economics. No mention was made of Stewart's plans either; they apparently had not been defined. Instead, Riefler painted on a broad canvas: the group in economics would work to increase "understanding of the role played in finance in the economic organization of society." Studies in national and international finance were detailed covering all aspects of these fields. The economists would "keep in touch with the broad field at three levels: the theoretical formulation of problems, organized research on

them, and application to the results of both theoretical formulations and of research findings...." But the fact-finding would be done elsewhere in institutions such as the National Bureau of Economic Research. Riefler repeated his earlier ideal of making the Institute the center of a "ferment" in economic research, and also contemplated, as he had planned earlier, bringing to Princeton for short periods outstanding scholars in various problems.[15]

The Foundation granted the funds in a way which indicated it feared the Institute's resources might not be turned to aid the economists at all. It appropriated $35,000 per annum for each of three years (1941-1943) to be matched dollar for dollar, and not to be obligated unless the Institute appropriated $30,000 from its own general funds to the purpose. Any surplus at the end of the period must be returned.[16] As soon as the approval was in hand Mr. Aydelotte asked Mr. Bamberger to match the grant, which he did.[17] Though the terms of the Rockefeller grant contemplated and provided enough for the employment of additional staff, it is not apparent that Mr. Stewart, now conceded to be the "leader" of the economists, made any move to add personnel until 1945, when he supported the nomination of Dr. Jacob Viner of Chicago University, who was then considering an offer from Princeton University. After Professor Riefler left the Institute in 1948, Mr. Stewart submitted several candidates to the Director, but in view of his own and Warren's imminent retirements, none was presented to the Board.

There were cross-currents during the transactions which may or may not have confused relations with the Foundation. Professor Earle chatted again with his confidante in the Foundation's staff, who advised

that any application for funds and any grant, should be made for the School of Economics and Politics rather than for economics alone. He quoted her as follows:

> She said...that a recent conference which Mr. Willitts had with our economists had left an unfavorable impression because they had indicated no willingness whatsoever to indicate any definitive work they had in mind, but wished complete freedom of action and a roving commission; as she put it, they indicated that they wished to be endowed on the basis of their record.

Professor Mitrany, alerted in England, wrote Aydelotte telling of certain adverse effects which Rockefeller Foundation grants for research had had on the London School -- effects which Sir William Beveridge attributed to subsidizing busy teachers to perform researches for which they had no time, thus demoralizing the staff. All in all, Dr. Aydelotte found a strangely disjointed mutually hostile group in the School of Economics and Politics.[18]

That Dr. Flexner's future security was taken care of four months before Dr. Aydelotte's own gave eloquent testimony of the new Director's generosity and lack of egotism. It was not until the 29th March, 1940, that the Executive Committee got around to formalizing the terms of his appointment. Perhaps it was felt there was no need for hurry, since Swarthmore continued to pay his salary until the end of the fiscal year (although Mr. Leidesdorf insisted on reimbursing the Director for their expenses at Princeton during that helf-year.).[19] Thanks to Dr. Flexner's intercession with Mr. Bamberger, the Committee also authorized the remodeling and renovation of the Olden Manor, which was to become the Director's residence, rent-free, appropriating $15,000 for the work. Mr.

Maass feared the sum was too generous, for he scrutinized carefully both plans and expenditures. By the following September Aydelotte had spent $4,800 of his own money for necessary construction and landscaping not covered by the appropriation. Aydelotte wrote Mr. Leidesdorf, proposing if he could do so legitimately, to deduct it from his income tax as a contribution to the Institute. The accounts show, however, that the Institute reimbursed him and spent more than $23,000 in completing work at the Manor within the next several months.[20]

The Institute showed a small deficit for three years (1939-1941) with adverse effects on Mr. Bamberger, who worried about the results of the war on the values of securities. However, before the end of fiscal 1940 the Founders reimbursed the Institute for a part of the costs of constructing and furnishing Fuld Hall by giving it $469,000. They had earlier contributed $50,000 for the architectural plans. By the time Fuld Hall was completed: i.e., had its fourth floor finished and furnished, it had cost some $520,000. There was thus no endowment for maintenance and repairs, a serious omission. Dr. Aydelotte made clear a fact little noted by either Founders or Trustees in discussing finances at his first annual meeting; some $710,000 in savings of income had accumulated during Flexner's administration which had been put back into capital account promptly and not maintained as a surplus fund.[21]

As he took office, Dr. Aydelotte was faced with several changes in the Board. Fortunately Mr. Houghton's pending resignation was deferred because of the concerted appeals of Flexner and Aydelotte, for as Flexner remarked, though the Chairman's attendance was poor owing to his bad health, when he was needed in a crisis: e.g., the dedication of Fuld Hall,

there was no one who could match "his dignity and sound sense." Moreover, Houghton was both Chairman and President, and was entirely willing to allow Mr. Bamberger to designate the Standing Committees and, countersign checks, among the President's supervisory powers as they were set forth in the By-Laws. What would have happened had a successor been needed at this juncture is hard to imagine, for there were deep divisions within the Board as in the Faculty. Now Mr. Houghton promised to serve as long as his health would permit, and did so.[22]

Even so two vacancies required filling at the annual meeting of 1940. To Dr. Flexner's credit be it said that when Dr. Friedenwald, his personal physician, asked him for advice, he referred that member of the Committee on Nominations to the new Director.[23] Messrs. Lewis W, Douglas and Lessing Rosenwald were elected. Mr. Douglas, President of Mutual Insurance of New York, and a friend of and colleague of Mr. Stewart from his Amherst days, had been briefly Vice-Chancellor and Principal of McGill University of Montreal, and Director of the Bureau of the Budget in President Roosevelt's administration, from which he resigned over policy differences in 1934. Stewart had nominated him in 1939. Mr. Rosenwald, formerly Chairman of the Board of Sears Roebuck and Company, was founder and Trustee of the Lessing J. Rosenwald Foundation. Neither man found it possible to attend many meetings of the Board or to do much committee work during the early years of their tenure.[24]

Messrs. Stewart and Riefler had expressed the desire to resign as Trustees -- indeed, Stewart tried to do so just as he became a professor, because he felt that the duties of professor and trustee were basically incompatible. It appeared for a time before Aydelotte's first annual meeting

that all three Faculty Trustees were going to vacate their trusteeships, and plans for their successors were being discussed when Mr. Bamberger intervened. He said that so many vacancies would put too great a strain on the Board, and asked Aydelotte to request Riefler and Stewart to continue for a while longer as Trustees. Professor Veblen was reported by Aydelotte as "wavering" as to staying or resigning. It would seem clear that he never intended to abdicate this unique position of power which grew to be out of all proportion when he was the sole representative of the Faculty on the Board.[25]

Stewart did resign in 1941, with reminders of his several attempts to do so earlier, and the following statement:

> During this period, both experience and observation have confirmed me in the belief that I ought not to serve both as a faculty member and trustee, and the time has come now for definite action.
>
> My view is that the faculty and the trustees have quite separate and distinct functions to perform, and that any overlapping of membership always runs the risk of creating confusion and misunderstanding. If I were to continue as a trustee, I would not feel justified in voting for the reelection of my faculty colleagues to the Board solely because they were members of the faculty, and I therefore feel that it is entirely illogical for me to continue both as a trustee and a professor...

The Trustees regretfully accepted his decision. Apparently most of them now believed his action was sound; there was discussion. As was usual, this was not reported, but a sole "comment" was given currency: "It should nevertheless continue to be the policy of the Institute to have certain scholarly and scientific members on the Board." Manifestly this was not a consensus, but an individual opinion.[26] A year later, Professor Riefler resigned, with a similar statement of policy.[27] Professor Veblen

remained through the years, until in 1951 he became an Honorary Trustee.

New Trustees took the places recently vacated, and also that of Dr. Carrel, who had retired from the Rockefeller Institute in 1939 and had apparently neither resigned nor attended Board meetings since January of that year. Mr. Michael Schaap, President of Bloomingdale's in New York, a nephew of the Founders, was elected in 1941 at their express wish. Messrs. John R. Fulton and Henry Allen Moe became Trustees in 1942. Dr. Fulton, Professor of Physiology at Yale, was a friend of Dr. Weed, and of Dr. Friedenwald who had died in June, 1941. Mr. Moe, a former Rhodes scholar, had assisted Dr. Aydelotte in the studies undertaken for the planning of the Guggenheim Foundation, of which he had been Secretary since 1924. He was a member of the New York bar and a barrister of the Inner Temple in London. The Director had considered nominating him in 1940, but deferred it, hoping that Moe would become his successor at Swarthmore. But the Guggenheim Foundation executive made it plain that he wished to remain with the Foundation.[28]

Relations between Aydelotte and Flexner continued to be cooperative and friendly. Flexner had paved the way for his successor with the foundation executives with whom he had done business; and had succeeded in overcoming some dissatisfaction on the part of President Dodds at the succession.[29] Flexner was evidently still unaware of Aydelotte's activities during the crucial summer of 1939, which seem to have been on the whole rather constructive. But later, apparently after someone had told the Director Emeritus of these, his attitude was to change. For the present, however, the past and present Directors worked loyally together,

realizing fully that only through such a policy would Mr. Bamberger be encouraged to think of the Institute as a viable and important institution to which he had further obligations. Though Dr. Aydelotte was as conscious of this as Dr. Flexner, the older man did not hesitate to remind the younger of the need to visit Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld. "They get so much pleasure out of the Institute, and are so fond of you both that you could not do anything to give them more pleasure than to pay them a visit," he wrote during the summer of 1940.[30]

Flexner, sensitive as only a sentimental man can be, was delighted to receive a token of good will from the Faculty early in 1940, about which he wrote to Professor Weyl happily:

> Professor Panofsky brought me a beautiful volume which had once belonged to President Gilman and which the Johns Hopkins Trustees had given our group that it might belong to me -- 'The first Director from the first Faculty.' None of you can fathom the depths to which I am stirred by this touching and beautiful act. To President Gilman I owe more than anyone but myself can ever know; to you and your colleagues, as well as to the Founders of the Institute, I owe the opportunity to see a dream realized....You must imagine for yourself the deep pleasure which this remembrance gives me, and the gratitude I feel to those who have taken my dream, now a reality, into their keeping.[31]

Dr. Aydelotte read the proof of Flexner's autobiography, which was ready for print early in 1940, since he had kept it fairly well up to date. Flexner was more ill than well during most of that and the succeeding year, suffering from a throat ailment and the loss of his voice, as his letters informed Aydelotte. It was an old complaint of his, a disability which afflicted him in bad weather and particularly in bad times.

The book, entitled I Remember, was a very personal account of his life and career up to the founding of the Institute, which he treated

with relative brevity, and with some liberty as to facts. The Institute had sprung, "full-panoplied," from his brain, without his effort for the Hopkins or for a University of New Jersey. He repeated much of his Confidential Memorandum of the 26th September, 1931, with certain significant changes. Now he said flatly that he had always opposed faculty government. This was true enough in the broad statement. But he said nothing of the consultative role he had hoped to achieve for the faculty, dismissing the whole matter by saying: "I was opposed to it in toto from the start." In his accounts of his investigations, and the scholarly support he received for certain appointments, he now showed less confidence than he had apparently felt earlier; now it appeared that he had met Professor Veblen almost accidentally at Göttingen; certainly he ascribed to him no creative role in the establishment of the School of Mathematics. He made Professor Riefler responsible for the appointment of Walter Stewart. Implied rather than outspoken was some criticism of the Founders for having exercised so close and intimate a supervision over the Institute, for he applauded the senior Rockefeller for never having been active as a Trustee of the General Education Board, though he was named as one. However, he made it clear enough that the junior Rockefeller took up where Mr. Gates, Mr. Rockefeller's alter ego, left off as an active trustee and officer. He repeated Mr. Gates' disdainful allusion to foundation grants to individuals and for small projects as "retail business." However, he had earlier carefully explained that while the organization and methods of retail distribution of goods was necessary and of genuine service, they were not properly applicable to philanthropy in education, or to offerings of college curriculums.

The chief merit of the book is its revelation of the man: his pride, his loyalties, his ambition, his sensitivity, his courage, and the intensity with which he devoted himself to the three separate and demanding phases of his career. The record of the early times in Louisville, in the days of his fatherless family's poverty, of the love and loyalty which bound certain members of the remarkable family together; of his brief and unbelievably arduous labors as student at the new Hopkins, which lighted up his whole life and set enduring standards for his later views on higher education: all are valuable and moving. The book is also valuable for the light it sheds on the great work of the first quarter of the twentieth century in medical education; with Simon and James Flexner's Wm. Henry Welch it brings to life again "the heroic age of American medicine."

Professor Veblen made himself useful to Aydelotte, who had seen his power and tactics in the land purchase episode, from the ill effects of which the President of Swarthmore had managed to stay clear. He relied far more on Veblen, in fact, that he did on Flexner in every concern of the Institute except those involving the favor of the Founders. Thus, as he prepared for his first Board meeting as Director, he asked Veblen's comments on his plans and proposed report. There were three. All meetings of the Board should be held in Fuld Hall, "because of the physical presence of the problems and of the possibility for informal discussion with the various people involved..." The next was a question: "Is there any need for a written Director's report more than once a year?" The third was familiar: stipend funds for the School of Mathematics should be increased.[32]

Whether there was an agreement between the two men that at least until the Founders could no longer recall Professor Veblen's demands for a greater Faculty voice in Institute affairs, or no longer could oppose it, the issue would lie dormant, is not known. But it will appear later that Dr. Aydelotte seemed to be quite unaware that the Professor would want more exacting arrangements for Faculty power than the consultative role he contemplated. It is abundantly clear that Aydelotte wanted to discuss with the Trustees and also with the Faculty his plans for expansion of the Institute, which included that novel concept of the "experimental" nature of the Institute which might envision a shift away from some disciplines or specializations already represented. Since Mr, Bamberger proscribed such discussions, no test of Faculty reaction had been made. As for personal relations between the two men, Veblen's manner was cordial and warm toward the Director as it had never been toward Flexner, who inclined to lecture him while Aydelotte sought his advice. Almost immediately after Aydelotte's appointment "dear Frank" replaced "dear Aydelotte" and "dear Veblen" was replaced by "Dear Oswald."

The Director did not intend to conduct a holding operation. He had ideas for expanding the Institute, and discussed them with various outside authorities. So while he ministered to the wounded sensibilities of the Faculty members with enduring understanding, sympathy and patience, he took steps to tell Mr. Bamberger of his ambitions. First assuring him of the importance and excellence of what was being done, Aydelotte suggested that any of the following fields of knowledge presented inviting areas for advanced study at the Institute: the applied sciences, including physics, chemistry, biology, astronomy; economics, engineering; economic history;

the literature, history and philosophy of mediaeval and modern times; Latin American studies; Oriental studies, including Chinese art, history, literature and civilization; the history of science. For none of these subjects did he propose employment of permanent Faculty in the beginning. In whatever new studies were undertaken in future, he would employ a new method:

> If means were available to do this my method would not be immediately to enlarge the permanent staff, as Dr. Flexner has done in the past; I should prefer instead to bring together groups of older and younger scholars, as temporary members...for limited periods of time, to explore a given subject of research, with the understanding that the individuals concerned should go back to their own institutions at the end of the period of work for which they were invited...These groups might then be succeeded by others, so that over a period of years we should have the opportunity of making the best possible test of the value of research in various subjects and of the qualities of various individuals. On the basis of these tests certain subjects and individuals might be added to our permanent program if and when our financial condition made this possible.[33]

His observations about the financial situation of the Institute were brief and telling. Of the annual income for the current budget of $450,000 only $325,000 came from endowment; the rest was subvened. Thus the Institute needed about $5 million in new endowment. But he would not, he said, fill all vacancies to come about through retirement or death of the present staff. Instead, he would preserve what Flexner had urged as important -- the flexible, experimental character of the Institute, seeking new fields where men of outstanding quality were available.

He mentioned his effort to Dr. Flexner, who had already urged Chinese studies, and received his approval; Flexner said he regarded the Institute as but "a skeleton" of what it should be. He could not imagine that Aydelotte had already taken his requests up with Mr. Bamberger, and

offered to "help" draft the program if Aydelotte wanted him to, as Aydelotte noted somewhat sardonically in a memorandum for his file. But Mr. Bamberger declined to authorize any expansion, or even to permit Aydelotte to discuss his plans with the Executive Committee, or any others among the Trustees.[34]

It soon appeared that Dr. Aydelotte did not have the command over the Board's procedures which his predecessor had exercised. Despite Veblen's advice, he usually made written reports. Flexner's reports were the first order of business after previous minutes were approved and a word from the Treasurer was heard, and, as has been shown, he sometimes promoted discussion of an issue or a policy before presenting his actual proposal for a vote. Frequently, when he was familiar with the proposals to be made by the standing committees, he anticipated their reports, recording his own view: e.g., his opposition to land and buildings while he was seeking to build staff. In all the circumstances, one must view that as salutary, otherwise development of the Institute might have stopped with the completion of the staff of the School of Mathematics. And it was clear that in the one case where he seemed to be unaware of what the Committee on Buildings and Grounds contemplated, the lack of prior consultation with the Founders resulted in the cessation of further gifts. Now Dr. Aydelotte's report came later and later in the agenda, usually following the reports of the various committees. He was forced to comment on proposals without having the preferred position to which his responsibilities entitled him. In one case his report was not presented until the Board reconvened after lunch; in others, it appears doubtful it was more than received and filed; in yet another, even that was not done,

and it was deferred until the next meeting.[35]

During the three regular meetings in 1941 Dr. Aydelotte, at Mr. Bamberger's suggestion, gave a thoroughgoing report on the schools, one at each meeting. There is little doubt that the Trustees appreciated this deeply, although there is some reason to believe that the professors, who disliked even the cursory reports of their activities which appeared in the annual Bulletin and resembled accounts of progress, did not welcome them. However, he relied entirely upon the Faculty for the material in each report, as he did in editing the annual Bulletin, and gave little or nothing of his own opinions or viewpoint until the Founders' death. The reports were much more impressive because he had asked the professors to describe their own activities. His introduction to the series was significant: it was not simply an account of what the Institute was doing; rather, it appertained to the future:

> In order to lay the problem of our future development before the Trustees I propose to begin, in this and the two or three meetings to follow, by a discussion of the work now going on at the Institute. The methods pursued here at present are as varied as the members of our Faculty. This is as it should be in an institution which has no choice but to be experimental. It is only, it seems to me, by understanding the work now in progress that the Trustees can form any clear idea of the direction which growth should take in the future, and form any estimate of the possibilities open to an institution of this character.[36]

He first dealt with the School of Economics and Politics, beginning with economics. He placed the whole emphasis on the nature and value of the studies which Professor Riefler had proposed and was supervising at Hillside for National Bureau of Economic Research. Messrs. Lewis Douglas, Stewart and Warren contributed to this work, he said, but only, as he made quite clear, as members with Riefler of the Bureau's advisory committee

on financial research. The three special studies supervised by Professor Riefler, in process or finished -- on instalment credit, corporate bonds and the financial structure of American private enterprise -- he described carefully. The collated data and the analyses which issued from them were distributed only to the sponsors, public and private, as materials to be used by them for their own information, as well as for possible theoretical studies later to be undertaken. Aydelotte made no secret of his hope that some means might be found to make larger distribution of the important data by microfilm; or of his misgivings about the status of the young post-doctoral employees of the Bureau who performed the actual fact-finding work and prepared their conclusions under careful guidance. He said:

> The National Bureau is a rigorous training school in cooperative methods. Young men are not asked what they would like to do. They are appointed to perform definite tasks, closely related to a work which other men are doing, to be rigorously checked as parts of a complete whole. Even though they have won their spurs in scholarship, they enter this organization as apprentices with much to learn, and they must work not as free individuals but as members of a team. The training they receive in turn is the breadth which comes in participation in tasks beyond the power of any single man to perform.
>
> It seems to me the Institute may be able to do more for the best of these young recruits.[37]

One of these "youngsters" was now at the Institute as a Foundation-supported member, hopefully to engage in a period of quiet study and reflection "to enable him to get the most out of his experience." He hoped others would also come to the Institute.

The studies so far undertaken, said Aydelotte, "set the minds of the members of our own department working on the need for similarly careful studies of economic history," which Messrs. Willitts, Stewart and Warren were projecting for the National Bureau of Economic Research, and

"which would constitute one of the most important activities of our economics group during the next...years." Aside from the concrete achievements of Professor Riefler, Dr. Aydelotte noted that Professor Stewart was studying the teaching of economics in American colleges and secondary schools, mainly through an agent -- the President of Bennington College, Dr. Robert Leigh, who was on leave, and performed the actual travel and contacts for Mr. Stewart, who was a Trustee of Bennington. There is no indication of any of the results of this study. Indeed, they were purposefully withheld from publication, according to a report from the Rockefeller Foundation.[38]

It was impossible for anything definite to be said of Professor Mitrany's work with the Chatham group at Oxford on information of use to the British Foreign Office; Dr. Aydelotte could not discuss such secret matters.

Professor Earle had conducted seminars during the past two years on the history and nature of American foreign policy with particular reference to military matters. These were participated in by several Princeton professors, and by others from abroad for whom he had secured Rockefeller grants. Papers of considerable value were issuing from this work, some of which were to be incorporated in a volume entitled Makers of Modern Strategy which Professor Earle edited with collaboration. Besides this, Professor Earle was Chairman of the Rockefeller-sponsored Committee for International Studies, enjoying the services of a paid secretary. The Committee's function was to learn what studies in the field were being undertaken in the United States, and, without acting as a propaganda agency or financial sponsor, to encourage scholars to undertake the needful studies.[39]

The Director could not bring his report to a close without mention of an allied but entirely separate matter which was a subject of great pride to him. In the spring of 1940, Mr. Arthur Sweetser of the League of Nations Secretariat discussed with Professor Riefler, with whom he had become well acquainted during the latter's work with certain of its economic committees, the possibility of assuring the safety of three of the technical departments of the Secretariat should Hitler decide to go beyond France and the Low Countries and on into Switzerland. Riefler brought the matter to Aydelotte, who swiftly mobilited the University and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research's Division of Plant and Animal Pathology to join with the Institute in inviting the three departments -- Economics, Finance and Transit, Opium Control, and Public Health -- to come to Princeton for the duration. The action was entirely successful with respect to the first-named department; in the fall of 1940, after many uncertainties and some opposition from Vichy France, some thirteen staff members and their families arrived in Princeton, and the Institute provided offices for them. Fuld Hall was crowded; the visitors occupied Professor Mitrany's office, the Board Room and adjoining space on the fourth floor, (which had never seen a Board meeting or a Faculty dinner yet, since it was just completed) and tables in the Library. Professor Veblen, absent, objected to giving up the Board room, but Aydelotte wrote him that the Faculty Standing Committee and the Board were unanimous in yielding the space for the purpose.[40] The Rockefeller Foundation reimbursed the Institute for the expenses of the occupancy, and the League maintained their salaries, so that when the United Nations was organized at war's end, the Department was taken over by it.

It was not lost on men that there was justice in Princeton's harboring the Department. Woodrow Wilson, without whose vision the League would not have provided its invaluable experience in international cooperation, had started on his way to the White House at Princeton. He was destined to lose his battle to bring the United States into the League, there to lend its help and achieve experience in its work. That the Department of Economics should celebrate the League's twenty-first birthday (the 10th January, 1941) in Wilson's old home seemed strangely appropriate. Not all the members of the large staff were so fortunate in conditions for carrying on their work; 600 men and women had left the offices at Geneva, while some 50 remained there. A half-dozen men in opium control were in Washington for the duration, and some of the staff of the International Labor Organization group were in Montreal.

The Board was proud of its hospitality, and shared the gratification with the University and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research at having been able to help. Of the move, Carl J. Hambro, President of the Norwegian Storting and of the League Assembly, who with Lord Lothian of Britain had helped to prevail on Geneva to release the Department, later said:

> You can hardly understand how much it meant at the moment -- not materially but morally and from the psychological point of view. It was more than an encouragement, it was an inspiration. It gave proof that all the competent unostentatious, patient, good work accomplished during twenty years -- in practically every field of human activity, a work of sifting and consolidating, of collecting, classifying and presenting facts, of uniting the experts of every country in an exchange of experiences, of establishing a universal clearing-house for progressive and constructive ideas -- it gave proof that this work had not been entirely wasted, but was bread thrown upon the waters.[41]

At war's end the staff members at Princeton who had doubled, were accommodated by Dr. John A. Mackey at the Theological Seminary in part, and at 69 Alexander Street, because of the congestion at Fuld Hall.

The Director's next report covered the activities of the School of Humanistic Studies. Here again his material was drawn entirely from the reports of the professors themselves. Thus in reflecting the concerns of one of them, the paleographer, he pointed out that four of the five professors had gathered the materials for their researches, and the libraries which they required. Latin paleography, Grecian pre-history, Near Eastern art and archaeology, and Greek epigraphy were not subjects generally represented in American universities; the Institute's scholars were preparing the materials for the studies of future generations of historians and scholars. The writer had asked whether the Institute would perpetuate chairs in these subjects. No answer could be given, of course.[42] But on one point all members of the school were clear. Funds for stipends to bring to the Institute promising younger scholars would encourage their continuation. Miss Goldman confessed anxiety on the possible effects of foundation aid, presumably in the School of Economics and Politics, in the following letter which the Director quoted:

> I am anxious only on one point. The lack of adequate funds with which to bring the people of our choice to the Institute makes it necessary to depend upon the large foundations and to accept the people they choose and sometimes even the subjects to which they give preference. It would be quite easy for the Institute gradually by imperceptible steps to become a kind of guest house of the foundations. Our vigilance will undoubtedly prevent this, but adequate funds of our own would entirely eliminate the danger.[43]

The Director spoke with real appreciation of Professor Panofsky's work:

> The study of the unified and total significance of a work of art as a document in the history of a civilization must be based on meticulous scholarship of the antiquarian type, but it uses such scholarship as a means, and not as an end, and rises to the interpretation of the work in question in connection with the thought of the time as expressed in literature, in political and social institutions, and in every other way...[44]

It was no part of Aydelotte's intention to apologize for the aid given to the Department of Art and Archaeology by his predecessor, or to hide the brilliant work of the scholars financed by the Institute over the past several years to aid in the research projects undertaken by the Department. He could hardly know what criticism the first Director had suffered for extending this aid. He asked Dr. Morey for a letter explaining the effects of the financial and scholarly cooperation, and read it in full to the Trustees. No longer could anyone claim that scholarship was divisible by institutions, or that it could be properly called "theirs" and "ours." Morey pointed with gratification to the work of the non-art-historians in their occasional activities with the Department -- the feats in expertise which helped to identify, place, date, or clarify this or that phenomenon in art of great importance to its history and explication. Lowe had given Morey's staff pro-seminars in paleography, Herzfeld had lectured, and consulted at all times on Near Eastern and Mid-Eastern art and archaeology with great effect. Of Panofsky Morey spoke with warmth and admiration:

> It is not only that his seminars are eagerly sought by our students, but they go to him for all sorts of problems, and out of this connection there have emerged some excellent papers....The contribution of Panofsky and his pupil de Tolnay to the studies in art history in Princeton is no less important for the training that our students thus get in European methods than for the information acquired.[45]

Morey described the invaluable contributions of Drs. Kurt Weitzmann and Hanns Swarzenski, W. A. Campbell, and others among the members whom the Institute had supported with appointments and stipends, for the benefit of the Department of Art and Archaeology. His conclusion was clear that without the Institute's help the work at Antioch would have been neither so completely exploited nor so well recorded. He added:

> Finally, I think I ought to mention...one outstanding fact which, I think, is not unconnected with the development of the cooperation...This is the distinct improvement, both in quality and numbers, of graduate students applying for entrance to Princeton in art and archaeology. The Department has filled and transcended its quota in the last two years, and is impressed by the unusually good background of the students who are seeking to continue their studies at Princeton...
>
> I thank you for the opportunity to express the Department's appreciation of the cooperation...in this way.[46]

It was good to have this forthright appraisal of the benefits of cooperation. No exception could really be taken to the benefits to scholarship which the Institute's impersonal aid had brought -- the less because now the Director concluded with his own assessment of the importance of the humanities in a lambent passage:

> It seems to me that all the disciplines we pursue here have a value which, while not utilitarian in aim, is nevertheless of supreme importance. The function of the humanistic discipline is the critical study of that organized tradition which we call civilization and which it is the purpose of this war to preserve. We cannot, and in the long run will not, fight for what we do not understand. Our democratic way of life is not, in the last analysis, a material order; it is a spiritual point of view. It is a kind of sum total of the achievements of man's intelligence and idealism in all ages that have gone before us. It can in the end only be destroyed by being forgotten. It must be remembered and understood if men are to have the basis for still greater achievements...
>
> Human nature does not change; in each generation men possess the same capacities for good or evil as their forefathers.

> But different ages vary widely in the vividness of their understanding of the great achievements of the past. When humanistic studies flourish life is richer and more gracious. When they decay, in the dark ages of history, man's way of life becomes brutal, poor, and mean.
>
> The natural and the social sciences teach us, among other things, the techniques of preserving our way of life in peace and war. The humanistic disciplines show us what it is we are struggling to preserve. They supply the motive for effort and sacrifice against chaos and the dark which the human race has made since the beginnings of civilization, that effort which we can never forego to make life on this planet not merely a blank animal existence but something free, gracious and spiritual, filled with ardor and meaning.[47]

Mr. Houghton recorded an event otherwise unnoted after the delivery of that report. He wrote Dr. Aydelotte:

> You came into your own yesterday. The spontaneous applause of the Trustees was the first instance of such enthusiastic approval that has taken place during the twelve years since the birth of the Institute. Moreover, I think Mr. Bamberger was more stirred and moved to greater interest in the possibilities of the Institute than I, at least, have ever noted before. All in all, it was a fine meeting, and one that will be long remembered.[48]

The School of Mathematics assigned to Professors Morse and von Neumann the task of preparing a report on the work of their School for Aydelotte, who, pretending to no knowledge of mathematics, adhered faithfully to their text in describing the work of the individual professors. But he departed from the introductory material in both words and meaning, and in most interesting content. He gave the subject its place in saying that its primary value was "as an intellectual discipline and an element in a liberal education." It was also "an indispensable tool for research" in all the natural and the social sciences. He gave some idea of the importance of the School of Mathematics by quoting Dr. G. D. Birkhoff as having

> estimated that American educational institutions spend $ 6 million per year in the teaching of mathematics alone. As he pointed out to me, anything which we can do to improve teaching and scholarship in so important a subject will more than justify the modest budget of our School.[49]

Aydelotte had invited comparisons as between Princeton and other American centers of mathematics, learning that though there were comparatively many worthy centers, the only comparable one was Cambridge, taking both Harvard and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dr. von Neumann had told him that Princeton was the equal in pure mathematical research of any of the greatest European centers of the generation -- Cambridge, Göttingen, Moscow, Paris, Rome and Warsaw -- but that the European centers "were probably better integrated in the direction of applications of mathematics to physics and other subjects." Then Aydelotte continued:

> If and when means are available, it will be for the Trustees and Faculty to decide whether the broadening of our mathematical School in this respect is possible or desirable. Scholars are discovering every day new applications of mathematics to other fields of knowledge, and the value of these applications is great, not merely to the subject considered but because of the stimulus they offer to the development of new branches of mathematical science.[50]

This was rather courageous of the Director, considering the following text with which the two Institute Professors had introduced their treatise on the School:

> The great difficulties of describing adequately the work of the mathematical group are obvious. Apart from being a highly technical and finely differentiated science, mathematics is among other things a language differing no little in its words, considerably in its grammar, and absolutely in its syntax, from any other language used by men. And from its very nature -- in fact this is the main reason why mathematical language was invented -- its contents cannot be translated into any other language. It is only fair to expect that any attempt to describe the contents of

mathematical research cannot convey essentially more of the essence of the subject than would an attempt to describe the 'contents' of a Chinese poem.

The only thing one may reasonably try to describe is the general tendency and purpose of such research, and the spirit, the atmosphere, in which it is undertaken.

One must realize, above all, that there is a very particular double character which pervades all mathematical work. It is perfectly true that mathematics has practical applications. These are sometimes very indirect -- for example, applications to mathematics, physics, which in turn are justified by applications to engineering, etc. -- but they are applications nevertheless. It is even true that much, if not most, of the best mathematical inspiration has been directly or indirectly derived from 'applied' problems. Nevertheless most mathematical research is usually undertaken without any regard to such applications, and it is strongly to be suspected that its quality could only suffer if the mathematicians kept the applications constantly in mind. As matters stand, they sometimes enter his mind, and it is by no means established that this is always a loss. It is very difficult to do justice, in a finite number of words, to this situation and to all its nuances, but it is necessary to keep it in mind when visualizing the nature of mathematical research.

Thus when dealing with mathematics it is probably more useful to judge it by the same standards by which a creative art is judged -- that is, by esthetic standards. The esthetic angle may escape the layman who does not speak the 'foreign language' in which the intellectual effort goes on. It may also seem strangely disconnected with the application which ultimately may be made of mathematical results. But it is there, nevertheless, and ignoring it would lead to a complete misunderstanding of mathematics.[51]

The Director did not neglect this urgent and oft-repeated claim of the mathematicians that their subject must be recognized as an art as well as a science. He felt that both are, in their highest achievements, products of the creative imagination:

I have frequently been assured by mathematicians that the pleasure they get from a fine demonstration is partly aesthetic, and that the elaboration of a new chain of mathematical reasoning seems to those who create it to be partly an artistic achievement, something like the writing

> of a poem. It is noteworthy that as between two proofs of a theorem mathematicians will prefer the one which, as they say, is more 'elegant,' a term which has primarily an aesthetic rather than a logical significance.[52]

The adjective, borrowed from the Latin, French and English, was undoubtedly selected to speak to the lay as well as the mathematical mind.

However, Aydelotte gave some indication that he was unwilling to concede the full claim to the complete analogue between mathematics and art when he observed:

> Perhaps the best analogy is with architecture, which in its highest forms combines use and beauty....
>
> Unquestionably all scholars in all fields have their flashes of creative insight when they mold whole systems of knowledge and chains of reasoning into order and symmetry.[53]

He concluded that "the very abstractness of the mathematician's conceptions and the rigor of his thinking...claim for his subject the position so frequently assigned to it, that of being the mother of the sciences."

Aydelotte had thus, with fine descrimination, conveyed to his audience that in its subjective effect upon the practitioner, truly creative mathematical thinking resembled the subjective effect upon the artist of his creative achievement. But he carefully avoided any implication that the objective results of the works of pure mathematicians and of fine creative artists are in any way the same. A fine construct in mathematics was not to be given the place of a fine creative piece of artistry, despite the lack of any differentiation by the mathematician between the two. In avoiding the extravagant claim, Aydelotte might have been guided by the words of Joseph Conrad in differentiating the effects of the scientist and of the artist, though both seek the truth

and make their appeal.

> The artist appeals to that part of our being which is not dependent on wisdom: to that in us which is a gift and not an acquisition -- and, therefore, more permanently enduring. He speaks to our capacity for delight and wonder, to the sense of mystery surrounding our lives; to our sense of pity, and beauty, and pain; to the latent feeling of fellowship with all creation -- and to the subtle but invincible conviction of solidarity that knits together the loneliness of innumerable hearts, to the solidarity in dreams, in joy, in sorrow, in aspirations, in hope, in fear, which binds men to each other, which binds together all humanity -- the dead to the living and the living to the unborn....
>
> All art...must strenuously aspire to the plasticity of sculpture, to the colour of painting, and to the magic suggestiveness of music -- which is the art of arts.[54]

Far from trying to confine himself to an exclusive language, understood only by a few other men who alone can enjoy the elegance -- an attribute of royalty -- and appreciate the triumph of his reasoning, the artist appeals to all mankind with eyes to see, ears to hear, heart to respond. Though he cannot appeal to all men with a single work, his truth must be so compelling as to touch even those who do not reach out for it.

As for the place of the temporary members in the School of Mathematics, Morse and von Neumann described this in discussing briefly a book on which Professor Veblen had been working for some years, first with Messrs. Taub and Givens in 1935, and latterly with them and others. The book was to be called Spinors in Projective Geometry; and was hopefully soon to be published.

> 'Several other men...have worked with Veblen's group on this subject, and particularly on its applications to theoretical physics. In accordance with the general policy of the Institute all these men are mature scientists rather than beginners. They came from widely separated parts of the world.

> Presumably this bringing together of such men to work on a common program for a while and then to depart to their several situations with renewed enthusiasm is about as much as the Institute can profitably attempt to do in mathematics.'[55]

Apparently Professor Veblen had seen neither the mathematicians' report nor Aydelotte's before he heard it read to the Trustees. Ten days after the Board meeting, in answer to Aydelotte's request for comment, the mathematician caused the professors' report to be attached to the minutes of a School meeting, and replied to Aydelotte with advice on arrangement and an oblique attack on his revelations of the work going forward in economics. He wrote:

> The mathematicians themselves are rather emphatic in regarding such work as organizing and administering research projects as 'extra-curricular.' Also they regard the type of work that they do for the Government as strictly temporary, no matter how inevitable and necessary it may be at the present time. Their real work is with the foundations of mathematics and mathematical physics, with the discovery and development of those principles of mathematics which will give to mathematics 'deeper harmony as an art, and greater power as a science.' /Morse's and von Neumann's words/ This is in accordance with the basic conception of the Institute; namely, that it is concerned with the long-term problems of scholarship, and not with the incidentals and accessories.[56]

Despite Professor Veblen's rigorous eschewal of mathematical applications, time and circumstances were to change his views. Indeed, he and Aydelotte had already discussed the likelihood that the secret but important progress of governmentally-supported researches in atomic fission would lead the Institute to take some position in it post-war.

Aydelotte's brave and enlightening effort to make the work of Institute professors live for the Founders and the Trustees had given him and them a much better idea of the Institute and its diverse and dissoci-

ated activities. His objective approach had inevitably given a correct impression that some men were busier than others. As a practical matter he emphasized the importance to the schools of added funds for stipends, so that the small but important Institute might enlarge its influence upon learning in its fields through training in the techniques of scholarly research as well as in quickening the inspiration to discover new knowledge. These reports were an impressive contribution from a devoted man, who could not imagine that an attempt to penetrate the veil of mystery which surrounded activities at the Institute could make it one whit less engaging.

Mr. Houghton indeed served the Institute as long as his health permitted. The Chairman died suddenly on the 16th September, 1941, leaving the Board to mourn a wise officer, and to solve the problem of replacing him. Mr. Bamberger selected Mr. Hardin to succeed Houghton as the Chairman, but since the lawyer was then eighty-one, decided that the office of President which had been merged with the chairmanship in 1933 should now be separated, and that Mr. Maass should fill that post. Mr. Hardin could not hope to continue as Chairman of the Finance Committee, and so Mr. Leidesdorf took that place, bearing almost the entire burden of investing wisely and productively the Institute's liquid resources. For the necessary changes in the By-Laws, Mr. Bamberger authorized the Director to consult outside counsel, since Mr. Hardin and Mr. Maass were not always in agreement in these matters. It seems, however, that Dr. Aydelotte had a very good idea of what he wanted to achieve, and that he submitted his ideas to Mr. Paul Kieffer of New York for comment and

advice, and not suggestions. Nevertheless, Mr. Kieffer made a suggestion; it was that the powers of the President not reinstated with the office be mentioned specifically as inhering in the Director by amending Article VI, which described the functions and duties of the Director. But no such amendment appears to have been offered.[57]

The amendments submitted to a special meeting of the Members of the Corporation in January, 1942, omitted almost entirely any mention of the duties and powers of the presidency as they had inhered in Mr. Bamberger and in Mr. Houghton. The President was now to conduct meetings of the Members of the Corporation, and to sign documents as authorized by the Board. No powers of supervision were now vested in him; there was a Vice-President to act in his absence or disability. The Chairman presided over meetings of the Board of Trustees. Both the President and the Chairman were members ex officio of all standing committees.[58]

If the President was no longer to appoint the members of those committees, how were they to be selected? They were to be nominated by the Committee on Nominations and elected by the Board. For this important function, the Committee itself was to be changed. It was still to consist of three Trustees, each to serve three years, with one to be replaced each year, and the senior in its service to chair its meetings. (It nominated its own members.) Mr. Maass found a small gap in the arrangements: since Mr. Bamberger still would allow no Vice-Chairman, he advised the Board to provide that in the Chairman's absence the President should preside over Board meetings. The Board approved the amendments and voted in the new officers.[59]

For some reason the Nominating Committee failed to discharge its new functions at the annual meeting which followed. The Board left the task of appointing the standing committees to Mr. Bamberger and the Director with power. In this circumstance, Professor Veblen became a member of the Executive Committee.[60] When the Board convened that May, there were only eight Trustees present, and five absent, not counting Mr. Bamberger. The eight were all original members of the Board; of the five absentees, two attended not at all, one but rarely, and a fourth had just resigned. Thus the Board had at the moment only nine active members. In this situation, Messrs. Fulton and Moe, with their clear interest in the Institute, and their wisdom in administrative and academic problems, were to prove most useful. Neverthless, five of the fourteen Trustees were new to the Institute. Perhaps it was because of this that Aydelotte yielded the coveted appointment to the Executive Committee to Professor Veblen. For beyond any question, he was knowledgeable.[61]

Dr. Flexner seemed to be deeply offended by the potential power which Professor Veblen now assumed. The former Director had never missed a meeting of the Board, and only one of the Executive Committee, from which he had absented himself because his pension was decided upon then. Now he abstained from attending the meetings of either body. Nor would he resume attendance until he was requested to do so by Mr. Bamberger, when he appeared at the last meeting of the Board held while the Founder lived. However much he was offended, no word of the fact appears in the record at this time, nor was the elevation of Professor Veblen to

the Executive Committee ever mentioned as a cause of the differences which arose later between the two Directors. Succeeding events leave little doubt, however, that Professor Veblen was now prepared to impress his will on the Board of Trustees.

In making the budget for 1942-43 Dr. Aydelotte found he could balance income and expenditures by using (with Mr. Bamberger's permission) $15,000 from the Library fund for ordinary expenses, and by omitting the pension reserve of $10,000 and Professor Mitrany's salary, as he went on leave without pay. This gave the Treasurer the idea of omitting the pension reserve from the report for fiscal year 1942, so that a small balance ($2,000) of income over expenses was shown. The Institute appeared to be in the black for the first time since 1938.[62]

But Dr. Aydelotte did not intend that Mr. Bamberger should conclude that the Institute was really solvent, for apparently he sent the Founder a homily on the financial situation, judging by a handwritten draft in his papers which reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Bamberger:

You will I am sure be pleased to hear our Treasurer Mr. Leidesdorf report at the Board meeting in October that the result of the operation of the Institute for the year 1941-42 shows a surplus in place of the deficit of the two previous years. I feel it my duty to say to you in advance of the meeting, what I must then say to the Trustees, that I hope you will not assume that this surplus means that we are solvent. The fact is that we are not. The permanent long-term obligations of the Institute which I inherited from Dr. Flexner amount to about $450,000 per year; our income from endowment is at present $330,000. The difference is made up by temporary annual gifts from yourself, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation and other sources. The largest of these gifts (from the Rockefeller Foundation and yourself for economics) is made for a three year period, and will end in June, 1943. Your gift of $100,000 for the library will be completed in

the year following. The Institute will face a serious financial crisis when these gifts expire. You asked me a year ago to tell you what I proposed to do when that time arrived, and I have given long and careful thought to the problem.

We cannot dismiss professors without giving the Institute a black eye from which it would take us long to recover. An institution which aspires to lead the world in scholarship cannot begin its career by breaking its word to members of its staff. We could dismiss all our assistants who are appointed only on one year terms. It would cripple most of our professors but it could be done. We could cancel all stipends to students...but this would largely destroy the usefulness of the Institute. A few other economies could be made but the effect would be to limit the usefulness of our institution which with adequate financial support could make itself more and more valuable to scholarship in this country and in the entire world.

During the latter years of his term as Director Dr. Flexner with your approval, enlarged the faculty so as to call for a budget considerably larger than the income which the Institute receives from its permanent endowment. This has given rise to annual deficits. That could not go on, and we have ended the deficits temporarily by these...gifts, of which you yourself have given a considerable part. There must now be provided for it some permanent money, or the whole character of the Institute will change. Instead of growing into increased usefulness it will be compelled to terminate the most useful work it is doing: it must cease to assist students and become merely a fund to maintain a few professors.

If you intend to provide for the Institute either in your lifetime or in your will the problem is solved. If not I think we should begin now to look elsewhere for support and meanwhile plan to curtail the work we are doing until such support can be found. We must plan well in advance. The funds which will be needed to replace the temporary gifts we now receive cannot be obtained on a moment's notice, and time will be needed to plan the changes we should have to make if those funds are not forthcoming.

For this reason I venture to ask you now to give me some intimation of your intentions, and Mrs. Fuld's, as to the provision of further endowment for the Institute. Naturally I hope that you will plan to complete what you have so well begun, and will not leave it to others to give the funds to finish the work. What you have done has made your generosity famous in the world of scholarship. But those who know and admire the Institute most consider that we have made but a beginning and expect that we shall go forward to carry out

> the plan. You have led me to feel that you and Mrs. Fuld would not let this befall your work, which leads me to put the situation before you in this very frank manner. I should like all of this to be your work and I very much hope that is your intention.
>
> I think you have seen enough of my administration to know that any funds provided will be economically used. The idea of a deficit is a nightmare to me. I believe it to be a first responsibility of an educational institution not to spend money which it does not possess but rather to keep expenses well within its income. The surplus this year, even in this time of stringency, will show you what efforts I am prepared to make to carry out that policy. Just because I believe those principles so strongly I venture to raise the whole financial question now in order that we may plan wisely for the future.[63]

At about the same time Flexner wrote Aydelotte of his effort to bring Mr. Bamberger's mind to bear on the plight of the Institute. The Founder had telephoned him to inquire after his health, saying "We never cease to think and to speak of the fact that you gave us the best advice that we have ever received in all our lives." Flexner continued:

> That gave me a little chance to add: 'It is very pleasant, of course, Mr. Bamberger, for me to have you and Mrs. Fuld feel as you do, but the whole world is passing through difficult times, and colleges, universities, hospitals and especially institutes of research, which have no income except from endowment, have to make a severe struggle to maintain their standards unimpaired. We must not let the Institute at Princeton slip, but must by every effort maintain it on the level at which it was started.'
>
> He replied, 'I agree with you thoroughly.'[64]

When the Treasurer's Report for fiscal year 1942 was distributed, Mr. Bamberger, perhaps forgetful of Aydelotte's warning, telephoned Flexner, who was also happy about the favorable turn in fortunes, for he wrote that the Founder, elated over the report, "talked very much like his old self."[65] The October meeting came and went. The Treasurer made an oral

report, explaining how the small savings in 1942 were achieved, except that the omission of the $10,000 pension reserve was not mentioned in the minutes.

Meanwhile, Dr. Aydelotte had been giving financial and administrative problems serious consideration. Four professors were due to retire after their sixty-fifth birthdays in 1944 and 1945. The added expense threatened to be substantial, if adequate minimum pensions were to be paid, and the Institute's commitments for maximum pensions were to be met. Aydelotte decided to make another attempt to engage the Founders' interest in the expansion of the Institute's activities, or at least the substitution of other subjects for those affected by retirement.

He persuaded Mr. Bamberger to invite him to discuss the problems of the Institute, responding first with a general letter, which he took to Mr. Bamberger in Newark, directed to the importance of the Institute in American education, and the need to ensure its healthier financial condition. He emphasized strongly the need to train and guide the younger men who would be the scholars of the future. Since the Institute could never be large, it must be flexible, if it were to fill the real needs of changing times. Programs must change with the retirement of the older men. He reminded the Founder that he had suggested subjects in 1940, and offered to do so again if Mr. Bamberger wished him to do so. He would also like to talk with the Trustees, particularly the Executive Committee, which he had called to meet on the 14th December, and for which he intended an ever more important role in the affairs of the Institute. "I feel that the committee should meet at frequent intervals and should have much fuller information about the whole situation...than has been the case in the past,"

he wrote.[66]

As he had hoped, Mr. Bamberger invited him to be more specific about the subjects he had in mind, and so on the 8th December, he took a signed letter in hand and again visited Mr. Bamberger. He confined his suggestions to Chinese and Latin-American studies; for these he estimated annual budgets of $75,000 to $100,000 and $50,000 to $60,000 respectively. His third suggestion was for research in English literature, which, he said: "I have been considering with a group of scholars...for a number of years." There was active research going forward at that time within a group of young and vigorous men. His plan was to call four of these men, and to appoint six young post-doctorals as members to work with them. The project would not be a permanent addition to the Institute; he thought two or three years would be enough, and estimated the cost at $50,000 a year. The fate of these requests was the same as in 1940; Mr. Bamberger would permit him neither to embark upon the programs nor to discuss them with the Trustees.[67] But Aydelotte had done what he told Mr. Leidesdorf he wanted to do; he had got his answer from Mr. Bamberger on academic programming before bringing up with him questions of imminent retirements and pensions.[68]

Now he turned to Dr. Flexner for help in bringing pressure to bear on Mr. Bamberger to cause him to realize the desperate financial plight of the Institute. The two arranged to meet in Princeton on the 18th December.[69] On the 22nd, Flexner, having talked with Mr, Bamberger, asked Aydelotte for a precise statement of the financial situation, which was complicated by the fact that the budget for the past year and the present seemed to be in balance, but only because approximately one-third

of the income came from subventions. Flexner's illness and age had made him remote from those affairs of the Institute which he had dwelt on so continuouly as he directed it. Aydelotte had been kind to his ailing predecessor; he had tried not to trouble him with his fears, although they had worked with one accord to turn the Founders' thoughts to the need for endowment. Now Aydelotte told Flexner that the budget had not been balanced since 1938, and the deficit of 1940 would have been larger had Swarthmore not paid his salary. The salaries of the two economists had never been capitalized in endowment; neither had the expenses of maintaining Fuld Hall, to say nothing of keeping it in repair. Flexner's own pension was not provided for by endowment; there were besides pension arrangements which, with Flexner's own, would cost about $30,000 a year, if Professors Herzfeld and Lowe were to receive annuities of $4,000 a year when they retired, as Aydelotte was sure Flexner would agree they should. The end of his letter seems to indicate that Flexner had been encouraged by Mr. Bamberger to be quite specific about the Institute's need, for he concluded with the following:

> The upshot of all this is that we are running at least $125,000 behind at the present moment, which is the interest on $4 million.
>
> I hope, however, that Mr. Bamberger's generosity will extend not merely to the point of covering our present commitments but will make some provision for such interesting extionsions as the development of Oriental studies, Latin American studies, and work in other fields in which I think the Institute might make a great contribution....The plan which you laid down for the Institute and its method of approach to scholarship is so effective, so much needed, and promises such fruitful results that it would be nothing less than a tragedy if we were not going to be able to enter other fields. We need not enter them all at once and we can exchange one subject for another, but we need some margin in order to do anything.[70] (Emphasis added)

But the hopefulness of the moment appeared to be deceiving; Dr. Flexner wrote later that he did not believe it would be wise to ask Mr. Bamberger for $4 million.

When the Executive Committee met on the 14th December Messrs. Aydelotte, Leidesdorf and Veblen were the only members in attendance. The minutes record that they "discussed the financial situation in great detail." They decided that if the Rockefeller-Bamberger fund were renewed, "the budget for 1943-44 should be made on substantially the same lines as the current budget." Thus they came close to pre-empting the function of the Budget Committee on which no Faculty Trustee could serve. More important, perhaps, they decided that the Executive and Finance Committees should meet each month of the academic year in which the Board did not, even in the summer if necessary. Thus Professor Veblen appeared to be starting on the course he had suggested to Flexner in July, 1931 -- that an executive committee of Faculty Trustees should conduct the business of the Institute during the intervals between the Board meetings. (See p. 168) Of course he must have other Faculty members with him on the Board, but he had not given up hope of doing that. The Board approved the schedule for the meetings.[71]

Having received Mr. Bamberger's refusal to permit him to discuss his plans with the Executive Committee, Dr. Aydelotte then asked if the Executive Committee might consider what should be done about pensions and retirements. These were imminent in the cases of Messrs. Einstein and Herzfeld, who would reach their sixty-fifth birthdays in 1944, and Messrs. Lowe and Veblen, who would do so in 1945. Mr. Bamberger gave his approval.[72] The Executive Committee met on the 26th February, 1943, and requested

Aydelotte to collect and submit data from the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. Just before the meeting the Director gave the Treasurer a summary of the main problems. The Committee asked Mr. Hardin to find out whether Mr. Bamberger would like the name of the Institute changed; he had showed irritation on the frequent occasions when the press and others confused the Institute with the University, instead of recognizing it as a separate entity.[73]

On the 1st March, Aydelotte conferred with Flexner on a very serious matter: Mr. Bamberger had told him that he "had made no financial commitment to the Institute." Flexner returned to New York and was ill for a week, then sending Aydelotte a letter enclosing a draft for his comment and criticism of another he proposed to send to Mr. Bamberger. In that he conceded that the Founder was correct: "neither you nor Mrs. Fuld ever made a financial commitment beyond what you actually gave," he wrote. But he followed this by setting forth history pointing out action after action in which they tacitly conceded they considered themselves responsible for the further financing of the Institute.[74] There is no evidence that Dr. Aydelotte offered his comments, or that that effort went further. However, on the very same date Aydelotte sent Mr. Leidesdorf a long and powerful draft which he hoped the Treasurer would send to Mr. Bamberger over his signature, emphasizing the virtually insolvent position of the Institute if outside subventions ceased. In that he suggested that the following steps would be necessary: the elimination of all assistants, or all stipends; or reduction of all $15,000 professorial salaries to $12,500, and his own to $15,000; or the use of the surplus in the Rockefeller-Bamberger fund; or leaving unfilled all vacancies caused by

retirements.[75]

Mr. Bamberger actually signed his last will on the 20th February, 1943, making the Institute for Advanced Study his residuary legatee, before any of the last four efforts were made. Of course, Mr. Hardin knew it, and probably Mr. Leidesdorf also. But neither was free to divulge the information. Perhaps Mr. Bamberger had become exasperated by Aydelotte's hammering and homilies, so that he deliberately refrained from easing the Director's pain and worry immediately. But tell him he ultimately did, though when is a question. As will be seen later, Aydelotte did not agree with himself as to the time of Mr. Bamberger's revelation. (See p. 583)

The Executive Committee met again on the 22nd March, and came to certain conclusions about the pension problems. These were considered by the Board at its annual meeting in April. The questions were difficult. The Committee did not mention the fact that Professors Einstein, Veblen and Weyl were to receive pensions of $8,000 on retiring at the age sixty-five, or that Dr. Flexner was receiving $12,000 then. But it did emphasize the distress in the cases of Herzfeld and Lowe, whose Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association benefits would yield far less than the $4,000 per annum which since 1905 had been considered a proper minimum annuity for university professors.[76] It recommended that the Institute should directly augment their Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association pensions to allow each $4,000, which would cost the Institute $4,650 per annum. Five more professors would retire between 1950 and 1957, none of whom would receive $4,000 under prevailing arrangements with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. Without regard for the benefits to be realized

the Committee recommended that the joint equal premium payments of all five should be doubled, if the professors were willing. The results would yield Professors Mitrany and Stewart less than $4,000, and Professors Alexander, Panofsky and Warren more than that sum. The cost to the Institute of doubling its contribution for the five would be $3,150 per annum.

The total cost of the Committee's recommendations was relatively modest -- $7,800 a year. But in failing to mention the Institute's responsibility for the larger pensions, the Committee had understated its potential liabilities by about $28,000. Moreover, it had recommended no overall policies governing the age at which professors should retire, or the establishment of a recognized minimum pension.[77]

When the Board surveyed this handiwork, which it discussed for a whole afternoon, it was obviously dissatisfied with the results, and decided that a Special Committee on Pensions should be appointed to review the whole subject and report to a special session of the Board to be held in about a month. The minutes reveal that the dissatisfaction was not due alone to the report: it became apparent that not all the Trustees were receiving the Treasurer's annual report at the end of each fiscal year. Indeed, it would seem that some were not even aware that the Treasurer was offering such an excellent compendium of financial data as he had been making since fiscal 1934. These were admirably detailed, showing for each year a balance sheet, current expenditures in great detail, income by sources, financial status of the Foundation, lists of all securities together with changes in the portfolio and a summary of capital gains and losses. In view of a policy to restrict the circulation of such data

one can readily appreciate how radical was Dr. Weed's suggestion in 1939 that a financial report of the Institute be published in the annual Bulletin, although it is possible that only the newer members of the Board were aggrieved by the failure to acquaint them with the facts.[78]

The question was bound to arise at this meeting, not only because of the pension matter, but also because the Budget Committee reported it could present no budget for 1943-44, nor could the Treasurer, he reported, account correctly for savings and reserves of surplus in accordance with a resolution passed on the 13th May, 1940, providing that an excess of income in any fiscal year should be set up in a surplus account instead of being turned to capital account as had been done theretofore. The problem here was the treatment of a surplus in the Rockefeller-Bamberger fund for economics. It seemed that the arrangements made by the Director with Mr. Willitts did not suit the Chairman of the Board of the Foundation, and that the disturbance of these agreements resulted in doubt about the use of reserves in the fund and consequently in the accounts of the Institute, which had little or no margin of safety.[79]

The Special Committee on Pensions consisted of Messrs. Leidesdorf, Chairman, E. S. Bamberger, Maass, Moe and Weed. Clearly Moe and probably Edgar Bamberger had been critical of the report of the Executive Committee for its treatment of individuals rather than of policies, and therefore earned appointments. Omitted from the group which had made the report were Messrs. Hardin, Flexner and Veblen. Since Flexner did not attend, and Mr. Hardin was uninterested, the net effect was to relieve Professor Veblen of further action at the formulative level. Later moves to "pack" the Executive Committee indicated that some of the Trustees did

not welcome his influence there, as will be seen.

The discussion at the April meeting was so protracted that no time was given the Director to render his report; he was told to present it at the special meeting soon to be held. And though officers were duly nominated and elected, the committees were not; instead, Mr. Hardin announced at the end of the meeting "that the Standing Committees would be substantially the same as for the present year." The minutes go on to say:

> Since the meeting of the Board, however, it has developed that certain changes will be necessary, and these will be announced by the Chairman at the special meeting.

But at that meeting, the Committee on Nominations presented its recommendations, and the Board approved them. Messrs. Moe and E. S. Bamberger were elected to the Executive Committee. By statute the Executive Committee had four members; it now had nine, since none was removed. Dr. Leo Wolman, Professor of Economics at Columbia, a director of Mutal Insurance Company of New York, member of the research staff of National Bureau of Economic Research, close friend of Messrs. Douglas, Stewart and Flexner, was elected a Trustee of the Institute in April, 1943, and assigned to the Committee on Finance.[80]

The Special Committee studied the retirement policies of several universities, examined the pension and retirement arrangements which had been made for the individual professors of the Institute, and at first evidently decided against any special action which would give any professor a pension of more than $4,000.[81] Thus the first thought was to eliminate the doubling of joint premiums suggested by the Executive Committee, perhaps on the ground that no favoritism should be shown. But that view did

not prevail. The Committee then submitted certain alternatives to Mr. Bamberger, and when they received his answer through Mr. Farrier, completed their report to show his decisions. One alternative offered to double joint equal premiums for Professors Alexander, Panofsky and Warren to yield pensions above $4,000 if they wished to participate on an equal basis; otherwise joint equal lesser amounts at their option. The other would be joint equal increased premiums to yield pensions of $4,000. Mr. Bamberger chose the first. Professors Mitrany and Stewart were offered the opportunity to match premiums more than double current ones to yield pensions of $4,000. Alternative proposals would give Dr. Swann a pension of $1,200 or $1,500, the added expense to be borne by the Institute. Mr. Bamberger opted for the $1,200 annuity, which would cost the Institute $900 per annum and Miss Swann nothing additional. Professors Herzfeld and Lowe were to receive direct subsidies for total pensions of $4,000. The Committee recommended these actions to the Board, together with offers to Dr. Mayer to pay equal premiums to build a pension of $1,500, and to double equal premiums with the Director in the hope of meeting the Board's commitment to him and Mrs. Aydelotte as survivor on his retirement at some undetermined date. As for the Director Emeritus and the three professors who had been promised pensions of $8,000, Dr. Aydelotte had investigated the cost of insuring the Institute's liability and found it excessive, as had his predecessor. Therefore the Institute would subsidize them directly. The Committee stated the annual cost.

The Board agreed with all these recommendations, except that it placed Professors Warren, Mitrany and Stewart in the group to be offered the opportunity to contribute to a $4,000 annuity. It found that all the increased premiums would cost the Institute about $12,000 per annum above

the usual 5% of salaries. The total direct subsidies, including $600 per annum for Mrs. Bailey, would cost approximately $29,000 per annum. The Committees had found that Professors Earle, Meritt, Morse, Riefler and von Neumann would fare well under the normal arrangements, and the Board agreed. The Committee noted that Miss Goldman had been omitted from the pension arrangements because "she possesses an independent fortune and because of the unusual nature of her appointment." The Board agreed, citing only the latter reason.

As for general policies, the Committee recommended, and the Board agreed, that in effect the minimum pension should be $4,000 for professors, and that every professor should retire at the end of the fiscal year in which he reached his sixty-fifth birthday, except that when the birthday fell in July or August, retirement should be effective the first of the following month. But the Board left itself some leeway, and added that the time of retirement for any professor might be deferred by its own vote. The Director was instructed to arrange terms in all future appointments to effectuate these policies, and cautioned that in employing an older man the burden might require a reduced salary. Officially, the Board stated that its "maximum annual pension liability will be between $30,000 and $35,000 in addition to the 5% premiums...On the other hand, there will be a decrease in the salary roll from July 1, 1945 onwards of not less than $50,000." The minutes added:

> The Board believes that these measures will satisfactorily meet the matter of pensions...at a cost which will put no undue strain on the budget and which will not demand additional capital funds for this purpose.[82]

Clearly there was no official recognition then of any future gifts in contemplation.

Throughout Dr. Flexner appeared to dissent. He took the position that the Institute was being less than generous. He had called appointments to the Faculty "indeterminate" with the idea that men reaching age sixty-five might be continued in active service year by year on recommendation of the Director, approved by the Board. He had told Messrs. Herzfeld and Lowe that their active service might be so extended, for they admittedly had been appointed to finish their life's work, which might require an extension of active service beyond age sixty-five. But Flexner was careful to tell Dr. Aydelotte that since "mathematicians do their best work in their forties and fifties," he would not recommend extensions for either Professor Einstein or Professor Veblen. Indeed, he would not consider it necessary to replace them. Moreover, he felt that minimum pensions of $4,000 were inadequate; the minimum standard of $8,000 recently adopted by the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research was more appropriate. Where, he asked Aydelotte queruously, were the early promises of Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass, who had talked in terms of $30 million for the Institute? He added:

> It was on this basis that I acted, and I felt justified in continuing so to act because the Founders without request from me...gave the Institute additional funds and... bought a large site and proposed the building of Fuld Hall. Have circumstances so fundamentally altered that the Institute is so soon forced to abandon some of the characteristics that make it most notable and distinctive?[83]

Dr. Aydelotte had his answer ready: it was Mr. Bamberger's recollection that with the abandonment of the policy to promise $8,000 pensions, the joint 10% contribution to Teachers Insurance and Annuity Associ-

ation was to take care of the whole problem, regardless of the age of the professor at his appointment. But Flexner had reason to know that this was not true. He maintained that the Founders as well as the other Trustees had understood clearly that the 10% premiums to Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association would not take care of adequate pensions for the older men. He had consulted Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association before April, 1932, he said.[84] There was no real controversy between the two Directors then, however. But certain surprising developments followed swiftly which did arouse hostile feelings.

After the Board meeting in June, Aydelotte called in all the professors individually and informed each exactly what the Board had decided in his case. At the end of these conferences, he wrote Mr. Leidesdorf that all concerned, except Professors Herzfeld and Lowe, were "uniformly cordial and grateful." As to the protests of the two humanists, he said:

> I sympathize with them...but I have told them that the financial situation...made it impossible for us to continue them beyond sixty-five and pointed out to them gently that the annuities for them went far beyond any provision made at the time of their appointments...In every other case the members...were extremely well satisfied...thought the action of the Board was fair and generous, and were only disposed to be a little anxious as to whether the Institute will be financially able to carry out the arrangement. I was able to tell them that all this was financially sound from our point of view.[85]

The Director also wrote Dr. Flexner at this time, saying he hoped his predecessor was better satisfied, and telling him of Herzfeld's and Lowe's complaint that Flexner had himself "promised" them added terms of active service to enable them to finish their work. He added that while Mr. Bamberger had been "appalled at the magnitude of the pension problem

at first, he is now well satisfied with the solution which has been reached."[86]

On the 12th July the Director wrote each professor confirming the terms he had discussed with him. The two humanists were still protesting vigorously, and Aydelotte asked Mr. Moe to help him with a suggestion or two. Moe, saying that "hard cases made bad law," finally suggested that in addition to their augmented annuities, each should receive an additional sum annually for three years for expenses to enable him to finish his work.[87]

But neither man was satisfied. Professor Herzfeld sold his valuable library and museum privately in New York without giving the University or the Institute an opportunity to offer to purchase them. He had completed manuscripts for which the Institute was unable to appropriate more than $6,000 for publication of one of his works; Herzfeld left for Europe soon after the war ended to try to raise the necessary money. He died while in Europe in 1948. Professor Lowe seemed to feel doubly aggrieved; he felt he had a case at law, and consulted an eminent jurist who referred him to an attorney, from whom he learned that he had no case and should abandon any thought of suing the Institute. Professor Lowe also sold his valuable library and collection privately, without giving either the University or the Institute an opportunity to purchase them. Curiously, Dr. Lowe complained that he had "been encouraged" to build a home with money at 4% on a large and beautiful lot on Battle Road Circle which he leased from the Institute at $1 a year for ninety-nine years. As Aydelotte was to write him:

> The Trustees understand that you felt, in your own phrase, that you should not have been allowed to build a house in view of your prospective retirement....

The Board was embarrassed; it offered to take the house off the Professor's hands for what it had cost him, or to allow him to sell it subject to its right to recapture it. Meanwhile, it remitted amortization payments, and gave him a year to decide which he wished to do. He sold the house at a substantial profit with the Board's approval, in spite of the opposition of Messrs. Maass and Veblen. Professor Lowe has continued throughout the years to occupy the most luxurious office in Fuld Hall.[88]

In 1945 Aydelotte asked the Rockefeller Foundation to help with the expense money it had agreed to pay Professor Lowe. Dr. Stevens of the Division of the Humanities consulted the authorities at the Oxford Press. He found that sentiment there favored cutting off the Codes Latini Antiquiores with the fourth volume, which it had just got in hand. This was not because the Press believed any the less that the ten projected volumes would serve scholars well for the next one hundred years, but because the manuscript was so slow in coming to press. The Foundation refused further aid on the basis of this advice, and Dr. Lowe continued the work, while the Institute supplied him with a research assistant, secretarial service, travel funds, etc.[89]

In August Professors Einstein and Veblen entered the ranks of the dissatisfied. Professor Einstein suddenly asked Dr. Aydelotte to take back his letter of the 12th July establishing his retirement at the end of fiscal 1944 with a pension of $8,000, on the ground that "Dr. Flexner had never written me a letter of appointment." In some way he had become convinced of this, and since his papers had been confiscated by the Nazis,

he could not refresh his memory. Oddly enough, the Institute's official file had disappeared; it reappeared years later, and with it the documents cited in Chapter IV. Aydelotte asked Dr. Flexner for verification and set the Director Emeritus and Mrs. Bailey to cudgel their brains for recollection. The clearest of recalls here would not have sufficed. Of course the Board minutes of the 10th October, 1932, began a regular pattern of terms of appointment which invariably provided for retirement at age sixty-five unless it was deferred by the Board. The agenda for the Committee on Pensions stated Veblen's ground as being that his appointment antedated Einstein's. Aydelotte made some pencilled notes of Veblen's statements as follows: (1) successors should be appointed promptly after the retirement of professors; (2) The Institute should recognize its moral obligation to increase to the maximum the salaries of the three professors in the School of Mathematics who were still receiving less; (3) the interests of the Institute would best be served by retaining himself and Professor Einstein in active status.[90]

Aydelotte conferred with various Trustees, including Moe and Wolman and the members of the Finance Committee. A letter to Moe on the 26th August indicated that "the Finance Committee agrees in principle with the line that you and I took, but Wolman suggested one or two modifications in detail which seem to me to be good," It is likely that this "line" was to avoid making "bad law" -- not to breach the policy recommended by the Special Committee and established by the Board. He was going to confer further with Mr. Moe soon. But it became apparent that an impasse developed between the Committee and the two professors, for the Committee met on the 24th September and the 5th October, and

the Director was able only to report "progress" to the Board on the latter date. Meanwhile the dissidents' cases had not been submitted to the Executive Committee or the Board. Finally, as became apparent, Mr. Bamberger took a hand, and directed that the two members of the powerful School of Mathematics should continue to receive their full salaries. The Committee met on the 8th December, and reported alternatives to the Executive Committee which read as follows:

> That because of their distinguished service to the Institute, Professors Einstein and Veblen may, at their option, be continued upon the active list until each reaches the age of seventy.
>
> Suggested alternative: That because of their distinguished service to the Institute, the rule of retirement at age 65 shall be waived in the cases of Professors Einstein and Veblen, the date of Professor Einstein's retirement shall be fixed between him and the Trustees, and Professor Veblen may, at his option, continue upon the active list until he reaches the age of seventy.

The Executive Committee chose the second, and added:

> The Trustees shall make no conditions for men on the retired list as to their places of residence or the activities in which they may engage, except that Professors Einstein, Veblen and Weyl, for whom unusually favorable pension arrangements have been made, shall not identify themselves with another institution without the approval of the Trustees.[91]

Here at last was the "bad law" which most of the Trustees had been so anxious to avoid. Aydelotte, vacationing in Florida during the Christmas holidays, was made aware of Einstein's embarrassment, and wrote Mr. Bamberger that because of that feeling, which he surmised Veblen might share, he believed it would be best if the Founder gave the Institute the $7,000 per annum for each man, so that the Faculty could be assured their budgets would not suffer. He would like to announce the funds were coming from "an anonymous donor." He continued:

> In 1945 we shall, as you know, be forced to make a serious cut in expenditures unless we receive more income. I know you are opposed to cutting salaries, as I am myself, if by any means it can be avoided. If you plan to make any contributions in 1945 to avoid the necessity, the contributions for Einstein and Veblen could simply be merged in that gift...I would not make this suggestion if I did not feel it would be important to the whole Faculty.

Mr. Bamberger's reply showed impatience:

> ...In reference to your remark about the Institute's financial problems, I am somewhat surprised. I was under the impression that any misunderstanding that might have existed had already been ironed out.[93]

It was apparent that Mr. Bamberger was not really conscious of the startling nature of the exceptions which he had made, or of their inevitable effect on the Faculty. Moreover, if the "ironing out" was through the bequests of the Founders, it might not suffice to alleviate the Institute's present budgetary problems. Aydelotte was even more conscious of his difficult position when he received an ominous note from Dr. Flexner:

> I do not understand the considerations which led to some of the action taken. Mr. Bamberger told me some weeks ago that he wanted me to attend the Board meetings, and I agreed to do so. I have never been in the position of differing with you at a meeting of the Board, and I do not wish to do so, if it can possibly be avoided. I suggest that you and I try to meet toward the end of this week.[94]

Aydelotte made his position clear to Mr. Bamberger in a personal visit, and was able to tell the Faculty on January 24th that a special gift from an "anonymous" donor would defray the cost of the continued full salaries for Professors Einstein and Veblen, while the $27,000 for three years to meet the expenses of Professors Herzfeld and Lowe was to be taken from surplus funds. Professor Lowe came to the meeting with his complaints in writing, asking for the appointment of a special committee

to survey matters of retirement, pensions, and salaries, which he asserted were grossly unequal. His colleagues finally dissuaded him from pressing his cause, and the meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Director for his careful work.[95]

When the Board met next day, Messrs. Douglas and Wolman attended for the first time, though the one had been a Trustee for three years and the other for nearly one. Dr. Flexner also attended. The first matter discussed and decided appertained to the establishment of a Special Economic Reserve Account, which was accomplished by "perfecting" prior resolutions providing that savings in income should be kept in a surplus account, properly earmarked for special purposes. Of course, it was really not the wording of the resolutions which had taken so many months, but rather the working out of an agreement with the Rockefeller Foundation which would serve Mr. Stewart's objectives.[96] Also Mr. Leidesdorf now announced that he had mailed to each Trustee a full financial report for fiscal year 1943.

But the interest of some Trustees extended beyond that. Dr. Wolman asked whether it was the custom to distribute to all Trustees the minutes of the Executive Committee; Dr. Aydelotte replied that in the past those minutes had gone out only to the Committee's members, but that in future they would be sent to all Trustees.[97] Further evidence of critical attitudes appeared when Dr. Fulton asked whether the $6,000 set aside for publication of one of Herzfeld's works would suffice "to bring out even one of his books." Dr. Aydelotte could only express the hope that outside funds might be enlisted for that, and for others of the Professor's accumulating manuscripts. But he reported that the American Council of Learned Societies, which had helped liberally to publish works of Professor

Panofsky and Dr. de Tolnay during the past year, had said that "they would make their contributions in the future dependent upon contributions from the Institute's budget." Indeed, Dr. L. Leland had sent Aydelotte a copy of the Council's minutes to that effect; they ended with this statement: "The Council expressed astonishment that such an organization as the Institute had no provision for publication of research in the humanities." Was the Council aware that Institute funds were more liberally supplied for publication of the papers of the School of Mathematics? It might have been so, for the Faculty had considered the need for underwriting the publication of books at its meetings in September and again in December, going so far as to debate asking for an Institute imprint, but tabling it because of the lack of funds.[98]

It was, then, made quite clear that the special gift from the "anonymous" donor (known to be Mr. Bamberger) was badly needed to publish the works of the humanities instead of to continue full salaries for two Faculty members whose pensions equaled or bettered the full salaries of many university professors of the day, including some at Princeton University. There was reproach in this guarded questioning; candid debate was evidently foreclosed by the presence of the fragile Founder. Apparently Aydelotte did not favor the exceptions to the retirement policy. He had worked faithfully with the Committee, and with Mr. Moe particularly, who viewed these things with impersonality and a knowledge of good administration, with the result that the Committee seemed to have decided upon a compromise of the claims of Veblen and Einstein which might have avoided breaching policy. Its details are not available; they died a-borning, having evidently failed to please the two professors. It seems that they

were superseded by Mr. Bamberger's capitulation to a direct appeal from Professor Einstein, or from Professor Veblen on the physicist's behalf. Characteristically, Aydelotte composed a series of handwritten notes to guide him in his conference with Mr. Bamberger on the 22nd January, when he secured the Founder's pledge to give the difference between the pensions and continued full salaries. These indicate that he declined to justify the individual exceptions to policy, and went further to speculate that the $15,000 salary rate was too high -- it was "buying professors" -- and in future it should be $10,000 to $12,000, with pensions of $7,200 and full service for life. This he seemed to justify on the ground that it would give "freedom of movement -- /now/ no one can leave except myself -- cannot command a higher salary elsewhere." But the Director knew he could not prevail against the appeal of the physicist to Mr. Bamberger, and so wisely he did not try.[99]

The Board approved the recommendations of the Executive Committee after Professor Veblen assured the Treasurer that the Faculty understood and approved the exceptions made, having thanked the Director for his careful work for them. Mr. Aydelotte referred frankly to the identity of the "anonymous" donor, and received permission to investigate housing for members, a long-felt necessity, and landscaping to make the Institute appear more like the campus. It was clear now that the Founders were committed to "take care of the Institute in their wills."[100]

When Veblen received the formal notice from the Director that the Board had approved his salary arrangement, he replied in characteristic fashion:

> As I said to you the other day, this arrangement with regard to my retirement and that of Einstein is particularly gratifying in that it makes a substantial part of the salaries which we have been receiving available for other Institute purposes. I am sure you will understand me if I take the liberty of saying that I think the two purposes which should have priority are: (1) that of fulfilling the commitments that were made many years ago to three of the mathematical professors, /i.e., maximum salaries/ and (2) that of providing for suitable successors to Einstein and myself. I recognize, of course, that both of these purposes have to be considered in their relation to a balanced budget.[101]

The position of Professor Veblen was now very strong. He had won favor with Professor Einstein, having at long last seen that his former policy of coolness or even open hostility weakened his position as he wanted it to be among the Trustees and the Faculty. Veblen had little claim to the Board's consideration at this time, except as he could promote the idea that the School of Mathematics was his creation, and at the same time the source of the prestige of the Institute.

CHAPTER IX - NOTES

1. Brand Blanshard, Frank Aydelotte, The American Oxonian for April, 1957, p. 49.

2. Board of Managers, Swarthmore College, Resolution to President and Mrs. Frank Aydelotte, 11/8/39..

3. Einstein to William O. Aydelotte, 12/24/41. Aydelotte files.

4. Earle to Mitrany, 3/8/40. Earle papers. Aydelotte to Willitts, 3/7/40. Aydelotte files.

5. Aydelotte to Faculty members, 1/16/40. Aydelotte files.

6. Veblen to Aydelotte, 5/5/50. Aydelotte to Veblen, 5/8/40. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 5/10/40.

7. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/22/40, pp. 5, 6. Flexner to Aydelotte, 2/9/40. Aydelotte to Flexner, 2/13/40.

8. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/24/39. Aydelotte files.

9. Fosdick to Stewart, 7/18/38. Copy sent by Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/24/39. Aydelotte files.

10. Riefler to Aydelotte, 12/13/39. School of Economics and Politics papers.

11. See William Carson, National Bureau of Economic Research, to Stewart, 9/28/44. School of Economics and Politics papers.

12. Riefler to Aydelotte, 12/13/39.

13. Warren to Riefler, 12/18/39. Aydelotte files.

14. Interviews with Dr. S. E. Howard and Jacob Viner.

15. See Aydelotte to Willitts, 3/2/40. School of Economics and Politics papers.

16. Rockefeller Foundation by Norma Thompson, Secretary, to Aydelotte, 4/4/40. Aydelotte files.

17. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 4/5/40. Louis Bamberger to Aydelotte, 7/19/40.

18. Earle to Aydelotte, 12/23/39. Aydelotte files. Mitrany to Aydelotte, 12/2/39. Aydelotte files.

19. Minutes, Executive Committee, 3/29/40. The new Director was to receive a salary of $20,000, and a pension of $10,000 on retirement at an unnamed date, with his widow to receive half that during her widowhood. He should have Olden Manor rent free as his residence during his tenure, and an entertainment fund to be fixed between himself and the Treasurer. His salary to be effective 7/1/40, "or whenever his salary from Swarthmore College ends, but it was agreed that the pension arrangements should be effective immediately." See Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 6/18/40, submitting itemized expenses in Princeton during the last half of fiscal 1940.

20. Aydelotte to Flexner, 1/10/40. Aydelotte files. Maass to Aydelotte, 3/12/40. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 12/17/40. Aydelotte files

21. Deficits were: 1939, $25,570; 1940, $36,820; 1941, $2,348, all including the reserve of $10,000 for pensions. Minutes, 5/13/40, Appendix, p. 5.

22. See Flexner to Aydelotte, 1/4/40. Aydelotte to Flexner, 1/8/40. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte to Houghton, 1/9/40. Aydelotte files.

23. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/19/40. Aydelotte files.

24. See Stewart to Flexner, 6/16/39; to Aydelotte, 1/12/40, nominating Mr. Douglas. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 5/13/40. Douglas to Aydelotte, 5/27/40. Aydelotte files.

25. Aydelotte to Flexner, 5/3/40, not sent. Aydelotte files. Weed to Aydelotte, 5/7/40. Aydelotte to Weed, 5/9/40. Aydelotte files.

26. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 5/19/41.

27. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 5/18/42.

28. Ibid. Aydelotte to Weed, 4/29/40. Moe to Aydelotte, 5/3/40. Aydelotte files.

29. See Stewart's notes, 8/17/39-8/25/39. Flexner then told Stewart that Dodds was unhappy. But on 10/17/39 Flexner wrote Stewart telling him of Dodds' enthusiasm at the appointment:

"I saw President Dodds on Friday and told him of the conclusion which the Board had reached. He beamed and said, 'I have been inquiring about Aydelotte since you first spoke to me. I am absolutely convinced that you have made the best possible choice in the entire country, and though I regret your leaving, I am sure that Aydelotte and I will hit things off as successfully and cooperatively as you and I have been doing in these past years.' That lifts from my mind the last remaining doubt."

"Gauss and others, whom within the last few days I have taken into my confidence, have spoken in the same strain. The future is therefore as secure as human forethought can make it."

30. Flexner to Aydelotte, 8/7/40. Aydelotte files.

31. Flexner to Weyl, 2/18/40. Weyl files.

32. Veblen to Aydelotte, 1/1/40. Aydelotte files. The Board held its annual meetings at Fuld Hall in 1940 and 1941; in 1942 Dr. Flexner suggested that all meetings requiring the presence of Mr. Bamberger should take place in Newark because of his fragility. This was done.

33. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 11/18/40. Aydelotte files.

34. Aydelotte, pencilled notes of a conversation with Dr. Flexner, 12/1/40. Also Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/44, p. 4.

35. Minutes, Trustees' meetings, 5/13/40; 4/20/43; 6/8/43.

36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 2/24/41, Appendix, p. 1.

37. Ibid., pp. 3, 5.

38. Ibid., p. 6. Minutes, Rockefeller Foundation Board meeting, 2/19/43. School of Economics and Politics papers.

39. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 2/24/41, Appendix, pp. 7-9.

40. Aydelotte to Veblen, 9/19/41. Veblen papers.

41. Hambro

42. Unsigned ribbon copy of a memorandum, 4/18/41. Aydelotte files.

43. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/19/41, Appendix, p. 3.

44. Ibid., p. 7.

45. Ibid., pp. 7 ff.

46. Ibid., p. 9.

47. Ibid., p. 11.

48. Houghton to Aydelotte, 5/20/41. Aydelotte files.

49. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/14/41, Appendix, p. 1.

50. Ibid., p. 2.

51. See Minutes, School of Mathematics, 10/24/41, Appendix, for report of Professors von Neumann and Morse.

52. Ibid., p. 7.

53. Ibid., p. 7.

54. Joseph Conrad, The Nigger of the Narcissus, Preface, (1897).

55. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/14/41, Appendix, p. 5.

56. Veblen to Aydelotte, 10/24/41. Aydelotte files.

57. See Paul Kieffer of Kieffer & Killea, attorneys, 31 Nassau Street, New York, to Aydelotte, 1/5/42. Aydelotte files. Also Aydelotte to Weed and Douglas, 12/22/41. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte to Hardin, 12/22/41. Hardin to Aydelotte, 12/23/41. Hardin papers.

58. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, Special meeting, 1/28/42, pp. 1-3.

59. Ibid.

60. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/18/42, p. 8.

61. Ibid. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 5/18/42.

62. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 4/16/42. The Director said that he had never approved of the reserve for pensions as it was handled. Mr. Leidesdorf replied that if it were to be abandoned the Trustees should do it, although there is no record to show that they had been asked to approve its initiation in fiscal 1937. (Leidesdorf to Aydelotte, 4/28/42. Aydelotte files.) Though no mention is made of the subject in the minutes of 5/18/42, the reserve was omitted in Treasurer's report for that fiscal year, presumably with the Board's permission. See Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 5/1/42. Aydelotte files.

63. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger. Handwritten draft undated but presumably written during the summer, 1942. Aydelotte files.

64. Flexner to Aydelotte, 5/4/42. Aydelotte files.

65. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/13/42. Aydelotte files.

66. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 11/30/42. Aydelotte files.

67. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 12/8/42. Aydelotte files. See Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/44, p. 4. Aydelotte brought his signed letter back from Newark with him; it is in his files.

68. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 12/11/42. Aydelotte files.

69. Aydelotte to Flexner, 12/16/42. Aydelotte files.

70. Aydelotte to Flexner, 12/22/42. Aydelotte files.

71. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/43, pp. 1-2.

72. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 2/25/43. Aydelotte files.

73. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/26/43.

74. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/10/43. Aydelotte files.

75. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 2/27/43. Aydelotte files.

76. The C.F.A.T. at the time of its founding established a non-contributory pension of $4,000 for retiring college and university professors of private non-denominational institutions. When it learned that even the considerable funds donated by Mr. Carnegie could not support the system, certain of those originally contemplated as annuitants were to be allowed pensions of $1,500. (Dr. Aydelotte was one of these while he remained at Swarthmore, but lost it when he came to the Institute.) The T.I.A.A., a regular insurance company administering a contributory system, succeeded the original pension scheme in 1918. It was probably because of this history that the sum of $4,000 was considered to be minimal.

77. Minutes, Trustees' meeting. 4/20/43 with Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/26/43 and 3/22/43, Appendices.

78. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/20/43, p. 2.

79. Ibid., p. 2. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/5/43, pp. 1, 2. The problem arose over some confusion within the Foundation whether the Institute must refund excess of the grant to the Foundation. Dr. Aydelotte was assured it must, then that it need not; but finally he and Dr. Willitts met and agreed that the Institute should refund 35% of savings in the R-B fund. The next question concerned the use of the remaining 65%. Mr. Stewart maintained that this belonged to the economists, while Dr. Aydelotte insisted it belonged to the general fund. The same arguments attended the accounting of the second series of grants for economics (1944-45) based on the same requirements. They were finally resolved by a showing that the total savings at 6/30/45 had been spent for economics in 1946 and 1947. (Leidesdorf to Comptroller Rockefeller Foundation, 9/28/49.)

80. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/20/43, p. 3. Minutes, Trustees' Special meeting, 6/8/43, p. 4. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 4/20/43.

81. Aydelotte, Summary of "Discussions and decisions on retiring allowances, February, 1943 to January, 1944." Aydelotte files.

82. Reports, Special Committee on Pensions, 5/11/43, 5/21/43. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 6/8/43, pp. 1-3. Aydelotte to Farrier, 5/21/43. Aydelotte files.

83. Flexner to Aydelotte, 5/7/43; 5/11/43; 5/27/43. Aydelotte files.

84. Aydelotte to Flexner, 5/28/43; 6/19/43. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/23/43; 10/1/43. Aydelotte files.

85. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 6/17/43. Aydelotte files.

86. Aydelotte to Flexner, 6/19/43. Aydelotte files.

87. Aydelotte to each professor, 7/12/43; to Moe, 7/21/43. Aydelotte files. The solution was to offer Herzfeld $7,500 for three years, and Lowe $13,500 for the same period, to be spent under the supervision of the Director and the Treasurer for their expenses.

88. Aydelotte to Lowe, 3/16/45. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45, p. 2. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/19/45, pp. 3, 4. Interview with Lowe.

89. See David Stevens to Aydelotte, 11/14/46.
In 1940 the Carnegie Institute had cut its stipend to Lowe to $1,000. Dr. Flexner at Dr. Aydelotte's request had talked with Dr. Vannevar Bush in an effort to recover the amount, losing his voice in the vain attempt.

90. Aydelotte undated pencilled notes. Aydelotte files. See Aydelotte to Flexner, 8/4/43. Aydelotte files.

91. Aydelotte to Moe, 8/26/43. Agenda for meeting, 9/24/43 of the Special Committee on Pensions. Aydelotte files. Report, Special Committee meetings, 9/24/43; 10/5/43; 12/8/43. Aydelotte files. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/14/43. To the $7,500 for Professor Herzfeld the Committee added $6,000 for the publication of his Zoroaster.

92. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 1/8/44. Aydelotte files.

93. Louis Bamberger to Aydelotte, 1/12/44. Aydelotte files.

94. Flexner to Aydelotte, 1/17/44. Aydelotte files.

95. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 1/24/44.

96. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/44, pp. 1, 2.

97. Ibid., p. 2.

98. Ibid., pp. 3, 5. Aydelotte to Leland, A. C. L. S., 7/21/43. Leland to Aydelotte, 11/26/43. Aydelotte files. Minutes, Faculty meetings, 9/20/43; 12/18/43.

99. See Aydelotte to Maass, 5/2/44, asking whether the Executors of Mr. Bamberger's estate would make the $70,000 available immediately as Mr. Bamberger was considering doing. Maass replied he understood Mr. Hardin would. 5/9/44. See Aydelotte's handwritten notes for conference with Mr. Bamberger, 1/22/44. Aydelotte files.

100. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/44, pp. 4-6. Aydelotte to Maass, 5/2/44. Aydelotte files.

101. Aydelotte to Veblen, 1/26/44. Veblen to Aydelotte, 2/22/44.

CHAPTER X

THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER

On the 11th March, 1944 Louis Bamberger died in his sleep just before his ninetieth birthday. Few had known him intimately, but the community which he had enriched with his generosity mourned him. The Newark Evening News, to which he had been so loyal in 1930 as news of the Foundation was made public, editorialized sorrowfully at his going. It commented that generous as had been his public benefactions, he derived the greatest joy from many deeds of kindness which were known only to himself and the beneficiaries. He did not yield to importunities and always made up his mind independently as to what was worthy of his help. The editorial continued:

> He was a calm, quiet man of simple tastes, who hated only ostentation and pretentiousness. For these his scorn was unmistakable, but for most of the foibles and failings of humanity he had inexhaustible tolerance. He was shy, reserved, and sparing of speech, but he expressed himself with directness and candor and his words lost none of their forcefulness because they were invariably spoken in a voice little louder than a whisper.
>
> He wielded his great power with a delicacy and restraint which marked all his actions, and his humility and self-effacing spirit made him appear to be unconscious of his eminence.[1]

Speaking for the Institute, Dr. Aydelotte told the press:

> A native shrewdness and knowledge of human nature...enabled him to form sound opinions of men connected with higher scholarship as well as of men of business. He and his sister, Mrs. Fuld, saw instantly the merit of Dr. Abraham Flexner's proposal for an institute devoted to advanced research beyond the doctor's degree...Without pretending to any broad knowledge of education and scholarship Mr. Bamberger sensed the fact that emphasis upon excellence rather than upon size was the greatest need of higher studies

> in the United States. He made himself one of the great benefactors of American scholarship not merely by the amount of money he gave but still more, I should say, by his selection of the purposes to which his generosity was devoted.[2]

When the Board met on the 18th April, the Trustees knew that the Founder had left his residual estate to the Institute and were sincerely gratified. During a short period given to reminiscences Mr. Hardin, then eighty-four years of age, expressed deep distress over the loss of his friend and client, whom he described as "by far and away the best friend I ever had." Mr. Maass, in Mr. Leidesdorf's absence, apparently spoke with a lapse of memory, omitting any mention of the Treasurer in recalling the investigations in 1929 and 1930 for a suitable philanthropy. Dr. Flexner remedied the omission gracefully, at the same time reminding the Trustees that the Institute "was the work of no one man."[3]

The Trustees had not yet prepared a memorial resolution to Mr. Bamberger; the Faculty was more alert. At a meeting on the 3rd April it had adopted a tribute which was now read to the Trustees. Policy overtones appear in this document. Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld were given the credit for having originated the plan "to found a School for research with exceptional and unhampered opportunities for advanced study." The resolution expressed gratitude for the "continued benefactions" of the Founders, and appreciation that Mr. Bamberger "even at the last" strengthened the Institute's resources. The Faculty members rededicated themselves to realize to the full the hopes with which the Institute was established.[4]

On the 18th July Carrie Bamberger Frank Fuld followed her brother in death. Mr. Hardin then canceled the Committee he had named on the 7th July to prepare a memorial resolution to Mr. Bamberger, and told the Director he would himself prepare one to both Founders. He submitted his draft

to Mr. Leidesdorf for comment. The Treasurer found an error; Dr. Flexner, he informed Mr. Hardin, was not an intimate and old friend of Mr. Bamberger's. On the contrary; he wrote:

> You say, 'before final decision their adviser's were many, but the model they at last accepted was suggested by their longtime intimate friend, Dr. Abraham Flexner, who was invited to become the head of the educational institution that they had decided to endow.' This is not the fact. Originally Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld had conceived the idea of founding a medical school and had asked Mr. Maass and me to investigate both the possibility thereof and the wisdom of its location at Newark. Our investigation finally placed us in contact with Dr. Flexner, who was then entirely unknown to Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, and he, Dr. Flexner, not alone recommended against a medical school but suggested the plan which ultimately ripened into the Institute for Advanced Study. Mr. Maass and I introduced Dr. Flexner to Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld at this time in order that he might present his views to them, and from this introduction there eventuated a series of Saturday luncheon meetings attended by Mr. Bamberger, Mrs. Fuld, Dr. Flexner, Mr. Maass and myself, at which Dr. Flexner's plan for an institute of higher study was developed and ultimately came to fruition through the endowment of the Bamberger-Fuld Foundation.[5]

Mr. Hardin's response was short and friendly, thanking Mr. Leidesdorf for his assistance. In part he wrote:

> I had forgotten that Dr. Flexner was not known to Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld until after introduction to them by Mr. Maass and yourself. Of course the important error in my original draft should be corrected, and I have endeavored to substitute something new. I see no impropriety in introducing into the resolution the names of both Mr. Maass and yourself, but except for essentials, I have avoided the use of names of outside persons, however instrumental in molding the nature of the foundation. I too had many conferences with Mr. Bamberger both before and after he introduced Dr. Flexner as the 'persuader,' and apparently you also have that view.[6]

Careful reading shows that Mr. Hardin was at some pains to correct the impression conveyed by the Faculty resolution in at least two respects. He gave to Dr. Flexner, whose name was conspicuously omitted from the Faculty's resolution, full credit for originating the idea of the

Institute during the evolution of their planning. Flexner had

> inspired them with ambition to enter an area in the educational field not theretofore occupied and not bounded by definitions of research. The Director's plan for an institute of higher study was developed and ultimately came to fruition. This purpose was later epitomized by Mr. Bamberger as a 'desire to increase the sum of human knowledge.'[7]

The wills of both Founders were simply written. Mr. Bamberger's named as executors to serve without bond his two old friends, John Hardin and Sam Leidesdorf, and his nephew Michael Schaap. It made specific bequests totaling approximately $1 million to various individuals and to certain welfare and cultural agencies of Newark. All taxes and fees were to be paid from the residue, which came to the Institute for Advanced Study with no testamentary directions to its Trustees. Mr. Leidesdorf estimated that the Institute would receive $6,690,000. Mrs. Fuld's will, dated the 31st May, 1944 followed the same pattern. The executors were Messrs. Farrier and Schaap. The total estimated inheritance of the Institute as residuary legatee, after the payment of fees and taxes, was $1,962,000. Mrs. Fuld also disposed her personal effects of value, making the only bequest to any one concerned with the Institute. She left her golden clock to Dr. Flexner.[8]

All four executors were mindful of the critical condition of the Institute's finances, and worked faithfully to expedite the settlement of the two estates, with the result that in fiscal 1945 more than $6 million in chas and securities was transferred to the Institute. Mr. Leidesdorf diclined to accept his fee when the estate was finally settled, thereby contributing $50,000 to the Institute. Only a brief mention of this gift was made officially, and Mr. Maass was responsible for stating

its amount.

The Treasurer's reports reveal that the Founders actually gave evidence of their continued loyalty to the Institute between 1935 and their death in the establishment of a small trust in 1937, as a result of which on the death of the beneficiary a part of the corpus came to the Institute.[9] As has been said, Mr. Maass reported to a committee of Congress that up to the 11th December, 1952 the total of gifts and bequests received by the Institute from Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld was $16,462,355.

The total was thus much less than Maass had originally estimated it would be. It must be remembered that many demands were made upon the donors for contributions to other enterprises. Thus Dr. Aydelotte was to write from Palestine in 1946 that the Founders had endowed the Department of Oriental Studies at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem.[10] What other large gifts were made is not known. It will be recalled that just before publication of the formal documents attending the establishment of the Louis Bamberger-Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation, Mr. Bamberger had amended language to pledge additional endowment only as in the Founder's judgment it was needed to effectuate the purposes of the Institute. There is no doubt that Mr. Bamberger was alienated by certain events which have been recounted, but only one or two of their intimate friends could have said whether the Founders actually considered that their responsibility for the Institute ceased with the giving of Fuld Hall. Though Aydelotte tried to ascertain this historically, he was met by silence.[11]

The Trustees were cautioned that the total income to be expected from the bequests would do little more than meet current obligations when the more substantial subventions to income ceased. The Institute would have had real difficulty in making ends meet had not Mr. Leidesdorf, now completely in charge of investments, been highly successful, adding some $4 million to capital through gains realized mostly during the eight years following the death of the Founders.

For fourteen years Louis Bamberger had dominated the Institute for Advanced Study despite his quiet and retiring demeanor and his conscientious effort to avoid deciding what he considered to be the academic policies of the Institute. He was not entirely successful in this effort. His reluctance to authorize the second appointment of Professor Weyl was a case of interference in face of the clear evidence that the mathematician was eminently well qualified for an appointment to the Institute. Dr. Flexner had been deeply disturbed by that attitude, which appeared to be due to disapproval of Dr. and Mrs. Weyl's reluctance to leave Göttingen rather than to a conviction that the School of Mathematics was being overstaffed.

But it was in Mr. Bamberger's inflexible determination to deny the first Director any opportunity to deal with the Faculty as a body with regard to academic policies and appointments that Mr. Bamberger, probably unknowingly, exercised the most profound influence over academic decisions and was most unjust to his chosen executive. Dr. Flexner was put at a great disadvantage by this denial; indeed, he came to rely almost entirely upon Professor Veblen in his dealings with the Faculty. This was dangerous, because Veblen had his own ideas about how the Institute should develop,

and they were at variance with the Director's. Thus the Professor's attitude toward cooperation with the University, which at first he had been so eager to promote, changed radically in the early years, probably due to the resentment aroused by his early recruitment policies, and also by the failure of the Institute to give the School of Mathematics separate quarters near Fine Hall. His attitude influenced profoundly the Institute's course of action.

His weapon was a secret one, however, designed to strike at a peculiar vulnerability in both the Director and Mr. Bamberger. Had Flexner found it possible to consult freely with the Faculty during those years of growth, Professor Veblen would have found it more difficult to exert his own influence. For Flexner was not at home in the academic milieu. He had never before dealt at close range with the academic personality, and he displayed a certain self-consciousness which he revealed in a letter to Aydelotte which read in part:

> Surely if ever a man was welcomed by his colleagues and his friends, you are he, and if ever a man started out with the blessings and good will of all concerned, you are again he ....For I said to Dodds that you have one great advantage over me -- you are in your own right a scholar and can be one of the humanistic group. I, alas, have never been a scholar, for two years at the Johns Hopkins do not produce scholarship, though they do produce and did produce a reverence for it which I am now leaving in safe keeping with you.[12]

Occasional Faculty meetings, and regular meetings with the schools, would have tended to overcome the effects of the isolation during those early years which his rented quarters at 20 Nassau Street helped to impose.

Enough has been said about the influence of Mr. Bamberger over the Board in its sessions and in management functions to show that here,

too, full and free discussion suffered. It was inevitable that as Mr. Bamberger's hand was removed, lightly as it had seemed to rest upon the Board, ambitions of Trustees and Faculty came to the surface. Even though at the annual meeting Mr. Leidesdorf was absent, and apparently there was little known of the probable size of the inheritance, it was felt the Institute would be able to make new appointments, and all concerned seemed to feel they were standing on the threshold of change and growth. It seemed certain that Mr. Maass was quite conscious that now the Faculty -- or its self-appointed leaders in the crisis of 1939 -- might well insist upon new procedures such as those embodied in the five points set forth by Professor Earle (and supported by Professor Veblen) on the 18th June of that year. In any event, he soon showed signs of decision to take strong measures to control both Board and Faculty.

Dr. Flexner, bitterly disappointed in his successor because of his failure to prevent the two notable exceptions to retirement policies, which he considered more than unworthy, had given clear evidence of his feelings to Dr. Aydelotte on a number of occasions. It seemed that he was in the wings, ready for a cue to go into action. As was soon to appear, he had allies ready at his side, led by Professor Stewart. Flexner was aggrieved by the power which Professor Veblen had assumed in three and one-half years of Aydelotte's administration; he was probably not entirely innocent of knowledge or complicity when Dr. Wolman raised questions of the ascendency of the Executive Committee in Board matters. The minutes of the Board in that pass failed to mention a question which Aydelotte had noted for himself before the Committee meeting of December 1943 -- did the Committee have the legal power to reverse or so seriously to

modify a policy adopted by the Board?[13] Manifestly that could not be argued out in the presence of Mr. Bamberger, whose devotion to the Institute for Advanced Study was not a little influenced by the presence of Dr. Einstein.

Aside from the fact that Messrs. Douglas and Stewart were doctrinaire in their respect for a firm retirement policy and its observance, as witnessed by their assent to the retirement of Mr. Rockefeller Jr. at sixty-five, the continuance of the two members of the School of Mathematics in active status was not comfortable for Mr. Stewart, in view of their weight and Professor Veblen's activity in the Faculty. Stewart undoubtedly looked forward to an opportunity for the equalization of the schools -- as a chance for the economists to escape from their position of comparative isolation; this would be threatened by the continuation of Professor Veblen's activity. The Rockefeller-Bamberger grants had provided funds for an additional professor at $15,000, and Stewart might have had intentions to move now that the successful end of the war was hopefully in view. But whether he was actually contemplating economic research is really doubtful. He had written a strange thing to Dr. Aydelotte in November, 1943 in a mid-year "progress report." He said:

> Both Mr. Warren and I have continued the practice, which we began when we came to the Institute, of reading over a range wider than economics, including history, political theory and philosophy. This rises from our belief that economics is too narrowly defined. Where this may lead us in the end is not now evident, but it is quite likely to influence our recommendations of members to the Institute.[14]

As for Flexner, he revealed his attitude completely to Dr. Weyl, with whom he was always on very friendly terms:

> I should feel less pessimistic about the Institute if the two mathematicians who have reached or are soon to reach retirement age had shown themselves less selfish. Of course, you are all ten years older than you were at the beginning, but if men act selfishly in respect to retirement, especially those who at sixty-five are assured of a pension of $8,000 a year, (which is not a pension, but a salary) younger men cannot be appointed. Had these two men retired, some younger men could have been appointed to 'carry on the tradition,' but no younger men have been brought to the Institute and younger men of high scholarship, like de Tolnay, remain where they were....
>
> We must make a fight in the academic world because after the war we shall have not only to be adequate to the needs of our own young men but to be in position to train the persons whose duty it will be to revive learning in the old world. If any university head is thinking mainly of that, I do not know who he is.[15]

After the meeting of the Executive Committee in December 1943 Dr. Wolman, who had evidently met with the Finance Committee at the same time, had travelled back to New York with Messrs. Heidesdorf and Moe. He gave them to understand that he felt isolated as a Trustee of the Institute, that he had many ideas for it, and wanted to be consulted about them, as Moe wrote Aydelotte that night. Dr. Wolman was therefore invited to attend the next meeting of the Executive Committee, and was forthwith elected a member by it.[16]

Besides Mr. Stewart's rancor at the Institute's interpretation of its obligations to the Foundation in observing the terms of the grant to economics, he disapproved of Aydelotte's handling of plans for a new program to be called "Studies in the Fundamentals of American Civilization," to which Mr. Bamberger was considering a gift of income for several years. In the beginning, President Dodds and Professor Gilbert Chinard were both interested in it.

Early mention of it occurs in a proposal to Mr. Bamberger from

Aydelotte in July, 1943. He had certain persons in mind to constitute a seminar or to conduct researches. He wrote:

> In addition to Wright, Chinard, Nicolson, and McIlwain, all of whom I think we could get, we should like, if possible, to bring Tawney from England. That would certainly give us a group which would produce the 'mild sensation' which you quite rightly said to me one day the Institute needed. I was tremendously struck with another sentence of yours to the effect that the Institute is too young to stand still. In the opinion of everyone I consulted, if we were able to carry out such a research project as this, we should be marching forward into new fields of tremendous interest and importance at the present time.

The general idea behind the program was that too little was really known of the people and the culture of this unique country historically, economically and philosophically, and that it was time for some of its leading scholars in those fields to ponder. and to suggest what studies might be undertaken better to explain it. Mr. Bamberger expressed his interest, and later Aydelotte told him that President Dodds was enthusiastic and would help with staff and money for younger fellows.[17] Later this plan merged with one which Aydelotte devised in the fall of 1943 as a possible answer to the problem posed by the demands of Professors Einstein and Veblen for continued active status. It contemplated the establishment of a new class of scholar at the Institute: membership of three to five years for productive men who had been retired, and for a younger group such as the Guggenheim Foundation was designed primarily to aid. More will be said of this later. For the time, it must be related that not only did Aydelotte project in July the leading persons in the American Civilization studies, but he and Louis B. Wright of Huntington Library worked out a list of proposed studies. To this particularization President Dodds objected vigorously, saying that the two had usurped the

function which he understood a select few of the country's leading philosophers, historians and economists were to be called together to perform. Thereafter the University pursued its own way in studies of American civilization.[18]

Despite this reversal, Aydelotte reported in glowing terms to the Executive Committee on the 18th February, 1944, mentioning the eagerness of Professors Earle, Stewart and Warren for the program, and couching the minutes in extravagant terms in comment on approval from the Trustees. But after Mr. Bamberger's death, Stewart felt he must set the record straight. And so he wrote Aydelotte that "he was not prepared to make anything but minor drafts against our present Economic Fund to initiate our new program...I do not favor curtailing...arrangements with the National Bureau of Economic Research in order to start the new program upon a larger scale." Moreover, the minutes of the Committee meeting in February were corrected to reflect a moderate interest rather than an overwhelming enthusiasm for the Studies in American Civilization.[19]

Aydelotte's pencilled notes in preparation for the annual meeting showed his displeasure with the economists: in an effort to impress representatives on the Board with his own role in making their lot better he alluded to Mr. Bamberger's early opposition to economics as part of the Institute's program, and to his own efforts to "unify the School of Economics and Politics." While there was no mention of this in the minutes, the amendment of the Executive Committee's minutes would seem to betray the existence of conflict.[20]

The Director spoke from a difficult position at the annual meeting. Four days before, Mr. Maass at Dr. Flexner's prompting had proposed a study of the Institute's past, present and future, to be undertaken by a

special committee of the Board. Thus he wrote Aydelotte:

> When one considers that since the founding of the Institute ...there have occurred many changes in the Board of Trustees, some of the newer members of which are now becoming active in its affairs, and also changes in policy which stem from your succession to the Directorate, it seems to me important that the Board be somewhat more fully apprised than it can be from the reading at the infrequent Board meetings...of the Director's report or even the restudy of that report when the minutes of the meeting are distributed, of the course upon which the Institute embarked under the direction of Dr. Flexner, the changes, if any, which have occurred since you became Director, and the plans for its future activities. With this thought in mind, I have come to the conclusion that it would be well if a small committee of the Board were appointed to make a survey and some recommendations to the Board from which the Trustees can be guided in their future judgment of the scope, extent and character of the activities in which the Institute should engage.
>
> Therefore I have prepared a preamble and resolution, copy of which is enclosed, which I propose to offer at the meeting of the Trustees on Tuesday next, and I hope that what it embodies will meet with your hearty approval and cooperation.

The Director replied that he believed some such study should be undertaken in that period of transition; while he had thought it would be better for him to present a report to the whole Board, he could, he said, "readily believe that there are advantages to having a committee survey the field first and then report to the Board."[21]

The President's resolution was approved, and Mr. Hardin revealed that he was well aware of conflicts within the Board when he announced that he would have "to take some time for consideration before naming the members of the Committee." On the 7th July he announced the membership: Messrs. Maass, Chairman, Douglas, Leidesdorf, Moe and Wolman. Mr. Aydelotte was not mentioned even as a member ex-officio; it appeared that he would be heard and judged in what he was privately given to understand would be deliberation on whether he should retire at age sixty-five, (on

the 30th June, 1946) or continue beyond that point.[22]

The Director's remarks at the meeting were fairly general. He spoke of some of Mr. Bamberger's concerns, voiced during his frequent social visits and weekly lunches with the Founder in Newark. Mr. Bamberger hoped that the Institute would remain small and of the highest quality. He wanted it "to stand on its own feet, to be independent," and was concerned because it was frequently confused with the University. He insisted on the payment of rent as long as Institute mathematicians were at Fine Hall. They had discussed a change of name to assure its recognition as a separate entity, and while Mr. Bamberger had emphatically rejected any suggestion that it be named after him, he did consider the wisdom of calling it the New Jersey Institute for Advanced Study, but had not decided to do so. Aydelotte said the Founder had wanted more money to be devoted to stipends, and more younger scholars as members.

As for Aydelotte himself, he hoped soon to speak to the Board at length on subjects near his heart: i.e., the increased importance of younger members; more regard for the Institute as a help to universities, rather than as a rival; recognition that it was better to have several men working in various facets of a single subject and collaborating in their work, than to scatter the Institute's resources too thinly over too many specialties. While specialization was a condition of thoroughness, "the most significant progress is made by men who are interested in the interaction of one phase of a subject upon another." He added that he hoped the Board and the Faculty would "act as a unit, and that any move we make will be preceded by the fullest and freest discussion between the two groups."[23]

The minutes of the Committee on Policy are unavailable. But after the usual notice for the October Board meeting had gone out, Mr. Maass instructed Mr. Edgar Bamberger, the Secretary, to postpone the meeting indefinitely, and told Dr. Aydelotte to submit to his Committee the report he was preparing for the Board. Aydelotte sent it first to Mr. Moe for his comment and criticism; Moe found it to be "too deferential." After revision he sent it to Maass personally for his comments. These were revelatory of the focus of criticism against the Director within the Committee. For Mr. Maass suggested that the Director say that Mr. Bamberger had thought the economics program was "experimental." Also, Aydelotte was to abjure any responsibility for the continued active status of Professors Einstein and Veblen, putting the responsibility wholly on Mr. Bamberger. Again, Aydelotte should call upon the economists to clarify their program as between "facts and theory." Aside from these suggestions, Aydelotte gained the impression that Maass approved of the report, and that the Committee would after careful study refer it with recommendations to the Board.[24]

Again Aydelotte revised the document, and sent it officially to Maass as Chairman of the Committee on the 11th October. As was natural, he treated the financial situation first; he had raised $600,000 during the five years in office, most of it from Mr. Bamberger himself. He had pursued the financial question with Mr. Bamberger actively until finally the Founder had told him not to worry; that he and Mrs. Fuld were taking care of the Institute in their wills. But he seemed to be quite uncertain about when that assurance had been received, putting it at two different times: early in 1943 and again at the end of 1943. He added:

> I did not dare to count too much on these assurances... Our whole financial future depended upon him. I felt myself responsibile for the security of the Faculty, for their salaries and pensions, and realized, in spite of my impatience, that I had no choice but to wait until he gave us permission to go forward. That permission he has tacitly given us in his will.[25]

About the pension problem he said:

> I found when I came to the Institute that this liability had never been understood by the Trustees. The appointments of members of the Faculty as approved by the Trustees contemplated retirement at the age of sixty-five, with the proviso that the period of active service could be prolonged by mutual agreement between them and the Institute. A good many members of the Faculty had received what they interpreted as assurances that their periods of active service would be so prolonged, but these informal assurances had never been reported to the Trustees....
>
> In the regulations for retirement the Trustees held strictly to the age of sixty-five which had been originally contemplated. Professors Einstein and Veblen are only an apparent exception. They were the two members of the Faculty whom Mr. Bamberger knew best and he felt very strongly that he would like to have them continue beyond the age of sixty-five. I explained to him that if this were done these two professors would be more comfortable and the other members of the Faculty better satisfied if they retired nominally at the age of sixty-five, and if he would contribute the $70,000 needed to pay the difference between their pensions and their salaries for the five years...This Mr. Bamberger promised to do and that sum has been received from his estate...[26]

Then the Director made a very important announcement, which Mr. Maass had suggested to him in their telephone conversation of the 7th October:

> While the retirement allowances were under discussion I raised several times with Mr. Bamberger the question of my own retirement. He saw no reason why the rule which applied to the Faculty should apply also to the Director, and said repeatedly that he hoped I would continue as long as my health and strength allowed. Other members of the Board with whom I talked took the same position. I felt uncomfortable to leave the matter in the air but there was too much at stake for the Institute for me to urge upon Mr. Bamberger further discussion of my personal situation. Consequently no such provision was made for my salary as for that of Einstein and Veblen. As I have

> thought the matter over since Mr. Bamberger's death I have come to feel very strongly that if members of the Faculty retire at sixty-five, the Director should do the same, and I have been quietly making my plans to retire at that age.
>
> I frequently expressed to the Pension Committee and to the Executive Committee my hope that members of the Faculty after retirement (while left in freedom to do as they liked) would continue to carry on their scholarly work at the Institute as long as they were able. Supplements have been voted to the pensions of Lowe and Herzfeld to enable them to do so. This is exactly what I should like to do myself. My pension (the funds for which were largely accumulated with the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association during my nineteen years at Swarthmore) will be ample to enable me to live in Princeton and I should look forward with great satisfaction to carrying on my work in Fuld Hall.[27]

Insisting that more younger scholars -- recent post-doctorals -- be asked to come to the Institute for periods of advanced study, Aydelotte then described and recommended a new class of temporary appointments for what he called Fellows:

> For appointment as Fellow there should be no age requirement...The appointment would not be honorary but for active research...I should not limit fellowships to older men. Many, perhaps the majority, might be young men for whom year by year appointment as members does not give a status sufficiently secure to enable them to do their best work. A young man like de Tolnay who has shown unusual productivity and distinction might be appointed to a fellowship for a term of years instead of being kept on year by year as a member.
>
> A distinguished member of our Faculty might be made a Fellow at the age of sixty-five. A man like /Charles H./ McIlwain of Harvard or Douglas Freeman of Richmond might be brought to the Institute with this status. The organization of a group of Fellows of the Institute would enable us to enforce the retiring age of sixty-five in a clean-cut manner without the loss which would inevitably follow from the departure of a man like Einstein. It would enable us to give to distinguished scholars from our own group or from universities outside secure appointments which would at the same time be limited in their duration. And if the standard were kept high, as it should be, it would add greatly to the intellectual resources of the Institute.[28]

Such appointments would be from one to five years.

The Director's next recommendation had to do with certain measures affecting the Faculty, which was prompted by a suggestion he had received from André Bedier, Administrator of the Collège de France:

> I had known Bedier for many years, had discussed the Institute with him in Paris, and I found him very much interested in what we were trying to do. He was intensely proud of the fact that the Collège de France had been for four hundred years, under all kinds of governments and through all national vicissitudes, the center of French learning. Bedier thought that we had made insufficient provision for the stimulation of scholars at the Institute to do their best work. He told me he thought the secret of the continuing success of the Collège de France lay in the requirement that every professor should give every year a course of public lectures on the subject of his researches.
>
> I can see all the difficulties of following that plan at Princeton. It would be very much easier in New York. There are methods, however, by which we can achieve the same result. One is the encouragement of seminars such as the very successful ones which have been held in mathematics, in military history, and Greek epigraphy during the last few years, and such as are now planned for the School of Economics.
>
> Bringing a larger number of younger scholars to the Institute would tend to accomplish the same result. Dr. Simon Flexner, who is wise in methods of research, has urged upon me that each professor should be required to take personal responsibility for a certain number of these younger workers every year. I have even thought that a policy of lending our professors to other colleges and universities for brief periods, such as one semester at a time, might be worthwhile for ... the same purpose.[29]

Then the Director suggested other fields in which the Institute might engage to advantage:

> Our guiding principle in the choice of subjects should be to make the Institute as useful as possible to American scholarship by developing fields which are important and which are not at the present time cultivated up to a sufficiently high standard by other colleges and universities....In my report to Mr. Bamberger in 1940 I suggested...certain developments in our three schools...together with three subjects not at present touched by the Institute: Chinese studies, Latin American studies, and the history of science....The Institute has a wide reputation for its work in mathematics, in classical

> archaeology, in the history of art, and for its collaboration with the National Bureau in research in economics. In addition Professors Lowe and Herzfeld will continue...the publication of their results in paleography and in Persian archaeology.[30]

Mr. Maass' suggestion that economists might have been appointed under circumstances which were misunderstood by Mr. Bamberger appeared in Aydelotte's text as follows:

> Mr. Bamberger had very definite ideas....but he had no wish to dictate. He was strongly opposed to the subject of economics and gave his consent originally only because he thought our activity in that subject was experimental and could be terminated at any time. When I explained to him that this was not the case and urged upon him the great potential interest and value of this field, he willingly matched the contribution which I was able to secure from the Fockefeller Foundation.[31]

Nevertheless, the whole report showed an effort to placate the economists; he gave more space to Professor Stewart's plans for economics than to any other single subject. He mentioned Stewart's hope that when qualified men would again become available to undertake research, the Institute and the National Bureau of Economic Research would conduct studies in public and private financing in wartime, (as Professor Riefler had earlier suggested). The Social Science Research Council was interested in seeing such studies pursued. Dr. Willitts had asked that a study be made of the corporation, and Stewart wanted to undertake that too, when possible. Beyond Stewart's plans, Aydelotte indicated that his own hope for Studies in American Civilization was far from moribund.[32]

He wanted also to see the Institute engage in "research on uranium"; several Western governments were spending large sums for that, he was given to understand. All in all, the report seemed to arm him against any charge of indifference toward the economists and their program; it also showed clearly that Stewart's concept of his program was

keyed closely to that of the Rockefeller Foundation and its associated institutions.[33]

The Director closed with the following:

> These are only a few of the plans which I wish to take up with the Trustees from time to time in the period now beginning. We do not know yet exactly what our financial resources will be. A considerable part of our new endowment must be devoted to the satisfaction of existing commitments and the strengthening of the best work which we are doing at present. I hope, however, that we shall have some surplus after those needs have been met. It is a great satisfaction to me to have been able to balance our budget during these last five difficult years, to have made a significant contribution to the war effort and to the cause of future international organization, at the same time that we have, with smaller numbers, carried on researches which have resulted in a long and distinguished list of publications. I hope before my retirement to be able, in collaboration with my colleagues in the Faculty, to set the Institute on the path to still greater accomplishments in the future.[34]

It appears beyond question that Aydelotte had given full consideration to his report, and that he was sincere in his willingness to retire at the end of the year in which he was to reach sixty-five. The Committee should feel no embarrassment on that score. As for his suggestions for Institute Fellows, and for the controls and exactions André Bedier and Simon Flexner had suggested relating to the activities of the Faculty, he could have discussed them with no member of that body, for none would have been willing to accept modifications of his absolute freedom nor to concede that they were needed or desirable, or conducive to the preservation or viability of the Institute. Indeed, Aydelotte's recommendations were honest, and far more courageous than he seemed to realize. But as will be seen, he was not reluctant to present those ideas to the Faculty. He simply acted as he felt the Director of an institution should; he would take such problems up first with the governing Board as a matter

of protocol, and then with his Faculty.

Whether he had forgotten Earle's five points, or felt that his relations to the Faculty were sufficiently sound to cause them to regard even such suggestions with complaisance, is not clear. But Aydelotte had never lacked courage, though he frequently had underestimated the capacity of his associates to stomach some of his ideas. He was to find that the professors were very much opposed to his suggestions affecting their status. But he had showed them that he wanted to promote relations between them and the Trustees, for at the very first meeting after Mr. Bamberger's death, he had arranged for the professors to lunch with the Trustees informally.

But now the Faculty was unaware of his plans, and he of their probable reactions to them. He appeared to believe that his right to retire at sixty-five was not a matter for consultation, and that there would be a transition in harmony under the new dispensation.

But suddenly fate intervened in the person of Abraham Flexner. Just as the intervention of Professors Einstein and Earle in 1939 had interferred with Flexner's plan to retire quietly at the end of that fiscal year, so now Flexner interferred with Aydelotte's intention to retire at age sixty-five. He discovered a bitter quarrel between Professor Panofsky and Dr. de Tolnay, an art-historian whom Panofsky had recommended as a member in 1939. This focused his rage against the Director for what Flexner, the true patriarch, regarded as a dereliction in duty. He wrote a stinging letter to Aydelotte on the same day Aydelotte placed his Report on Institute Policy in Maass' hands. Flexner admitted he had mixed in the quarrel, virtually threatening the Professor with dismissal. Aydelotte

properly rebuked his predecessor, and said he was forwarding the correspondence to Maass. This led to the preferment of various charges against Aydelotte by Dr. Wolman, stimulated by Flexner. The nature of these can only be guessed.[35]

The effect was tragic. Aydelotte, as had Flexner earlier, suddenly found himself not in the position of one who folds his tent and departs with dignity and honor, but on trial, forced to defend his reputation and his administration. The sunny extrovert disappeared; a brooding, bitter introspective man took his place. His many pencilled notes show he suffered torments, listing possible causes for Flexner's disaffection, and concluding that his old friend had connived and conspired with Professor Stewart to cause his downfall. He was entirely unwilling to accept that. With the "permission of the Committee on Policy," he decided to tell the Faculty of his intention to retire, feeling that in the new circumstances the Faculty would support him.[36]

And so at a social luncheon of the Faculty on the 6th November, Aydelotte mentioned casually that he had told the Committee on Policy that he intended to retire on the 30th June, 1946, in accord with the retirement policy for professors. He also informed them of the policy recommendations he had made in his memorandum to the Committee. He lingered at the meeting only long enough to know that his news created consternation and confusion; he departed before anything was said about his proposals for annual seminars, emphasis on guidance for younger members, a status for Fellows, or any of the other policy matters. It was clear that the Faculty was shocked at the imminence of a possible radical change in direction, and that some of its members realized that certain important changes in policy, such as

those mentioned by the letter of the 15th March, 1939, were still far from being recognized. Above all, they were keenly aware of how fundamental the changes might be if some the Director had suggested were effectuated.

Several days later, Professor Veblen waited on Messrs. Hardin, Leidesdorf and Maass in New York with a memorandum in which he had set forth his version of the Faculty's concern over the prospects. It was a masterful short essay, a virtual declaration of war, the effect of which would be to force the Trustees to discount the Director's voluntary offer to retire, and the Director to embrace the Faculty and its support, and to cease reliance on the Committee on Policy. It read:

> On November 6th, after a luncheon attended by all members of the Faculty except Professors Einstein and Mitrany, Dr. Aydelotte gave a summary of the report which he intends to present to the Board of Trustees. The question of the age of retirement of the Director aroused a lengthy discussion from which Dr. Aydelotte withdrew after the first few minutes. I was requested by the Professors to report the consensus of opinion to the Trustees.
>
> This consensus was that it is not in the interest of the Institute that Dr. Aydelotte should retire when he reaches the age of sixty-five. The discussion began with expressions of personal regard which must have been most gratifying to Dr. Aydelotte. The essential point brought out by the further discussion was, however, the strong feeling that the present Director knows how to work with scholars. As a result there exists in the Institute a spirit of harmony and effective cooperation which has been reflected in substantial achievements in the past five years.
>
> At the beginning of his term of office he faced a series of financial and other difficulties left over from the formative period of the Institute. In the process of clearing up this situation and giving the Institute a clean-cut administration, he has frequently had to say 'no' and to recognize frankly that the financial situation must impose hardships on certain members of the Faculty. In spite of these handicaps, Dr. Aydelotte has won the complete confidence of the Faculty. He and they are already engaged

harmoniously in planning for the future in a manner which was not possible to a like degree until the financial possibilities and limitations had been clarified.

There is a strong feeling in the Faculty that it would be a mistake at the present time to bring to the Institute a new Director who might come with a preconceived policy. What the Faculty wants is to get on with its work with as little distraction as possible. They prefer to face the future with the present Director, who, they expect, will develop the policies of the Institute in collaboration with the Trustees and the Faculty.

There was general agreement that there should be a retiring age fixed by statute for the Director and the Trustees as well as for the Faculty. The majority appeared to favor a retiring age of more than sixty-five for the Director but a strong minority favored the age limit of sixty-five in principle. Various methods of reconciling these general principles with the decisive importance of not making too soon a change in the present administration were suggested, but it was not thought desirable to insist on a particular plan.

For reasons which must be obvious, Mr. Maass refused to accept this statement.[37]

On the 20th November the Faculty in meeting approved a formal protest drafted by Professor Meritt, its Secretary. The tone was moderate:

On November 6, 1944, after a luncheon attended by all but two members of the Faculty, Dr. Aydelotte reported his intention of asking the Trustees to consider his retirement after his sixty-fifth birthday.

This brought up a matter which the Faculty realized affected them deeply. There were many expressions of personal regard for Dr. Aydelotte which must have been most gratifying to him. After Dr. Aydelotte's departure from the luncheon there was further discussion and a general expression of regret that he was considering his resignation. The essential point brought out was the strong feeling that the present Director knows how to work with scholars, and that as a result there exists a spirit of harmony and effective cooperation in the Institute which has been reflected in substantial achievements in the past five years. The general opinion was that the Faculty did not wish him to retire at the age of sixty-five.

> Many of the Faculty felt, however, that these informal expressions of opinion were not enough, but that a resolution embodying them, and emphasizing the vital relationship which this spirit of cooperation between the Director and Faculty has to the future welfare of the Institute, ought to be acted upon by the Faculty and made part of its permanent record. For this purpose a special meeting was called by the Secretary of the Faculty, by request, for the morning of November 20, 1944. It has now adopted this memorandum and ordered it included in the minutes of the Faculty.
>
> The Faculty also felt that the Trustees ought to know, and had a right to know, the opinion of the Faculty as expressed in its formal resolution. They therefore instructed the Secretary to send a copy of this memorandum, not through the normal channels of the Office of the Director, for the matter concerns him too intimately, but directly to the Secretary of the Board of Trustees for their information.[38]

The discussion which preceded the Faculty's approval of this document showed almost as many points of view as there were professors. There was complete failure to agree on a retirement policy for any Director, but a consensus, not unanimity, that Dr. Aydelotte should not retire in 1946. It remained for Miss Goldman to call her colleagues to settle this immediate matter by voting for or against Dr. Meritt's proposed memorandum to the Board, which they finally did, with Messrs. Stewart and Warren abstaining on principle. Since the discussion had concerned such matters, Professor Riefler then moved that the Chairman (temporarily Veblen since Aydelotte had absented himself) appoint a committee "to consider conditions of tenure." Alexander and Panofsky lost a motion to amend to include appointments, and the motion was passed. Professors Weyl and Lowe secured passage of a motion for the appointment of a second committee to report on "conditions of appointment in relation to the welfare of the Institute."[39]

Meanwhile two efforts on the Trustees' side were made to dissuade

Aydelotte from changing his intention to retire. Mr. Moe, who had been in hospital during the preceding meeting of the Trustees' Committee, wrote his old friend in dismay, asking him if he had changed his mind, and if so, why? He feared for the very survival of the Institute should Aydelotte's present course set Faculty against Trustees.[40] Aydelotte had no immediate opportunity to answer this sad warning, for on the very day the Faculty met and adopted its protest, Mr. Douglas lunched with Aydelotte in New York and sought to persuade him of the advantages he would enjoy if he adhered to his announced course: a larger annuity, an office in Fuld Hall, where he could continue with his researches in English literature -- perhaps even continued residence at the Olden Manor. To all would be added "handsome references to his work." The Director replied that the Trustees' Committee should consult the Faculty; for himself, the situation was no longer simple. Criticism had been made of his administration, and he was not willing by his retirement to accept it. Mr. Douglas "professed not to know what that was." He based his reasons solely on the ending of one era and the beginning of another, in which the Director who would be responsible for administering future policies should have a hand in forming them.

At the end of his pencilled notes of the conference, Aydelotte wrote: "Made it clear endorsement of the Faculty meant more to me than Trustees'. Would like to retire, but would not let Faculty down."[41]

When Moe learned what had happened, and why his friend was suddenly embattled, he tried to reason with Aydelotte, and introduced a new note which had evidently been the subject of conversation but which had not heretofore appeared in substance: the possibility that the Faculty would insist that there should be no Director in the future:

> You must think about your successor, and the handicap he would be under if the Faculty should be on record that they do not want a successor.[42]

In the light of this statement, Aydelotte's notes on Veblen's conference with Hardin, Leidesdorf and Maass on the 15th November take on new meaning. The three Trustees had advised Veblen: "Don't worry about policy," and "Plans impossible in sense suggested." These must be taken to apply to the suggestion Moe deplored. Despite this attitude, it will appear that Aydelotte and Veblen continued to hope and work for a new order in which the Faculty would confront the Trustees directly, without the intervention of a Director.

Now thoroughly embattled, Aydelotte informed Moe of Wolman's charges, and of the necessity to protect his good name by answering them. It was clear he felt he had been treated with less than respect by the Policy Committee, for he pencilled: "Honor! From Trustees not even regret!" For him, the endorsement of the Faculty was the only reward for his work -- "can't desert them. Can't call them off." It was essential for the Policy Committee to see and interview the Faculty in Princeton if they were to understand the situation fully, so Aydelotte noted he said in a telephone conversation with Moe. And he apparently asked his old friend to ascertain if he could what lay behind Flexner's hostility toward him.[43]

Despite the fact that the Policy Committee now seemed even farther away from any solution of its problems, a meeting of the Board became necessary because of an emergency in President Dodds' campaign to raise money for the building and maintenance of a new general Library, to be called the Firestone. Mr. Bamberger had earlier committed the Institute to help with this when the project was first discussed. A Board meeting was scheduled

tentatively first for the 22nd November, then the 28th, and finally for the 5th December, when it was held. The Policy Committee could make only a report of "progress;" the conflict was too severe for anything else.[44]

Mr. Maass arranged for a meeting of the Committee with Dr. Aydelotte and Professor Veblen on the 28th November in New York; the Committee was to see the Director first, and Professor Veblen only if it were then considered necessary. The Director learned that the Committee intended to recommend his retirement at age sixty-five, with a pension of $12,000, and an office in Fuld Hall. It would also recommend that if the category of Fellow was created as he had suggested, he should be appointed to it.[45]

As a result of Dr. Aydelotte's insistence, four of the Committee interviewed the professors in Princeton singly and in small groups on the 1st December. On the 11th December, Aydelotte met and reported to the Faculty, apparently confident that things were going his way. However, the Trustees' Committee had expressed concern about the varied states of mind they had encountered, although they seemed to be convinced that the majority wanted the Director to remain beyond his sixty-fifth year, as he informed the Faculty. He gently chided the members:

> /Since December 1/ I have had no official word from the /Policy/ Committee, but informally I have been given to understand that the impression produced upon the minds of the Trustees by their interviews with the Faculty was a confused one; that many other concerts, individual and departmental, as well as general matters of Institute policy, were urged upon the Trustees and that the net effect was to produce the impression that the Faculty was discontented and far from unified. Under the circumstances it seems to me that some further statement of the views of the Faculty is in order at this time.

> There are many matters of Institute policy more important than the question of my retirement upon which the members of the Faculty hold strong views. While I have no wish to stifle discussion, I must say that it seems to me that this is not the appropriate moment to raise such questions. The development of sound academic procedures for the government of the Institute must necessarily take time. To try to settle all the questions of the future in one year is certain to produce only confusion, and to provide unlimited opportunities for any individual who may wish to draw a red herring across the trail. Sound strategy demands that the Faculty stick to the one question at issue. I am sorry that this should be a personal question and one in which I am concerned...[46]

The Director had not in the meantime obeyed the instructions of the Faculty to appoint the two committees decided upon at the prior meeting -- one on tenure and one on appointments. Although his failure to do so might have been due to his preoccupation with his great problem, what was now to happen would indicate that certain professors did not want the members responsible for their proposal and passing -- Riefler, Lowe and Weyl -- represented on the committees, as parliamentary courtesy would have required them to be. Instead, a plan had been developed which would make resolution of what Aydelotte considered the prime issue at the moment contingent upon all the others, which he believed could wait. Professor Einstein moved that the Faculty elect a Committee on Policy to act vis-a-vis the Trustees' Committee. Dr. Aydelotte, evidently unprepared for this, suggested that the Standing Committee would serve the purpose. But Professor Veblen characterized that as merely a "house committee," and, since no one raised a point of order, Professors Earle, Einstein, Meritt and Veblen were elected to serve as the Faculty Committee on Policy. Aydelotte was to be a member ex officio, to act only when issues other than his own retirement were discussed.[47]

By the time this Committee's first recorded meeting took place on the 17th December, Aydelotte had already been alerted to its intention to go into all other issues which he had felt as a matter of tactics should await decision upon his own status. For it is clear that by the time of that meeting the Director had reviewed carefully all the historical documents which set forth the ideas and purposes attending the establishment of the Institute for Advanced Study, including Flexner's Confidential Memorandum of the 26th September, 1931, the founding documents, pertinent Board minutes, etc.

All in vain. He found that he was uncomfortably well informed, and must unlearn substantially all of his refreshed knowledge, if he were to get along with the Committee, which seemed to be in no hurry to approach the matter of his retirement, aside from asking the Policy Committee for an appointment, which was set for the 10th January.

Professor Earle acted as Secretary; he was instructed "to co-opt the services of Professor Riefler" in what was an obvious attempt to make up for the neglect of the Chair. But Riefler refused on grounds of health and work. The Committee's next step was described in a first draft by Earle as follows:

> There was considerable discussion concerning Institute policy, which everyone felt already existed in the form of documentary statements of the Founders, the first and second Directors, and the Board of Trustees. No definitive formulation of this policy has, however, been made in a single document, and Messrs. Veblen and Aydelotte were, therefore, requested and authorized to draft a statement of the purposes of the Institute as soon as convenient and to present it at the next meeting of the Committee, if possible. It was pointed out that Mr. Veblen had almost unique qualifications to participate in this task, because from the very beginning he has been a member of the Institute Faculty and of the Institute Board of Trustees, and could, therefore, contribute more than almost any other single individual to an understanding of the development of Institute policies and ideals.[48]

Despite the action, and the undoubted validity of the reason given for Professor Veblen's participation, he withdrew from it. Aydelotte pencilled on the margin of this draft: "Later revised to put the responsibility on F. A."[48] True enough, for as the final signed minutes note, Aydelotte alone was to prepare the statement, and the last sentence quoted was omitted. Important as was that change, it was as nothing compared with the following sentences which appeared on both first and final drafts of those minutes of the 17th December. It read:

> There was further discussion of the future appointment of new members of the Faculty as a matter of basic policy. Mr. Aydelotte expressed his determination, so long as he is Director, to appoint new members of the Faculty only upon the recommendation of the School concerned, with competent outside advice and with full participation of representatives of the other Schools of the Institute, as well as with final approval of the Faculty as a whole.[48]

That expressed "determination" was a well-kept secret, for in none of the five successive drafts of a policy statement prepared by Aydelotte and revised by the Committee was it mentioned or even implied. Nor did Aydelotte tell the Board of it until his last annual meeting as Director, though he told the Faculty earlier. Even if one did not know of his attitude toward such a complete measure of Faculty government, these facts would indicate that this concession was not voluntarily made. He was now in no position to dictate terms; instead, having in effect asked the Faculty for support he was forced by its elected Committee on Policy to meet conditions precedent to receiving its ministrations.

Aydelotte's first draft on policy was dated the 18th December and the last before he actually presented it to the Board the 9th April. Both of these as drafted appear in Appendix VI. In the first, the Director

said firmly what he knew was the truth about the Institute's origin and early history. He attributed the authorship of the Institute to Dr. Flexner, and emphasized the dual purposes: research and the training of post-doctoral scholars. He pointed to the "danger" of possible selfish personal or departmental action inherent in Faculty control, from which "only the Trustees" could protect the institution, and adverted to a wish attributed to Dr. Flexner to develop an "accounting" procedure with which to take account of progress in the work of the Faculty.

Paradoxically, he seemed at the same time to lean toward the elimination of the directorship entirely when he said (Paragraph 4, characteristics) that the "actual control of scholarly and educational policies should be in the hands of the Faculty." One of his critics caused him to amend this to mention the Director with the Faculty in subsequent drafts.[50] Professor Veblen's criticism of the first draft was firm. He wrote:

> There are too many references to Dr. Flexner. It will give him a chance to say that the report is not original but is simply a rehash of his ideas. Would it not be better to begin with a statement of the aims of the Institute and then to say: 'These were as a matter of fact stated by Dr. Flexner in an early Bulletin of the Institute as follows------.'
>
> This should then be made the only reference to Dr. Flexner, so that it will be apparent that the plan for carrying out these ideas is your own. (Unless of course other references come in naturally, as in Paragraph 4 of principles.)
>
> I think it is very inadvisable to include any statement which suggests that the Institute has not worked satisfactorily in the past few years, which is in fact not the case. The whole emphasis should be that these are <u>further</u> improvements. I think it would be safe to say that not all procedures have worked out yet, and that for financial reasons the Institute has been unable to expand in the last five years, but nothing beyond that. Otherwise the report will sound like an apologia.

> Points 1, 2, 7 and perhaps 6 may be construed by the Trustees as setting limits upon their power, and as an attempt to get control of the Institute away from them at this crisis. Would it not be better to play down this sort of thing, and play up general educational policies, as in your earlier draft? Much of the points made in the present draft could then be suggested parenthetically, as nothing new, or as a necessary procedure to carry out a policy on which everyone is agreed. (His emphasis)[51]

As sole Faculty Trustee, Professor Veblen appeared to be suggesting the application of a subliminal stimulus to the Board. Moreoever, he displayed here his determination, which was to be abundantly confirmed in subsequent actions, to eliminate Dr. Flexner's name as the spiritual and intellectual founder of the Institute. His specific textual changes bore out his own version of principles. Veblen's changes were subtle. Thus, the Director had not discussed procedures <u>with</u> the Trustees and the Faculty, but the Director <u>and</u> members of the Board and the Faculty had discussed them. Where Aydelotte admitted the lack of complete argreement between members of the two groups, the confession was softened. Where Aydelotte repeated that the veto of the Board was the Institute's <u>only</u> protection against the Faculty's tendency to seek their own or their School's departmental interests, the "only" was deleted. In alluding to Dr. Flexner's suggestion that some method for a "formal, critical public accounting at least once a year of the work in progress at the Institute..." his own statement was that the Institute had so far evolved no policy for doing it. Veblen eliminated that, and suggested: "The question is whether further steps are necessary." Where Aydelotte said the Trustees "should recognize the right of scholarly groups outside the Institute to be consulted" on appointments and policies and fields of study, Veblen suggested the Trustees should "make it a practice to consult" outside authorities. Adoption

of the suggested policies, said Aydelotte, would give the Institute a "security, stability and peace which it has never had." This became in Veblen's words a "greater security...than it has ever had." Veblen suggested omission of the following peroration:

> To this great endeavor the members of the Faculty pledge to the Trustees their best and most unselfish efforts to the end that the two groups working together may realize in actual practice the Institute of which Dr. Flexner dreamed.[52]

The Director's next draft -- dated the 22nd December -- was amended by the Committee in a session on the 23rd December, after Professor Veblen had seen it and prepared a version of the Institute's history which differed totally from Aydelotte's. This follows here, with its subtle false implications of an evolution which did not in truth take place. Apparently the Committee voted to substitute this for Aydelotte's statement of evolution. It follows:

> The Institute for Advanced Study is an institution in which a small permanent group of scholars serve as the nucleus of a larger, temporary group of mature, though generally younger scholars. It has been found that the scholars so brought together are so interested in their respective tasks, in their own development and in the development of knowledge that the usual academic arrangements such as regular courses, required attendance, degrees, examinations and administrative supervision can be dispensed with.
>
> In these respects, which are all consequences of the fact that it limits its membership to scholars of a high level of maturity, the Institute differs from all American universities. It is like a university in that its success depends as much on the influence that it has on its temporary members as on the individual discoveries of its professors.
>
> It is like a 'research institute,' of which there are several good examples in America, in that the members of its staff are contributors to knowledge. It differs from such institutions in two major respects (1) the emphasis on the treatment of temporary members which flow through it and (2) the absence of a specified program of research and of all regimentation, however gentle,

> The last point is of exceptional importance at the present time because of the new emphasis on immediate practical problems which has come into American academic life as a result of the war and which is particularly threatening to scientific research. As Dr. Flexner said in 1931 '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 mathematician is in a sense secure from immediacy; the economist must be made so.' These words are more significant today than they were when written.
>
> Essential to the success of the Institute is the quality of the group of professors who are its nucleus. No professor should be appointed who is not already an eminent productive scholar. Second-rate men, however meretorious, are a handicap.[53]

Many of these were Flexner's own words. But here Professor Veblen used them adroitly to mislead, and to give a meaning which differed from Flexner's use of them in his Memorandum of the 26th September, 1931. "It has been found...that the usual academic arrangements.../for graduate study/ can be dispensed with" hardly conveys the story of Flexner's battles with Veblen over the latter's determination to accept candidates for the Ph. D. degree at the Institute. At the same time, he destroyed Flexner's concept of the corollary duty of the Institute's professors to guide young post-doctorals, to substitute for it an element of prestige and some experience for the temporary members ambiguously called "influence." And Veblen decried the application of mathematics required of the mathematicians in war, at the same time getting in his licks again against the economists, even if he had to quote Flexner.

The Committee adopted the Professor's version of evolution, and added an allusion to Faculty Trustees. Aydelotte's quoting of Flexner's experimentalism was eliminated, though it was conceded that the Institute was not committed "to any particular subject."[54]

The next draft submitted by Aydelotte to the Committee was amended to say that the Faculty Trustees had been suggested by the donors! It asserted that the following policies had been worked out by the Directors, Trustees and Faculty:

> 1. That the members of the staff should be men and women capable of creative work of the highest possible excellence judged not merely by national but by world standards.
>
> 2. That the scholars in the Institute should enjoy complete freedom in their work, that there should be no attempt at planning or regimentation, that they should be left on their own responsibility to do what seemed best to them in research and in the direction of the activities of younger men.
>
> 3. That in the consideration of men for the staff or membership in the Institute, no account be taken of race, sex, or creed.
>
> 4. That while the Trustees have the ultimate legal authority, the actual control of scholarly and educational policies should be in the hands of the Director and the Faculty.
>
> 5. That appointments to the staff of the Institute should be made only with the advice and consent of the Faculty.
>
> 6. That the members of the Faculty should have the dignity and security which comes from adequate salaries and retiring allowances.
>
> 7. That in order to secure cordial and cooperative relations between Trustees and Faculty, certain members of the Faculty should, as suggested by the donors, be chosen to become members of the Board of Trustees.
>
> 8. That the Institute should not be permanently committed to any particular field of research, but that different fields might be cultivated or abandoned from time to time according to their importance...and the men available to represent them.[55]

The Committee made changes in the enveloping verbiage, including elimination of the fourth paragraph of Veblen's contribution, which included the quotation from Flexner's magazine article.

Two more drafts were prepared by Aydelotte, dated the 2nd January and the 9th April, 1945. There is no evidence that the Committee

reviewed them.

The two Policy Committees met on the 10th January, 1945. According to Earle's minutes, there was a "full and frank discussion of the issues which face the Institute... /if/ Mr. Aydelotte might be retired on his sixty-fifth birthday. The Faculty group strongly urged that for no reason whatsoever should the Board of Trustees consider Mr. Aydelotte's retirement at this time."[56]

The Trustees' Committee reported to the Board at its meeting on the 19th January. Mr. Maass presented its report, which said in effect that it had met on several occasions, had discussed the Institute's history to date, and "the direction its future activities should take." The Director on invitation had presented his views and his plans for the future, which he would later present to the Board himself. For the present the Committee concerned itself only with the Director's voluntarily announced intention to retire at age sixty-five, and his hope that he might become a Fellow according to recommendations which he had made for the establishment of a new class of member. The Committee then recommended that while future Directors should retire at age sixty-five, "it deems it inexpedient in view of present conditions that such rule be made applicable in the case of Dr. Aydelotte," who should retire on his sixty-seventh birthday, with a pension of $12,000. The Chairman should appoint a special committee of five to nominate Dr. Aydelotte's successor, which would "consult fully with the Faculty and others before submitting its recommendation to the Board."[57]

Presumably a vigorous debate ensued, not recorded except that Professor Veblen read to the Board the Faculty's resolution of the 20th

November, 1944 for the purpose of making it clear that the Trustees' Committee had real reason for its deferral of the Director's retirement. Dr. Aydelotte declined to decide then whether so slight an extension of his active service would benefit himself or the Institute; he would reach a decision before the next meeting of the Board.[58]

The Committee made several concessions designed to mitigate factional differences. It mentioned a conference with Dr. Flexner, but by implication limited its result to polishing with a few strokes the retirement conditions for Professor Herzfeld and Lowe. Because Dr. Flexner said he had promised appointees that he expected and hoped to bring all salaries ultimately to the maximum rate when financial conditions permitted, Mr. Maass mentioned particularly the three mathematicians who had not yet been so rewarded, and said the Director might recommend the action when he saw fit. This had a double value: it placated Professor Veblen. But he did not mention the other members of the Faculty who were still below the maximum, perhaps because one had retired and another was about to. Aydelotte had sought permission to do this at the previous meeting unsuccessfully; now he was compelled to move the increases on the spot at Mr. Maass' suggestion, leaving it an open question as to which of the two had curried the most favor with Professor Vablen. The Board approved them, but the Committee at the same time warned that "in spite of the increased endowment...income...is not greatly in excess of the present budget."[59]

The Faculty Committee met on the 20th and the 26th of January, and it appeared as though differences became sharp as between the Director and his supporters. For on the 28th, Mr. Maass told Mr. Hardin, he had

talked with Aydelotte, who, he believed, was willing to accept the Policy Committee's recommendation. Mr. Maass was to tell the Board at its special session on the 2nd March that Dr. Aydelotte had so informedhim, and that, several days before the meeting, Professor Einstein had conferred with him and with Mr. Leidesdorf and had seemed reconciled to its acceptance. Professor Veblen frankly expressed incredulity at these revelations. Mr. Maass as frankly deplored "that the Faculty had injected itself" into the situation "since the responsibility for the management of the Institute rests with the Trustees and not the Faculty..."[60]

Dr. Aydelotte had excused himself from the meeting with this letter:

> I have been thinking over carefully the matter of Friday's meeting and I am writing to ask that you excuse me from attendance. Since I am to be the subject of the discussion, it seems to me that this discussion will be freer if I am not present.
>
> When you raised the question of my position at the Institute last spring, I feared that members of the Faculty might object to my continuing beyond sixty-five. This feeling I could readily understand in view of the fact that I found myself compelled to enforce the sixty-five year rule so rigidly on others. Under the circumstances I felt, as I reported to your Committee, that it was only just that it should apply to me.
>
> It now appears that the view of the Faculty is exactly the opposite. Instead of wishing me to retire at sixty-five, they would like me to continue for some years beyond that age. Whether I should do so or not is for the Board to decide. I appreciate your friendly attitude, and whatever your decision may be, I shall continue to interest myself in the development of the Institute as I have done since 1930....[61]

It must be said that though Mr. Schaap moved and lost a resolution to extend Dr. Aydelotte's active service to the 1st June, 1948, Professor Veblen seemed to be much more concerned about whether the Policy

Committee had decided to adopt any of Aydelotte's suggested changes in academic policies. Mr. Maass declined to answer this; Mr. Wolman replied that the Trustees were anxious to maintain the high standards established; the final minutes say that "various members of the Committee" made it clear that "no change in the academic policies was contemplated at this time."

In the heat of the session, the minutes of the previous meeting were not approved as usual at the beginning. After the Board had approved the Committee's recommendation, modified by Mr. Douglas to provide for Aydelotte's retirement on the 1st October, 1947 in order to avoid a change after the term had begun, Mr. Douglas complained that the minutes of the 19th January did not properly reflect the stated reasons for the action recommended. These were: (1) the necessity to establish a policy for the retirement of the Director and the Faculty; (2) the possible embarrassment of a new director in having to administer long-range policies which he had no voice in establishing; (3) the difficulty in securing a competent successor which an overlong delay might cause. Mr. Maass declined to accept this as the ground for the Committee's action, and prepared his own statement, in which the same general considerations were recognized, but with the observation that the new Director would have to carry out any policies adopted by the Board, for the Institute did not intend to "stand still."[62]

The Chairman announced that he would soon appoint the Committee to Select a Successor, and invited suggestions.

It might be thought that one issue had been settled in this whole interminable and contentious pass -- that it was accepted by all that there was to be a successor Director, and that Mr. Leidesdorf's

several cautions to the Faculty Committee not to raise questions of policy as to "who was running the Institute" had indeed been heeded. But it will appear that this was not the end. Meanwhile, it will be recalled that the Committee had declined to turn the Director's report of the 11th October over to the Board, but had recommended that the Board consider carefully and make provision for his suggestion for the appointment as members of professors at the Institute and elsewhere who had retired as of age but were competent "to make important scholarly contributions in fields of interest to the Institute."

It is interesting, in view of the importance of this and other measures proposed in his report to the Committee, that Mr. Aydelotte felt it was incumbent upon him to present the Statement of Policy over which he had struggled so long and vainly before they were taken up. This he did at the annual meeting in April, 1945. It does not appear with what verbiage he presented the report, but presumably it was with that of the 9th April (See Appendix VI). What was significant was that according to a specific record he left, he omitted the following parts: the elaborated statement of the freedoms enjoyed by Institute professors; the need for Faculty's consent to nominations for appointment, and the reference to Faculty Trustees. He made no allusion to his secret pledge to the Faculty Committee as yet.[63]

Despite this restraint, the reception accorded his recommendations by Mr. Maass was shocking. The President moved that the Director's report be not accepted for filing, and that Mr. Hardin appoint a Committee to edit it. Mr. Maass, Chairman, and Messrs. Aydelotte and Weed were appointed. This move gave Mr. Aydelotte a rare opportunity, which he used, to express

> great satisfaction that the Board should now turn its attention to these important questions of organization, procedure, and policy. He made the suggestion that at some future date the Board might hold an all-day meeting to discuss these matters.[64]

The Director had finished a part of the unwelcome duties placed upon him by the Faculty Committee. It now remained for the Board's editors to climb down from their loft. In the words Brand Blanshard applied to Aydelotte's usual charity in such circumstance, he gaily assisted them. The report as edited was prefaced with a brief explanation by the Committee, signed by Maass, Chairman:

> It is clear that the Trustees had interpreted some of the statements as having a meaning quite different from that which the Director intended. Since the main point to the report was the suggestion of a sounder procedure than we have followed hitherto in making new appointments, it seemed best to the Committee to confine the report to that subject and to omit the statements to which objection had been taken....

According to this perscription, the pertinent portions of the edited report read as follows:

> Now that the time has come when we shall have the means to expand and enrich our activities, I wish to call the attention of the Trustees to the importance of establishing an orderly procedure for making new appointments to the Faculty. I have not raised the question before because we have never before during my directorship been in a position which would make new appointments possible...
>
> No professor shall be appointed who is not already an eminent creative scholar...The best method of maintaining the quality of the Institute at the highest level is to require that appointments recommended by the Director should first be submitted to the Faculty.../thereby giving to/ the Trustees the benefit of the Faculty's advice. The unity of the Institute will best be preserved by this procedure. The Trustees remain the court of last resort and are free at their discretion to approve or disapprove any recommendations made to them by Director and Faculty.
>
> In the appointment of members of the Faculty and in selecting fields for research, the Trustees should not, in an Institute of this character, rely solely upon the advice of the

Faculty. The institution we aspire to build will be so significant in all the fields of scholarship we touch that our appointments will be a matter of concern to scholars everywhere. Competent outside advice should be sought in some formal and responsible way....

I have several recommendations...to which I wish to give further study.

I wish at this time to suggest that the Trustees authorize the formation of a Committee on Appointments to which the Director can make his suggestions and which can in turn recommend those approved to the Trustees or to the Executive Committee.

In order to make sure that any recommendations of the Director should have the fullest consideration, I suggest that this Committee should require that any appointments recommended be approved (1) by the department (sic) concerned, (2) by scholars outside the Institute best fitted to give advice on a particular case, (3) by the Faculty.

I attach great importance to the last requirement and it would give me great satisfaction if the Chairman of the Committee on Appointments or indeed all of the members of the Committee would take the trouble to attend each meeting of the Faculty when new appointments are to be recommended... It is, in my opinion, very important for preserving a spirit of unity and cooperation that each individual who comes to the Institute should have the feeling that the invitation is extended to him not merely by the Director and the Trustees but by the Faculty as well.

It should be the duty of this new Committee on Appointments to consider all matters connected with the status of members of the Faculty, including salaries and retiring allowances and to consider such problems as the extension of our work to fields not now covered and the possible abandonment of studies now being pursued in case that should be deemed advisable because of the retirement of members of the Faculty or for any other reason.[65]

Now the Director had surrendered the last vestige of power and prestige in the directorship. The suggestion for the Trustees' Committee on Appointments was evidently an afterthought, though it was embodied in the minutes as though it accompanied the whole action. The Committee was

identical in membership with the Editing Committee. If Aydelotte had been endowed with a diabolical sense of humor, he might now have been enjoying the situation, for if an academic man could not deal with a group of professors and hold his own, non-academicians had little chance of success.[66]

It does not appear that Professor Veblen spoke on the emasculated statement of policy as Aydelotte first presented it. One can understand this, for the first business Aydelotte proposed was the confirmation of an informal action of the Executive Committee declaring that for purposes of publication in the Bulletin, Professors Einstein and Veblen were to be designated as professors emeriti after each became sixty-five. The resolution passed unanimously by the Board declared:

> Resolved that Professors Einstein and Veblen shall as they reach the age of sixty-five be designated in the Bulletin as Emeritus, it being understood that between the ages of sixty-five and seventy, they shall nevertheless receive full salary as provided by the special gift from Mr. Bamberger set aside for their benefit, and that in consideration of this extra compensation they shall undertake to fulfill their duties just as if they remained on the active list.[67]

Whether it was ever discussed or not at this time is not clear, but the two mathematicians continued to attend their own and the full Faculty meetings as though their status had not changed. Professor Herzfeld ceased immediately, but Professor Lowe continued to attend until the second meeting of the Faculty at which Dr. Oppenheimer appeared, after which he absented himself.

The Chair appointed the Special Committee to recommend a successor to Dr. Aydelotte. It consisted of Messrs. Moe, Chairman, Aydelotte, Douglas Fulton, Leidesdorf, Maass and Schaap.[68]

Neither the Director nor the Faculty Committee on Policy reported to the Faculty fully on the status of their problems with

the Trustees. Dr. Aydelotte, without divulging his secret commitment to the Faculty Committee, now reported to the assembled Faculty that the Board of Trustees had agreed to his recommendations as to future policy governing the selection of professors. He then said that he would submit no nominations which did not emanate from the School concerned and which did not receive the approval of the whole faculty. But, he added, he would not undertake to recommend to the Board every nomination submitted to him with the approval of the Faculty. He informed them that his recommendations would first go to a Trustees' Committee on Appointments, thence to either the Executive Committee or the Board.

The Board thus did not know what the Director told the Faculty, nor did the Faculty know of the traumatic experience of the Director at the hands of the Board or of its own Committee. With this evidence that the matters under consideration had been fully taken care of, Professor Riefler now innocently moved that the Faculty motions calling for the appointment of special committees to report on tenure and appointments be rescinded, and they were.[69]

Now it became the duty of the Faculty Committee on Policy to make good on a promise it had evidently made to the Director. It met for the last time on the 11th May to decide what it would say to the Faculty about the Director's plan for a special class of temporary members whom Aydelotte had referred to as Fellows, a term not used by the Committee. It reported unanimous agreement that the "interest of the Institute would be best served by extending membership to distinguished scholars who, for one reason or another, might not be eligible for appointment to the Faculty" and that the Faculty should "consider favorably...authorizing such appoint-

ments subject to what other conditions it may care to specify." Decisive opposition was offered by Professor Einstein who said he feared that the appointment of older men, especially those who had not been active in creative scholarly work, "might make of the Institute an institution." Maximum terms and members were suggested; finally, the Faculty decided that no School might appoint a member for more than two years, or extend the term of a member beyond that, without approval of the whole faculty. It also directed that each letter appointing a member define the Institute's responsibility as ending with its terminal date.[70]

At the annual meeting in 1945 a change which Dr. Flexner had already elected to effect was officially recognized. Mr. Moe as Chairman of the Committee on Nominations informed the Director Emeritus that in the interests of reducing the average age of the Board of Trustees, it was felt "comparatively young men now should be added to the Board who by association, in and out of meetings, with those who have the vision of the Founders, would acknowledge that vision and carry it on." He continued:

> It is in this spirit and with this purpose that the Nominating Committee decided not to renominate you to the Board but rather to nominate a younger man....We trust that you will both understand and approve of this action...With the respect I have always had for you since I, as a very young Foundation officer, met a great one...[71]

Flexner's response was in keeping:

> Dear Mr. Moe:
> I think the position which your Committee has taken...is perfectly sound. I understand and I approve.
> If in the future I can be of any service to you or to the Trustees, do not hesitate to consult me. But I do not wish any responsibility for the future of the Institute, and I do appreciate the respect which I have received. With all good wishes for the Institute and the Trustees...[72]

The Members of the Corporation elected two new trustees in 1945: Mr. Wilmarth S. Lewis, scholar, Fellow of the Yale Corporation, Editor of the Yale edition of Horace Walpole's correspondence, etc., then in his forty-ninth year, and Lewis L. Strauss, in his fiftieth year, a partner of Kuhn, Loeb and Company, president of Congregation Emanu-El in New York City, Captain, United States Navy, and holder of the Legion of Merit. Dr. Fulton nominated Mr. Lewis. Mr. Leidesdorf nominated Mr. Strauss, who, he thought, might help him with the investments of the Institute. It is of interest that Professor Veblen, though he had nothing to do with Mr. Strauss' election in 1945, had met the financier in 1940 when with Dr. Richard Courant of New York University he consulted him about bringing Professor Jakob Nielsen to this country. Veblen wrote Aydelotte on that occasion:

> I think it would be very helpful in this connection if you would write to Mr. Strauss saying that the Institute would be very glad to.../invite/ Professor Jakob Nielsen in case necessary funds were available. In the conversation with Courant and myself, Mr. Strauss expressed great interest in the Institute, and I invited him to come and visit it.[73]

Professor Veblen was enthusiastic over Mr. Leidesdorf's choice. He was to consider that Mr. Strauss was the most important of all the Trustees in the realization of his hopes and plans for the Institute.

It was by now clear that the Institute was the richer by some $5 to $6 million, and that the next step should be new appointments.

The Faculty had been told in April to prepare to offer two nominations for each School. The School of Mathematics chose to recommend permanent appointments for Dr. Carl Siegel, a very important mathematician, formerly of Göttingen, and Wolfgang Pauli, mathematical physicist of

Switzerland, both of whom had been members since 1940 on Rockefeller funds. Though both had a desire to return to their homelands, the School of Mathematics was very desirous of keeping them here to replace Professors Einstein and Veblen. The School of Economics and Politics chose to recommend Drs. Samuel Eliot Morison of Harvard and Jacob Viner of the University of Chicago. The School of Humanistic Studies nominated three: Drs. William F. Albright, Alfred H. Barr and Oscar Broneer, perhaps because they had lost two in retirement, perhaps because they could not agree on two. In any event, Dr. Aydelotte informed the humanists that he would recommend no appointments in the humanities, for reasons which are not clear. This provoked a bitter protest from them, and a demand for reconsideration.

All the names mentioned were placed before the full Faculty on the 4th May, according to the procedure Aydelotte had outlined in April, requiring that nominations must be before the Faculty for sufficient time to allow competent investigations into their fitness.[74]

May 22nd was the day appointed for a meeting of the full Faculty with the Committee on Appointments. Messrs. Maass and Weed had evidently decided to demonstrate to the Faculty its essential inability to do anything but perpetuate its own specialties. They succeeded, but it is unlikely that the Faculty, indisposed as its members were to countenance any experimentalism, or any basic change in the pattern of Faculty memberships, understood fully the impression it made on the Trustees.

Aydelotte's first announcement was that instead of two nominations from each School, only one would be entertained, and he named Messrs. Pauli, Albright and Viner, reserving, he carefully noted, the name of Siegel, but saying nothing about the other nominees.

As Professor Weyl rose to present his School's case for Dr. Pauli, Mr. Maass intervened to ask whether the Faculty had thought of what was best for the Institute as a whole. He was reported as saying:

> The Institute might be pre-eminent only in mathematics, and weak possibly in the field of economics, and he wondered whether the Faculty had thought of the need of bringing in new people where they were necessary to give added prestige. If there were not any man available at the moment in the fields which needed strengthening, he wondered if it would not be better now to appoint only one professor in the field of mathematics and so save the money which would otherwise be used in additional appointments until...men who would give prestige to the Institute would be available.

The case, he said, was entirely hypothetical. He had used these two particular fields merely for illustration.[75]

Without answering this, the Faculty approved Dr. Pauli. Mr. Maass then inquired whether those named would accept if asked. The Director replied that, lacking authority, he had approached none of them. In the discussion of Dr, Viner, Professor Einstein opined that the economist "had perhaps a less inventive mind than Siegel;" he said he was hesitant to vote for Viner's appointment if Siegel were to be passed over. Professor Veblen, sensing the drift, deplored any effort to compare men in the two fields. Mr. Maass "asked whether it was not possible to do inventive work in economics as well as in mathematics." Again no response; the Faculty approved Dr. Viner. Next Professor Goldman nominated Dr. Albright, receiving support from Messrs. Stewart, Weyl and Earle. Was not Albright's field (archeology, biology, linguistics and history) the same as Herzfeld's, Maass asked? The Director answered that Herzfeld was withdrawn since his retirement; the nomination was approved by the Faculty.

There were now mutually pleasant allusions to the success with which the new procedure operated; Mr. Maass regretted it had not been

possible heretofore for the Trustees to familiarize themselves with nominations. This caused some discomfort in the Faculty, and one professor took the floor to justify his own appointment, which evoked assurances from Mr. Maass that his remark was not meant personally.[76]

Fully aware of the misapprehension which had surrounded the last two appointments in economics, Maass said that he had encouraged the founding of the School; it

> was something that he could understand, because it had been thoroughly discussed with the Board. He ventured the opinion that this School might have more to contribute in the present state of the world than the other schools. Mr. Maass wondered whether the Faculty had given thought to this. In any event, Mr. Maass reminded the Faculty, he was Chairman of the Trustees' Committee on Appointments and President of the Institute, and said he felt it his obligation to see that things were done right in the future, and that the Institute was run on a practical basis, and this he was determined to do.[77]

In such wise did the President set the Faculty straight on the integrity of the procedures within the Board which accomplished Mr. Stewart's appointment.

Dr. Weed was recorded as being critical because no one had shown that any of the appointments recommended was necessary. Why not reserve action now, save the money, and enter other fields later, he asked? Why did the Faculty not observe an "age pattern" in its recommendations? Professor Morse answered that with the war's end it would be necessary to reach for the outstanding scholars immediately. Mr. Maass opined it might be better to appoint three mathematicians "if that is the field in which the prestige of the Institute principally lies..." Professor Veblen replied that the appointments of the humanist and the economist were desirable "not particularly for strengthening prestige, but rather for...unifying the

work...and strengthening the undertaking already begun." But Maass appeared to be still unsatisfied; how could he be sure that the nominees represented the best contribution to culture the Institute could make? The only answer came again from a mathematician; Professor Morse justified the non-mathematical appointments on the ground of furtherance of work already in progress. Mr. Maass posed a dilemma.. A Trustee trying to decide between the rival claims of the schools "was in the same position as a man entering a grocery store...and having to decide whether to buy asparagus or spinach." Professor Meritt terminated proceedings by observing that if this were the dilemma, the humanists should not be classed with the spinach. The meeting adjourned, and Meritt was complimented later by the Faculty for the wit of his minutes.[78]

Dr. Aydelotte had not taken part in the whole proceeding, except to maintain the fiction that he made the nominations which were considered. One of the professors present remarked on the shameful show of neglect and discourtesy toward the Director of which the President and Mr. Weed were guilty.[79] The play upon the element of prestige was helpful, or would have been had any of the Faculty undertaken to assert that prestige is often achieved by the arts of salesmanship, and might have little to do with excellence in academic work. But unfortunately, the only voices raised in support of the non-mathematical disciplines were those of Professors Veblen and Morse, who defended the consideration of appointments in the other schools solely because they had been started.

The Committee on Appointments met immediately after the Faculty, and appointed Messrs. Pauli, Siegel and Viner. Albright's nomination was tabled.[80] In essence, the day's work netted little,, for Dr. Aydelotte and

Mr. Stewart knew that Dr. Viner was considering an offer from Princeton University, which they were doing everything possible to cause him to accept, ultimately with success. Moreover, both Pauli and Siegel were eager to return to their native countries, there to take active part in the rebuilding of their academic systems. But both were great in their fields, and though they came from foreign soil, and would destroy that balance of Americans and foreigners which Veblen used to such advantage in urging the appointment of Professor Morse, both were considered essential to the success of the School of Mathematics. In the event, Pauli did not accept his appointment, but remained until 1946 as a member, then returned to Zurich. Dr. Siegel accepted the professorship, and remained in it unhappily for several years, returning to Göttingen in 1951.

Mr. Maass had evidently believed in April that the activities of the Committee on Appointments would continue, and that with a weak Director the Trustees composing it would have direct and meaningful contact with the Faculty. But one lesson was enough. If the President had ever thought for a minute that the Trustees could meet Faculty on a free and equal footing, he was evidently disabused of the idea. The Committee met no more with the Faculty. But there is some reason to believe that the Faculty -- and even the Director -- might have hoped the imbalance had been not quite so revealing. For in December, 1945, a further demonstration of Faculty autonomy was afforded by Dr. Aydelotte's decision, with permission from the Executive Committee, to take leave of absence not to exceed six months. He accepted an invitation from President Truman and the Secretary of State to serve as a member of the Joint Anglo-American Commission on Palestine. Aydelotte presented plans for a specially-appointed Faculty Standing

Committee (Messrs. Morse, Chairman, Panofsky and Riefler) to administer the Institute during his absence, with visits from Mr. E. S. Bamberger each Monday to "attend to business matters." These measures were approved.[81] The "controlled experiment" worked out well, for few challenges were offered the Committee during the five months of the Director's absence. Moreover, it gained prestige among those of the staff and Faculty who had long been underpaid. Dr. Morse as designated Chairman of a special committee on salary revision received approval of its recommendations, chief of which was the elevation of Professors Earle and Panofsky to the maximum salary rate. There were also approved other less important adjustments.

The whole proceeding was described in congratulatory vein by Dr. Aydelotte as follows:

> I should like to express...my appreciation of the work of the Standing Committee which has administered the affairs of the Institute during my absence. It consisted of Professors Morse, Chairman, Riefler and Panofsky, with Edgar Bamberger ...So far as I can see, the Committee has administered the affairs of the Institute with admirable wisdom and has created a precedent for cooperation between the Faculty and the Trustees.[82]

That statement gains importance in the light of events and attitudes concerned with the selection of a successor to the Director.

CHAPTER X - NOTES

1. Newark Evening News, 3/13/44.

2. Newark Sunday Call, 3/12/44.

3. Stenographic Notes, Trustees' Meeting, 4/18/44.

4. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 4/18/44. The Faculty Resolution, adopted 4/3/44, signed by Dr. Aydelotte and Professor Meritt, read as follows:

   The Faculty of the Institute for Advanced Study, having in mind the original desire of Mr. Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld to found a school for research with exeptional and unhampered opportunities for advanced study, and knowing their generous provision, through their own efforts and with the aid of trusted counsel, for the beginning of this school at Princeton,

   Remembering also with appreciation the deep interest of the Founders during the years when the several faculties were being assembled and when academic work was being inaugurated in the way made possible by the organization of the Institute and by the continued benefactions of its Founders,

   Wish to record now their sense of supreme loss in the death of Mr. Bamberger, whose every wish was directed to the welfare of the Institute and to the furthering of its purposes, and who made provision even at the last to strengthen its resources and its endowment.

   They wish, moreover, to rededicate themselves at this time to the ideals of the Founders, which they also hold to be of unique value in the intellectual life of the world, in the determination -- so far as it may be in their power -- to realize the hope with which the Institute was established fourteen years ago. They wish once more to pledge their faith and their best efforts, and have directed the Secretary of the Faculty to convey a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Fuld and to the Board of Trustees.

5. Leidesdorf to Hardin, 7/25/44. Hardin papers.

6. Hardin to Leidesdorf, 8/9/44. Hardin papers.

7. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 12/5/44, pp. 15 ff. The rest of portion relating to the founding of the Institute read as follows:

   The Founders began to study methods of applying their wealth to philanthropic and charitable uses for the benefit of their fellowmen. They regarded themselves as trustees of the great wealth in their

possession and planned to devote it to the service of mankind. After mature deliberation and intelligent investigation of practical potentialities, they agreed upon the high ideal which this Institute represents, and joined together in the initial endowment of the Institute for Advanced Study.

Their minds first turned to the founding of a charitable organization for a specific community service, to be preferably located in the City of Newark or on their own homestead property which had ample room, extending into Newark and two adjoining municipalities. They requested two intimate friends,* competent to investigate and advise them, as to the possibilities and wisdom of a foundation for that purpose. Performance of this duty brought these friends in contact with Dr. Abraham Flexner. He was introduced by them to Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld in order that he might have opportunity to present his views. Frequent conferences over many weeks resulted, during which Dr. Flexner not only recommended against their own original local thought, but inspired them with ambition to enter an area in the educational field not theretofore occupied and not bounded by definitions of research. The Doctor's plan for an institute of higher study was developed and ultimately came to fruition. This purpose was later epitomized by Mr. Bamberger as a desire 'to increase the sum of human knowledge.'

Dr. Flexner, by their authority, made wide investigation of the universities of the old and new world and concerning scholars available for a founding group. A name indicative of the purpose of the Founders was presently chosen; a location at Princeton was selected; Dr. Flexner was designated as Director; and the 'Institute for Advanced Study -- Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation,' shortly to be housed in a home of its own, announced a novel and larger opportunity to the scholarship of the world. This was in 1930. It is gratifying to those associated in the establishment of the foundation that both Founders lived to see their philanthropic ambition abundantly vindicated. They lived beyond the successful installation of their plan by the first Director and its continuation, after his voluntary retirement, by his successor, Dr. Frank Aydelotte, of extended prior experience as an educator and one of the original charter Trustees, chosen with the warm approval of the Founders. From the beginning they maintained their continued interest by liberal occasional contributions, and finally by testamentary devotion of their residuary estates, thus assuring ample endowment for the permancy and maintenance of higher learning.

The management of this amply endowed philanthropy has fallen upon the Trustees of the Institute. Many of us had the personal advantage of acquaintance with the Founders through the years of planning and inauguration. We are thus imbued with the full knowledge of their purpose. We know that they avoided in their living all manner of ostentation and sought no applauding praise by reason of their generosity.

We may be certain that, if still here, they would not now approve fulsome praise or extravagant eulogy. By this memorial minute we honor their memories, not only by official recognition of acknowledgement of the dedication of great wealth to a great cause, but as well by an expression of individual appreciation of the qualities of mind and heart of these modest benefactors with whom contacts were delightful and friendship a privilege.

*This was a slight error; Mr. Maass was a friend of Mr. Leidesdorf, known to the Founders for the first time in the sale of their Company to Macy's.

8. The Founders' last wills were printed, and a copy of each is in the files.

9. Treasurer's Report, 1944. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/15/48, p. 3. Interview with Mr. Maass.

10. Aydelotte to Maass, 3/16/46.

11. Aydelotte, handwritten Notes for the annual meeting in 1944, mentioning his wish to have a history of the Founders' provisions in wills for the Institute, much as the Rhodes Trust had in its archives the seven last wills of Cecil Rhodes. See also Aydelotte to Farrier, 9/30/44. Aydelotte files.

12. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/15/39.

13. Aydelotte's handwritten Notes for meeting of the Executive Committee of 12/14/43. The By-Laws (Article V section 2) forbade the Committee "to reverse an action taken by the Board."

14. Stewart to Aydelotte, 11/26/43. School papers. In this report, Stewart noted the presence of three members in economics -- two from National Bureau of Economic Research. The further report of activity says that Warren spent two days a week at the United States Treasury; his other activity was as a member of the Rockefeller-organized Committee on Economic History.

15. Flexner to Weyl, 4/4/44. Weyl papers.

16. Moe to Aydelotte, 12/14/43. Aydelotte files. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/18/44.

17. Aydelotte to Louis Bamberger, 7/23/43. Louis Bamberger to Aydelotte, 7/27/43. Aydelotte files.

18. Aydelotte, handwritten Notes dated "Fall, 1943" of a conversation with Mr. Bamberger. Aydelotte files. Dodds to Chinard, 1/5/44. Aydelotte files.

19. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/44, p. 1. Stewart to Aydelotte, 4/10/44. One of the curious details in Stewart's plans for the program was his mention of Richard Blackmur of the University as a "staff member" with himself and Warren to supervise certain biographical writings. Mr. Blackmur was to spend the next two years with the Institute as member in the School of Economics and Politics. The original minutes of 2/18/44: "The whole project was discussed by members of the Committee with the keenest interest and sympathy and the hope was expressed that the Director would proceed promptly in the development of the plans as outlined" became as amended: "interest was expressed in receiving future reports of the Director." It may be assumed that Mr. Wolman had something to do with this transformation.

20. Aydelotte, Notes cited.

21. Maass to Aydelotte, 4/14/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte to Maass, 4/15/44. Aydelotte files. Maass later told Aydelotte that Dr. Flexner was responsible for the suggestion resulting in the establishment of the Committee on Policy. (Aydelotte, handwritten Notes, 11/28/44.)

22. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/44, p. 9. Hardin to Aydelotte, 7/7/44. For the statement that Mr. Maass had informed Aydelotte that his tenure was at issue, see Aydelotte to Maass, 2/28/45. (Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45, Appendix. Also, Aydelotte's Notes of conversation with Maass, 10/7/44. Aydelotte files.

23. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/44, pp. 5-7.

24. E. S. Bamberger to Hardin, 10/5/44. Hardin papers. Aydelotte Notes of telephone conversation with Mr. Moe, 9/29/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte to Maass, 10/5/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte Notes of 10/7/44 of telephone conversation with Maass.

25. Aydelotte to Maass, 10/11/44. Aydelotte Report, October 11, 1944, pp. 1-3. Aydelotte's indecision as to the time of the Founder's assurances is shown in the following two references to it:

"I laid the whole situation before him /Mr. Bamberger/ and I believe gradually brought him to realize both the difficulties of our present position and our possibilities for the future. At the beginning of 1943 his attitude changed. He began to reassure me...He asked me not to worry. He told me that he and Mrs. Fuld were taking care of the Institute in their wills..."(Emphasis added) p. 2.

And again:

"In November 1942 I handed him another letter on the same subject /academic changes/ and asked his permission to lay my proposals before the Trustees in order to keep them informed and to get their

advice. This Mr. Bamberger asked me not to do for the present and nearly a year later he made the statement which I have quoted above that he expected to provide generously for the Institute but was not yet ready to allow me to discuss its future program with the Faculty and the Trustees." (Emphasis added) p. 3.

26. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

27. Ibid., pp. 6, 7.

28. Ibid., pp. 10-14. Earlier, in clarifying his ideas to Mr. Moe, Aydelotte wrote: "They would be a little like Guggenheim Fellows. I would put Einstein and McIlwain and de Tolnay in this category, fixing the term for each...It might come to be a more distinguished group than the Faculty! If the Trustees wanted to make me a Fellow, I should be only too delighted." (10/9/44, Aydelotte files)

29. Ibid., pp. 14-15.

30. Ibid., p. 16.

31. Ibid., pp. 3, 4.

32. Ibid., pp. 16-19.

33. Ibid., p. 19.

34. Ibid., pp. 21, 22.

35. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/11/44. Aydelotte files. Panofsky to Aydelotte, 10/12/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/17/44. Aydelotte files. Flexner to Maass, 10/23/44, a handwritten copy from Maass' original, taken from Aydelotte's confidential files.

36. Aydelotte, Notes, 11/6/44; 11/15/44; 11/20/44; 11/28/44; 12/31/44. Aydelotte files.

37. Veblen, Memorandum to Policy Committee, 11/8/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte Notes of Professor Veblen's meeting 11/15/44 with three Trustees. Aydelotte files.

38. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/20/44.

39. Ibid.

40. Moe to Aydelotte, 11/19/44. Aydelotte files.

41. Aydelotte, Notes of his meeting with Douglas, 11/20/44. Aydelotte files.

42. Moe to Aydelotte, 11/21/44. Aydelotte files.

43. Aydelotte, Notes of telephone conversation with Moe, undated, probably 11/21 or 22. Notes, 11/15/44, cited.

44. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 12/5/44. Dodds to Aydelotte, 10/24/44. The President quoted Mr. Hardin as saying Mr. Bamberger told him "the Institute should help us out with our Library."

45. Maass to Aydelotte, 11/24/44. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte, Notes of conference with the Policy Committee, 11/28/44. Aydelotte files.

46. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 12/11/44.

47. Ibid.

48. See copy of Draft of minutes, later amended. Faculty Committee on Policy, 12/17/44. Dr. Aydelotte carefully preserved this, with other records of the Committee, for future scrutiny. Aydelotte files.

49. Ibid,, minutes, Faculty Committee on Policy, 12/17/44. Ribbon copy signed by Professor Earle. Earle files.

50. Aydelotte Draft Statement on Policy, 12/18/44. Aydelotte files.

51. Veblen, handwritten comments and changes in Aydelotte's draft on Institute policy dated 12/18/44. Aydelotte files.

52. Ibid.

53. Aydelotte, draft of statement on Institute policy, 12/22/44. Aydelotte files. Veblen, statement of the history of the Institute, 12/23/44. Aydelotte files. The Director incorporated this in two succeeding drafts. Later, he took it out, modified it slightly, and incorporated it in Bulletin No. 11, (March, 1945) pp. 3, 4.

54. Aydelotte, draft of Policy Statement dated 12/22/44, as amended. Aydelotte files.

55. Aydelotte, draft, Policy Statement, 12/26/44. Aydelotte files.

56. Earle, Minutes of meeting of Trustees' and Faculty's Policy Committees, 1/10/45. Earle files.

57. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/19/45, pp. 8-14.

58. Ibid. Because Professor Veblen objected to changing directors after term had begun, it was decided to advance Dr. Aydelotte's retirement to the 1st October, 1947. It was later moved back to the 16th.

59. Ibid., p. 12. Also see Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 12/5/44, p. 24.

60. Stenographic notes for minutes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45, pp. 3, 4. Aydelotte files. See Maass to Hardin, 1/29/45. Hardin papers. See Aydelotte pencilled notes, early February, 1945. Aydelotte files. See stenographic notes for minutes of the meeting of 3/2/45. Aydelotte files. Maass to Hardin, 1/29/45. Bearing out Maass' statement are notes of thought of Dr. Aydelotte written at Highland Park, Florida, where he went for a brief rest after the 1st February, leaving the Faculty Standing Committee to administer the Institute. There he wrote: "Ready to do whatever best for the Institute. Will not stand still." And he entered further thought concerning "possible other roles for F. A." listing the chairmanship or presidency to succeed Hardin or Maass, with the Vice positions first. Another possibility was the chairmanship of an educational advisory committee similar to the post he held at the Guggenheim Foundation. However, on the 29th January he told the Faculty Committee that he had not yet decided his course.

61. Aydelotte to Maass, 2/28/45. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45. Appendix.

62. Stenographic notes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45, pp. 4, 5. Aydelotte files. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 3/2/45, p. 2.

63. Aydelotte's statement of policy as presented to the Trustees, according to a special note left with it in his files, read as follows, appearing without preamble:

1. That the members of the staff should be men and women capable of creative work of the highest possible excellence judged not merely by national but by world standards.

2. That the scholars of the Institute should enjoy complete freedom in their work, both in research and in the direction of the activities of younger men.

3. That in the consideration for men for the staff or for members of the Institute, no account should be taken of race, sex or cread.

4. That while the Trustees have the ultimate legal authority, the actual control of scholarly and educational policies should be in the hands of the Director and the Faculty.

5. That appointments to the staff of the Institute should be made only with the advice of the Faculty.

6. That the members of the Faculty should have the dignity and security which come from adequate salaries and retiring allowances.

7. That the Institute should not be permanently committed to any particular field of research but that different fields might be cultivated or abandoned from time to time according to their importance and according to the men available to represent them.

To this Aydelotte had appended a statement which read;

"The statement of policy to which the Trustees objected and which was finally omitted from my report of April 20, 1945 is given on the attached sheets. The statement to which the greatest objection was made was No. 4 which seemed to some of the Trustees an undue limitation of their authority. May 10, 1945 Frank Aydelotte." (Signature by typewriter.)

64. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/20/45, pp. 5, 6, 7.

65. Ibid., Appendix.

66. Ibid., p. 5. See Aydelotte to Maass, 4/26/45; to Hardin, 5/1/45. Hardin to Maass, 5/2/45. Hardin papers.

67. Ibid., p. 1.

68. Ibid., pp. 7, 8. Aydelotte had planned that Messrs. Maass, Leidesdorf, Veblen, himself, Schaap, Edgar Bamberger and Moe constitute the Committee on Selection. Handwritten notes.

69. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 4/27/45.

70. Minutes, Faculty Committee on Policy, 5/11/45. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 5/19/45.

71. Moe to Flexner, 4/16/45.

72. Flexner to Moe, 4/17/45.

73. Meeting, Members of the Corporation, 4/20/45. Veblen to Aydelotte, 5/28/40. Aydelotte files.

74. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 5/4/45. Meritt, Lowe, Panofsky and Miss Goldman to Aydelotte, 5/3/45. Aydelotte files. Aydelotte's instructions were given at the Faculty meeting of 4/27/45.

75. Minutes, Faculty meeting with Trustees' Committee on Appointments, 5/22/45.

76. Ibid. Professor Lowe was the member of the Faculty who arose to define his position.

77. Ibid.

78. Ibid.

79. Interview with Miss Goldman.

80. Minutes, Committee on Appointments, 5/22/45. Minutes, Executive Committee, 6/5/45. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/19/45, p. 1. The salaries offered were $10,000, and joint contributions were to be sufficient for annuities of $4,000 on retirement at age 65. The Executive Committee authorized the Director to negotiate with Messrs. Pauli and Viner for salaries up to $12,500. At the same meeting the Executive Committee authorized the Director to increase the salaries of Professors Earle and Panofsky to $12,500, and to increase Dr. Swann's salary by $900. At the same meeting, it regularized the status of Dr. Kurt Weizmann as jointly employed by the Institute and the University at a total salary of $5,000 with joint contributions to increase his pension.

81. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/18/45.

82. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/23/46, p. 8.

CHAPTER XI

THE SELECTION OF A SUCCESSOR DIRECTOR

It was not until six months after his appointment as Chairman of the Trustees Committee on Selection that Mr. Moe, a very capable executive, wrote his first letter to the members of the Faculty, reading in part:

> At the first meeting of the Committee I was instructed to ask members of the Institute's Faculty to suggest persons who should be considered for the directorship. We desire that all members of the Faculty shall be heard on the subject. It is left to the Faculty to decide in what way these suggestions shall be arrived at: the Committee is equally ready to consider one letter from the Faculty as a whole, or individual letters from each member...or communications based on any procedures between those two extremes....
>
> During the period of its deliberations the Committee will be glad to confer with individual members of the Faculty, or with a committee representing the Faculty as a whole...[1]

He cautioned them to keep their deliberations and conversations on the subject confidential. His Committee's function was advisory only, for "no board can in any way delegate responsibility for the appointment of its principal executive officer."

Perhaps some of the long delay may be explained by a confidential request for advice on a proposed draft of this letter which he sent to Dr. Aydelotte with a hasty note asking him to read it "and let me know what you think of it." He wanted to present a draft to the next meeting of the Committee. It was so expressed that one might reasonably suspect it was sent to inform Aydelotte rather than to elicit information from him. Thus he wrote in part:

At my committee's first meeting I was instructed to request of the Institute's faculty suggestions of persons to be the Institute's next director. I write "persons" and not "person;" for all my experience leads me to think that if choice centers around only one person as the indispensible man, the choice is likely to be wrong. For any position there are always several first-rate possibilities and it is well to recognize that from the beginning....

I have in my time seen a fair number of excellent choices for university executive positions made impossible of fulfillment by talk...by trustees' talk and by faculty talk. It does not much matter what the talk is; any kind of talk going around, outside the circles of the trustees and the faculty, about a man in relation to such a position is bad per se. To state the point is to make it plain; you could all adduce examples why it is bad. The deliberations and negotiations preceding the appointment of a Director of the Institute are matters of great delicacy.

The Trustees want the best advice they can get; they want that advice pure and undefiled by considerations other than those related to the future welfare of the Institute...They want a fair shot at getting the man they decide upon. Talk going around, outside, would make a fair shot impossible. I myself have no doubt that the spirit of this statement may be adhered to without foregoing any necessary responsible considerations.

I have made the above statement, I want the faculty to know, also to my committee, and it was agreed to, with objection, by the committee....[2]

In leisurely fashion Dr. Aydelotte appointed a Faculty Committee on the Succession on the 26th November, 1945, consisting of Professors Alexander, Earle and Panofsky. Its minutes are not available. But on the 4th February, 1946, the Committee addressed a letter to the Faculty members signed by all three listing in the following order seven candidates who had been suggested to it, and soliciting further recommendations, including even members of the Faculty or of the Board. The list follows as presented:

Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, physicist, University of California.
Dr. Detlev Bronk, physiologist and physicist of Philadelphia.
Dr. Harlow Shapley, astronomer, and Director of the Harvard Observatory.
Mr. (formerly Major General) Frederick Osborn.
Pf. Edward S. Mason, economist, Harvard University.
T. C. Blegen, Professor of History and Dean of the Graduate Schools, University of Minnesota.
Pf. E. Harris Harbison, Professor of History, Princeton University.[3]

Three weeks later they added two names to that list, and suggested that the Faculty might wish to discuss the whole list at its luncheon to be held on the 4th March. The two were:

Dr. Henry E. Sigerist, Professor of the History of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University.
Mr. (formerly Rear Admiral) Lewis L. Strauss, a member of the Institute's Board of Trustees, formerly principal administrative assistant to Mr. James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy.[4]

On the 5th March, the Committee members wrote the following memorandum to the members of the Faculty confirming the results of the discussion:

> As a result of the luncheon discussion on Monday, March 4, the list of candidates for the Directorship has been reduced to the following five names. (It is understood, of course, that additional names may be submitted at any time.) Also, the appended list does not include the name of any member of the Faculty.
>
> In accordance with your instructions, your committee is requesting Mr. Moe...to name a time at which he will be prepared to discuss with us the names of candidates now under consideration.

The Committee then listed alphabetically with their positions as given before the names of the five Messrs. Blegen, Bronk, Mason, Oppenheimer and Strauss.[5] At the same time, it acknowledged Mr. Moe's letter of the 26th October, 1945, and said in part, without naming the candidates;

> We have now been requested by the Faculty to make an ad interim and quite informal report to you, sometime at your

> convenience. We should like to put before you the names of the persons whom we now have under consideration, and to obtain the benefit of such criticism as you may be in a position to offer. This could best be done, we believe, if we were to meet with you, either in New York or Princeton, at your convenience, for informal discussion. Would you be good enough to let us know when we may have the opportunity?...[6]

The ensuing silence was deafening; Mr. Moe did not respond.[7] It may be assumed that the name of Mr. Strauss in this context, probably mentioned to him by Dr. Aydelotte, caused the silence. Professor Veblen had justified the nomination in what one professor has described as "a long and facetious speech." The financier was neither scholar nor scientist, nor yet a man such as Dr. Flexner had suggested might be appointed as his understudy in 1936: i.e., one who had "varied sympathies and interests, [and] a large acquaintance with men and educational institutions in this country and Europe."

Mr. Strauss had been called from his partnership at Kuhn Loeb & Company to active service in the Navy Department in 1941 with the rank of lieutenant commander. He was then forty-five years of age. Assigned to the Bureau of Ordnance, where his business experience made him useful, he was soon selected by Mr. James Forrestal, then Under Secretary, to be one of his several personal assistants. He accompanied his chief to the office of the Secretary when Mr. Forrestal succeeded Mr. Knox who died in 1944. He left the Navy early in 1946, and returned to New York, with a desire to enter public service. He had ample means, and did not need to return to the financial district. As Professor Veblen had written Dr. Aydelotte in 1940 on first meeting him, Mr. Strauss was very much interested in the Institute for Advanced Study, and undoubtedly might be of some help to it. He was now a Trustee, and though he was not a

member of the Trustees' Committee on Selection, it was clear Professor Veblen and Professor von Neumann regarded his influence very seriously indeed.

On the 12th April, 1946, Professor Veblen wrote Mr. Strauss a letter which revealed that he and Professor von Neumann were carrying on their own negotiations concerning the successor, and that Strauss had apparently returned to New York intending to see Dr. Oppenheimer appointed to the directorship. Veblen wrote:

> Von Neumann told me about his conversation with you in which the names of several candidates for the Directorship of the Institute were brought up. Of these names it seemed to us on further consideration that Bronk and Oppenheimer are the only possible ones. All of the others are too old except Condon, whom we both know very well and do not consider temperamentally or intellectually suitable for the job.
>
> Oppenheimer seems to me to have so many of the qualifications that I would have very little misgiving about the future of the Institute if he were chosen. Von Neumann is not as favorable to Oppenheimer as I am, though he has great admiration for him as a scientist. The general opinion among the Faculty is that Oppenheimer would be very welcome as a colleague.
>
> Both von Neumann and I would be very happy to see Bronk chosen. In the first place, he has, like Oppenheimer, already achieved a pre-eminent position as a creative scholar. We would rather take our chances with such a man than with one who lacked the qualifications even though he had the other desirable qualities. In the second place, Bronk has shown good capacity as an administrator and getting along well with other people. We have particularly flattering testimony as to his success in working for the Army. In the third place, Bronk is the foreign secretary of the National Academy of Sciences, and will be on this account in close touch with Washington and with international questions of a kind significant to the Institute. We are convinced that in the future the Institute must depend to a very considerable extent upon the national government for support.

After saying this, I am going to take the chance of weakening it by the suggestion that it might be wise to experiment with the continuation of the type of administration which has been in effect during Aydelotte's absence; namely, to vest the functions of the Director in the hands of a 'standing committee.' This method of administration seems to us to have been very satisfactory. The only drawback has been a certain disinclination by the standing committee to make decisions in the Director's absence which might seem to infringe on his prerogatives. The chairman of such a committee might be called, following European precedents, the Rector rather than the Director. He should not serve for more than two years. It would be an essential part of such a scheme that the President of the Institute should, like Mr. Maass, continue to take an active interest in its administration.

Quite apart from this particular suggestion, I think it would be desirable for the members of the standing committee to attend meetings of the Board of Trustees and of the Executive Committee of the Board; and also for the President and perhaps other members of the Board to attend the meetings of the Faculty. There are no differences in interest between the Trustees and Faculty, but there are sometimes difficulties in mutual understanding.

In this connection I may remark that I think the suggestion reported by von Neumann that the Institute ought to keep one or two rooms available for Trustees visiting in Princeton is an excellent one. May I add that I should be very happy to reserve a room for you at the Nassau Club if you will let me know when I may expect your long-promised visit to Princeton. The accommodations at the club are rather austere, but it is a good center from which to see Princeton.

Von Neumann asked me to say that he intends to write you before very long. In the meantime, he agrees substantially with what I have said.[8]

Aside from making it clear that he and von Neumann could agree on Dr. Bronk as successor, this letter laid a foundation for urging Mr. Strauss to consider the advantages which might accrue to the Institute should it be administered by the President and the Faculty with no Director. The point was particularly important, considering the fact that Mr. Hardin had died in December, 1945 before Aydelotte's departure for Palestine, leaving the chairmanship of the Board vacant and raising

the question whether Mr. Maass, then President, would prefer to be Chairman, leaving the presidency to some one else. At the first Board meeting in 1946, the strategy indicated that while the time had not quite arrived for that, the idea had taken hold. The minutes of the 23rd May show the following entry:

> On motion of Professor Veblen, seconded by Mr. Leidesdorf, and carried, the report of the Committee on Nominations was approved in its entirety. The Committee recommended an amendment to the By-Laws by which the offices of the President of the Corporation and the Chairman of the Board of Trustees be united, and that the offices of Vice President ...and Vice Chairman...remain unchanged.[9]

Mr. Maass was elected President and Chairman, and Mr. Strauss Vice Chairman. This was very strange, for the Vice-chairmanship had been abandoned in the amendments adopted on the 26th January, 1942 after Mr. Houghton's death, when Mr. Maass became President and Mr. Hardin Chairman, with Maass to act as Chairman in Mr. Hardin's absence. The vice-president continued to be held by Dr. Weed. The language of the present action did not restore the office; there was no up-to-date revision of the By-Laws available, though one had been compiled in Dr. Aydelotte's office in 1944 which incorporated the first clause of the second sentence quoted above.[10]

The Trustees' Committee on the Selection suffered the loss of its Chairman just before the October meeting of the Board, when Mr. Moe presented his resignation from the Board to Mr. Maass, pleading the pressures of his primary commitments and his health, and added sadly:

> I am ashamed to the point of being ill over my failure -- I shrink from the word, but know it to be true -- to function effectively as Chairman of the Trustees' Committee on the Institute's next Director....[11]

With "the agreement" of the Board, Mr. Maass immediately appointed Mr. Strauss to succeed the frustrated Mr. Moe.[12] Dr. Fulton pointed out to both Maass and Strauss that Moe had been compelled to resign because Dr. Aydelotte's presence on the Committee had made it impossible for him to function. Mr. Maass admitted his error in appointing Aydelotte, and called upon him to resign from the Committee allowing his place to be taken by Dr. Weed, who was appointed for the purpose. The Chairman said frankly that "your presence may embarrass others...from fully expressing their views."[13] But Aydelotte declined to leave; Mrs. Aydelotte had read Maass' letter to him on the telephone just as he was about to lunch with Mr. Strauss, who agreed with him that Maass' point was not well taken. Moreover, added the Director:

> The Faculty Committee on the choice of my successor which I appointed last year has been very active and notified the Trustees' Committee some months ago that it was ready with recommendations and only desired an opportunity to present them.[14]

Mr. Strauss later asked Aydelotte to send him a copy of Mr. Maass' letter, and in doing so, the Director reminded the financier that he had extended an invitation to meet the Faculty Committee. Indeed, the Director offered their services with remarkable abandon:

> I hope that if possible you will stop here to consult our Faculty Committee. Otherwise I will send them to see you in New York or Washington as you prefer.[15]

Professor Earle wrote Mr. Strauss on behalf of the Committee as follows:

> At a luncheon meeting of the Institute Faculty held today Dr. Aydelotte informed us that you have been appointed chairman of a committee to select his successor. This was good news to me personally, and, I might add, was welcomed by all other members of the Faculty as well....

> Although my colleagues and I have conducted no further investigations since March, 1946, we are prepared to discuss with you, if you so desire, the names of some of the persons concerned. For obvious reasons, we should prefer to do this in an informal conference rather than in writing.[16]

Professor Earle enclosed a copy of the Committee's list as sent to the Faculty on the 5th March, alphabetically arranged.[17]

Meanwhile, an event of great moment had occurred. President Truman had announced on the 28th October, 1946 the appointment of Mr. Strauss to the new Atomic Energy Commission. The Commissioner had apparently known of this since July or early August.[18] It was, of course, immediately apparent to those who had been hoping there would be no Director at the Institute that the situation had changed. Mr. Strauss in New York, free of absorbing commitments, was quite different from a Commissioner in Washington dealing with the control and development of nuclear energy in the United States, which meant absorbing responsibilities. Though there was apparent no immediate recognition of this fact, it was inevitable that the emphasis would be shifted from him as possibly an active President to someone else who would become Director for the long term or for the shorter period of the first term of the Commission.

Mr. Strauss' answer to Professor Earle said in part:

> It now develops that I shall have to leave here the end of this week to join my associates on the Atomic Energy Commission for a tour of Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and Hanford. That will mean that I shall not return until nearly the end of the month. Since so much time has already elapsed, it is probably wise to make as much progress as possible in the very early future. I wonder, therefore, whether I could persuade you and your colleagues, Professor Alexander and Professor Panofsky, to meet again and give me the benefit of your current consideration of the subject in a memorandum in which you would discuss the individuals in the order of your preference....

> Naturally I will consider in confidence any part of your memorandum which you may care to 'classify' in that respect. (Emphasis his.)[19]

This forthright request seemed to embarras the Committee; it sent a copy to each professor, and asked the Faculty to meet and make the preferential statement, suggesting also other names if any wished to offer them. He informed Strauss that the Committee was seeking the advice of the Faculty.[20]

The Faculty followed the counsel of Professor Riefler, and directed the Committee to request "effective contact" between the two Committees so that the names could be discussed personally. The Faculty felt that "the question would not be furthered by a ranking of candidates at this time." It is obvious that a change in the plans had indeed taken place; Dr. Aydelotte, supported by Professor Panofsky and with the approval of Professor Veblen, named Dr. Linus Pauling of the California Institute of Technology as a candidate, and another also, whose name Earle caused him to withdraw promptly as a poor judge of men.[21] Professor Earle again wrote Mr. Strauss for the Committee, tactfully reflecting the Faculty's discussion, emphasizing the importance of Pauling's nomination, and adding:

> In talking about the directorship, we found ourselves in something of a dilemma: on the one hand, we were eager to comply with your request that we rate candidates in preferential order; on the other hand, we felt that this could not be done with full justice to us, to the Trustees, and to the candidates themselves....
>
> There is so much to be said concerning each of the men we have in mind -- something of course depending upon the special qualities which ought to be sought in the new Director -- that we wonder whether it would not be more desirable if we could hold a joint meeting of the.../two/ committees -- or a preliminary meeting of our committee with you -- for a full and frank discussion....[22]

The Commissioner now suggested that Professor Earle

> Come to Washington and spend an hour or two with me canvassing the matter before I call a meeting of the Committee of the Board of Trustees. I have the feeling that this would be preferable to a joint meeting of the two committees as I will explain when we meet.

Professor Earle then repeated the Committee's request that Mr. Strauss come to Princeton -- even on short notice -- as the Commissioner had said he might find time to do.[23]

Matters stood thus until the Faculty met on the 13th December, having read in the morning papers that President Truman had appointed Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer to the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. Then Professor Alexander reported for Professor Earle that Mr. Strauss had said he had met neither the Trustees Committee nor the Faculty Committee, but had expressed himself as favoring the appointment of Dr. Oppenheimer as Director. The announcement came at the end of a meeting which had been devoted to the nomination of Dr. Homer Armstrong Thompson with exhausting discussion, so that there was time before adjournment only for Professor Meritt to express the hope that no one "too intimately associated with the atomic bomb would be appointed," and that whoever was agreed upon would "have the interests of all three schools at heart in order to maintain a balance between them."[24]

Matters having gone so far, Dr. Aydelotte told the Faculty what they already knew: that he would retire on his sixty-seventh birthday on the 16th October, 1947, and would occupy an office in Fuld Hall which the Trustees had kindly made available to him after that. He made a final effort to persuade the Faculty to recommend a new category of "Fellows of the Institute," but without effect. The news of the

Director's retirement reached the press; this did nothing to sweeten Mr. Maass' temper, which was quite short at the time.[25]

Professor Earle now dropped all semblance of speaking for the Committee in his exchanges with Mr. Strauss. He engaged in telephone conversations, urging a new candidate, whom he dropped quickly on receiving further information. Dr. Pauling's name was also eliminated, apparently. Earle cautioned Strauss not to forget relations with the University, for he wrote,

> As you know, some of the success of the Institute depends upon the degree to which we can cooperate effectively with Princeton University. It would be desirable, therefore, if some means of liaison with President Dodds could be effected by your Committee so that the University officers and Trustees could know of our proposed appointment before it is announced to the general public.[26]

He added "for what it might be worth" that his own preference was for Dr. Bronk over Dr. Oppenheimer, "partly because I think a man of fifty is a little more likely to have stability of judgment than a man almost ten years younger, and partly because I know and have considerable admiration for Dr. Bronk." He learned that Mr. Strauss was convening the Trustees' Committee on the 24th January, and alerted Dr. Aydelotte to quit his vacation in Florida and attend, to forestall the possible selection of a "dark horse."[27]

Dr. Fulton had sent a list of his candidates to Messrs. Lewis, Maass and Strauss in October, mentioning seven names, three of which were Bronk, Oppenheimer and Pauling.[28] In November he engaged Professor Veblen in a discussion of his nominees, making it clear that he would approve of the appointment of Dr. Bronk only if the biologist would give up his other commitments, which Fulton maintained were too numerous to

enable him to pay enough attention to the affairs of the Institute. His reservations did not seem to impress Professor Veblen, who had the last word, saying that he still regarded Bronk, Oppenheimer and Pauling as "the most promising candidates."[29]

Dr. Fulton also began to feel that Mr. Strauss was much too busy with the Commission to warrant his remaining as Chairman of the Trustees' Committee. He reminded Strauss that he had failed to call together his Committee in November as promised. He noted that a meeting scheduled for the 17th December was canceled. "I really think he ought to retire and let someone do it who could give the time to it," he complained to Weed.[30]

The minutes of a special meeting of the Board held on the 1st April, 1947 report Mr. Strauss' account of what had happened on the 24th January and later when Dr. Oppenheimer was appointed Director.

> Before calling a meeting of the Trustees' Committee, Admiral Strauss communicated with Professor Edward Mead Earle, Chairman of the Faculty Committee on the directorship, and received from him a list of suggestions of possible candidates. This list was then supplemented by additional names suggested by members of the Board and from outside sources. At a meeting on January 24th, 1947, the Committee on the Directorship approved a slate of five names all of whom were known to be acceptable to the Faculty of the Institute.
>
> By unanimous vote, the...Committee authorized Admiral Strauss to approach first Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer of the University California. Admiral Strauss took the matter up informally with Dr. Oppenheimer, and is now happy to report to the Trustees that Dr. Oppenheimer has expressed his willingness to accept the position of Director of the Institute for Advanced Study should the Trustees decide to offer it to him. In that event, Admiral Strauss reported that Dr. Oppenheimer has requested that in addition to administrative duties, he be permitted to devote some of his time to teaching in order that he may remain in direct contact with young scholars.

After the circulation of a short biographical sketch of Dr. Oppenheimer, the meeting was thrown open to questions and discussion. Supplementing the biographical material presented to the Trustees, Admiral Strauss stated that Dr. Oppenheimer had been named to the Joint Research and Development Board of the Army and Navy and had also been elected Chairman of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission. It is understood that Dr. Oppenheimer will continue these duties should he be elected Director of the Institute. Although Dr. Oppenheimer is primarily a theoretical physicist, he has had sound training as a classicist and is known to be deeply interested in humanistic studies.

There was some discussion of Dr. Oppenheimer's request that he be permitted to devote some of his time to teaching and it was pointed out that the Institute's present policy of opening all lectures and seminars to graduate students at Princeton University would probably give Dr. Oppenheimer the contact with young scholars which he desired. In this connection, Admiral Strauss told the Board that he had given the names of the five candidates to President Dodds of Princeton University and that Dodds had expressed the opinion that any one of these individuals would be an ornament to the Princeton community.

Since there were no further questions, it was moved by Admiral Strauss, seconded by Mr. Leidesdorf and unanimously carried that Professor J. Robert Oppenheimer be appointed Director of the Institute for Advanced Study to succeed Dr. Aydelotte on his retirement, with the understanding that his duties and responsibilities will be the same as those of the present Director, and that he shall receive the same emoluments. It is expected that Dr. Oppenheimer will come into residence before the retirement of Dr. Aydelotte and during that period his status will be that of Director-Elect.

The Chairman then presented for discussion the question of ways and means of publicly announcing this decision...It was finally agreed that Admiral Strauss as Chairman of the Committee should extend a formal invitation to Dr. Oppenheimer, get his formal acceptance and then consult him about his wishes concerning the form and timing of the announcement. Admiral Strauss and the Chairman of the Board will then prepare an announcement on behalf of the Institute to be released to the press. It was hoped that the announcement could be made public on Tuesday morning, April 15, 1947, immediately following private announcement to the Faculty at their meeting on April 14. Admiral Strauss expressed his desire to report the decision of the Board to Professor Earle in confidence. This the Board granted him permission to do.[31]

If this chain of events causes wonderment it must concern the position of almost complete power which the latest arrival among the Trustees seems to have achieved. For the Board had for so long been under the ultimate authority of Mr. Bamberger, and had been so conscious of his strong will, that one might expect to see Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass at least exercise vigilance to prevent the emergence of another power as dominant. It would appear that perhaps they had a less exact picture of the realities of Mr. Strauss' understandings with the whole Faculty than really existed. But if he could force his decision upon a compliant but less than enthusiastic couple of Professors as well-armored as were Veblen and von Neumann, the Treasurer and Chairman could be excused for relaxing in the belief that Mr. Strauss would have enough authority to deal effectively with the elder mathematician, the crux of most of their troubles heretofore with the Faculty. It should be said that they seemed to have little direct knowledge of the state of mind of the Faculty. What seemed clear now was the conviction of both Veblen and von Neumann that Mr. Strauss was the chosen patron of the Institute for Advanced Study. Certainly, before the news of his appointment to the Commission was announced, he was the only Trustee who had wealth, and the necessary leisure to devote to the manifold affairs of the Institute if there were to be no Director. Moreover, he appeared to want to do so. That his interest centered in the sciences and technologies tended to make the mathematicians complaisant to a degree which the non-scientists need not have shared, but apparently failed to protest.

As Veblen had written Mr. Strauss, the Faculty favored Dr. Oppenheimer "as a colleague." Indeed, the School of Mathematics had

considered him early in 1945 with Pauli and others for a permanent appointment, but had not unnaturally voted for Pauli, who had been their colleague since 1940, and whom they sought to keep in the United States.

Professors Einstein and Weyl were given the task of preparing Pauli's vita on that occasion. Either because they were fairly sure he would feel bound to return to Zurich, or because they really wanted to see Dr. Oppenheimer nominated as an alternate or another physicist at that time, they added an account of his career, with a brief comparison of the two. And because some of their colleagues were thinking a great deal about the necessity for the Institute to go into experimental physics postwar, they prefaced their essay with a statement of the transcendent importance of theoretical physics:

> The School of Mathematics is of the unanimous opinion that theoretical physics not only should continue to form a part of its scientific activities, but should even be reinforced. The entire history of physics since Galileo bears witness to the importance of the function of the theoretical physicist, from whom the basic theoretical ideas originate. A priori construction is in physics as essential as empirical facts. Of course the theorist must have contact with the discoveries and findings of experimental physics, but it is enough that laboratories exist in the civilization in which he lives; it is by no means necessary that he be associated with a laboratory at the place where he works. The war has made industry, government, and people in general, more acutely aware of the vital role of physical research. But in view of the forces which shape public opinion and action, it is not to be expected that pure theoretical physics on the advanced level which we wish to promote, will greatly benefit from this wave of popularity; on the contrary, in the interest of a sound balance, it will be more essential than ever for an institute of our character to emphasize the less popular theoretical side of science.[32]

They found the scientific accomplishments of Dr. Pauli more important than Oppenheimer's, and also relied upon him for his "highly developed organ for mathematics," and his "greater command of the mathematical ap-

paratus." When it came to "qualitative insight," they found the two men equally well endowed.

> In comparing Oppenheimer with Pauli, it is safe to say that Pauli's command of the mathematical apparatus is, and probably always will be, far the greater. Regarding qualitative insight, Oppenheimer since he reached his stature, comes closer to Pauli. In inspiring other physicists, they are on the same level; perhaps Oppenhimer /is/ even a little above Pauli as far as their influence on experimentalists on the spot is concerned. But certainly Oppenheimer has made no contributions to physics of such fundamental nature as Pauli's exclusion principle and analysis of electronic spin. Physicists outside our own circle agree with this opinion, or express themselves even more strongly to the effect that Oppenheimer is one in a series of younger physicists...but they are all several degrees lower than Pauli in originality, depth and lasting influence.

The authors spoke admiringly of Dr. Oppenheimer's participation in the development of quantum mechanics and its methods by treating important special problems, giving many examples. In further characterizing his work, they said:

> Since about 1930 the center of gravity of Oppenheimer's work has shifted to nuclear physics. He has studied the genetic relationship between the several elementary particles and radiation, for instance the perturbation of the process of radiation by generation of electron-positron pairs. Perhaps his most original ideas are contained in his papers on the decomposition of deuterons by impact, and on the multiplicative showers of particles which are such a surprising feature in cosmic radiation.
>
> Everywhere, and in particular in this latter work, he shows considerable strength in pursuing a theory into its last consequences, those consequences which are decisive for the whole theoretical foundation. It is characteristic of Oppenheimer that so many of his papers are written in collaboration with other physicists.
>
> During the war he has done excellent administrative work under formidable political and objective difficulties, and without losing any part of his scientific insight and integrity.

> Oppenheimer has been a very great influence in the United States in spreading the knowledge of quantum mechanics. He has an enormous capacity for influencing young people, and has founded the largest school of theoretical physics in this country. His interests are broad; he surrounds himself with a brilliant social circle, and his students are very enthusiastic about him. It may be that he is somewhat too dominant, and his students tend to be smaller editions of Oppenheimer....[33]

The School recommended Pauli and Siegel, as has been said, and both were offered appointments. However, in September, 1945, while Dr. Pauli was still undecided about accepting the Institute's offer, the School suddenly moved to recommend that Dr. Oppenheimer be offered an appointment as Professor of Theoretical Physics, and directed Professors Einstein and von Neumann to prepare his vita.[34]

Meanwhile Professors Veblen and von Neumann had been discussing with Dr. Harry Smyth of the University the future of physical research: they seemed to be agreed that the government would in effect replace the universities and private foundations in sponsoring and supporting experimental physics, and that the best men would go where the money was; they even contemplated that the government would build great regional laboratories, which would provide the main facilities for researches. The School spent several hours discussing these possibilities, and the joint employment by the Institute and the University of Dr. Enrico Fermi.

Professor Einstein disagreed with such planning. If the government took over experimental physics postwar, the emphasis would be upon weapons -- perhaps even "preventive war." If Dr. Fermi was employed as suggested, "the University would have the man, and the Institute the salary." Certainly such a future would be full of secrecy and interference with the freedom of scientific exchanges which are so nourishing;

moreover, the freedom of the scientists so employed would be gravely limited because of elaborate security precautions. Professor Morse seemed inclined to agree with Einstein. The unacceptability of applied science seemed to be less at issue than the practical considerations of money and prestige. Professor Veblen speculated that with Drs. Wheeler and Wigner at Princeton, the Institute and the University could together build physics at Princeton to the eminence enjoyed by mathematics. The debate was unresolved when Professor von Neumann suggested the Institute could assume the leadership in building a faster and more flexible electronic computer than existed.[35] No further conversation was recorded then.

The School urged the Director to join with Princeton and Columbia in petitioning Major General Leslie Groves to establish a governmental laboratory in or near Princeton. Dr. Aydelotte complied.[36]

In October, 1946, Dr. Aydelotte called the mathematics staff together to discuss appointments in theoretical physics, with the manifest intention of causing them to revive the recommendation of Dr. Oppenheimer which had lain dormant for a year without explanation. Professor Veblen kept the minutes that year, and occasionally he recorded discussion in a manner which reflected his personal opinions. In this case he wrote the following, knowing in all probability, of Moe's resignation and its possible consequences.

> Sentiment was that it would be better first of all to settle the question about the appointment of a younger man. Oppenheimer is still regarded as a first-rate candidate, although there is some doubt about the effect of the political activities into which he has felt it his duty to be drawn.[37]

The "political activities" referred to were quite unacceptable to Professor von Neumann. They consisted largely of Dr. Oppenheimer's

answering numerous calls for his advice -- by congressional committees legislating for the control and development of atomic energy in the United States; by the State Department to assist in the preparation of the Acheson-Lilienthal Report on the control of fissionable materials; by the United States Delegate to the United Nations Committee on Atomic Energy, Mr. Bernard Baruch, with whom he served for a time as scientific adviser, and later with Baruch's successor, Mr. Frederick Osborn, etc. Beyond these duties, Dr. Oppenheimer made a number of speeches in the effort to inform the public more fully about the nature of atomic energy.

The School decided that Dr. Aydelotte should invite Dr. Julian Schwinger for a visit of two or three days, but Dr. Schwinger, who had just accepted a full professorship at Columbia, declined. After that, the School recommended and the Board approved a joint offer with Princeton University to Dr. Robert P. Feynman, but he also was not interested.[38]

The discussions of applications of mathematics made the School aware of Professor von Neumann's wish to plan and construct a large-scale, high-speed electronic computer. This brought about a schism within the School of Mathematics, so that Dr. Aydelotte took it to the Board with Veblen's and von Neumann's support but without a vote by the School of Mathematics or the full Faculty, even though it required the employment of a specialized group of men, a special building, and some housing arrangements. The Board approved it on the 19 October, 1945; by January, 1952, the computer was in operation.[39] The work required both mathematical and engineering talent, and was supported by grants from the government, and by the cooperation of Radio Corporation of America and the Department of Mathematics at Princeton. While these efforts were going forward, a

project in meteorological studies was established in 1946 on contracts with the Office of Naval Research in the expectation that the computer would be a powerful research tool in the investigation of fundamental problems in dynamical meteorology, and would make possible for the first time a direct attack on the problems of weather prediction by numerical solution of complex equations governing the motions of the atmosphere. When this project was first discussed with the School of Mathematics, vigorous dissent was registered, according to Professor Veblen's minutes:

> The discussion considered the effect of such activities upon the progress of mathematics and upon the general atmosphere of the Institute. The personal views expressed ranged from that of Professor Siegel, who, in principle, prefers to compute a logarithm which might enter into his work rather than to look it up in a table, through that of Professor Morse who considers this project inevitable but far from optimum, to that of Professor Veblen who simple-mindedly welcomes the advances of science regardless of the direction in which they seem to be carrying us. In spite of this variety of personal points of view, it was agreed that the Institute should go forward with the project as proposed.[40]

The School of Mathematics approved the contract reluctantly, convinced that meteorology was the next practical step. But there is no evidence that the Board ever formally gave its approval, although it was assumed in several references to the project.[41] It was conceded that both the computer and the meteorological studies were examples of applied rather than pure mathematical researches, representing the first break with the School's tradition. With the success of a series of numerical experiments leading to the development of a model in 1953 by which the generation of storms could be predicted, the civil and military forces of the government took the project in meteorology over and the men connected with it left the Institute in 1956. While they worked here, they

enjoyed the cooperation of a distinguished group of scientists in universities, in Oslo, Stockholm, Copenhagen, London and Tokyo, and in some federal agencies, who came to work with Dr. Jules Charney, meteorologist, and Professor von Neumann, in charge of the exploration.

Dr. Oppenheimer thus inherited two large projects in applied mathematics which he had no hand in establishing, but which he administered well. The shattering of the monolithic facade of the School of Mathematics was probably a factor in his favor; the School had been disastrous to Dr. Flexner, because it furnished a model of unanimity which enabled Professor Veblen to speak with little apparent dissension for it and then for the Faculty. It must have been a relief to Dr. Aydelotte, who had experienced the same thing, and who seemed to be delighted that the Institute now had some applied mathematics on the boards. But there was little doubt that much as the School of Mathematics seemed to object, and particularly Professor Siegel, all were agreed that it was desirable to create conditions which kept Dr. von Neumann at the Institute while several universities were only too willing to pay him for doing the things to which the purists objected.

At least one Trustee believed that the interval between the Trustees' Committee's authorization of the 24th January, 1947, and the convening of the Board on the first April was caused by indecision on Dr. Oppenheimer's part. There had been two abortive calls for the Board's decisive meeting -- one for the 19th March, and another for the 28th -- but both were postponed. The reason for the delay was explained by the testimony of Dr. Oppenheimer and Mr. David E. Lilienthal given to the

Personnel Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission in April, 1954. Dr. Oppenheimer said:

> I came /to the Institute at Princeton/ in the late summer, I think, of 1947. I had been a professor at California Institute of Technology and at the University of California at Berkeley. In late 1946, perhaps, or early 1947, the present Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission /Mr. Strauss/ was chairman of the nominating committee to seek a new director to succeed Dr. Aydelotte at the Institute, and he offered me the job, stating that the Trustees and the Faculty desired this.
>
> I did not accept at once. I like California very much, and my job there, but I had, as will appear, not spent very much time in California. Also, the opportunity to be in a small center of scholarship across the board was very attractive to me.
>
> Before I accepted the job, and a number of conversations took place, I told Mr. Strauss there was derogatory information about me. In the course of the confirmation hearings, on Mr. Lilienthal especially, and the rest of the Commissioners, I believe Mr. /J. Edgar/ Hoover sent my file to the Commission, and Mr. Strauss told me that he had examined it rather carefully. I asked him whether this seemed in any way an argument against my accepting this job, and he said no, on the contrary -- anyway, no -- In April I heard over the radio I had accepted, and decided that was a good idea...[42]

The testimony of Mr. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Commission, revealed the Commission had received the Federal Bureau of Investigation's dossier on Dr. Oppenheimer on or about the 8th March, 1947, during Senate hearings on the confirmation of the Commissioners. The Commission then had the duty of determining whether the physicist who had presided over the making of the atomic bomb was eligible for clearance to access to top government secrets under the terms of the Atomic Energy Act and the current security regulations of the government. Mr. Lilienthal's testimony revealed that the Commissioners had read the thick dossier together and individually, and discussed it at length. Dr. Vannevar Bush and Dr.

James Conant, both of whom had been close to the physicist at Los Alamos, and now were Chairman of the Joint Research and Development Board and President of Harvard respectively, were in town, and were called in and asked for their advice and opinions. Dr. Conant had been scientific adviser to Major General Leslie R. Groves, head of the Manhattan Technology Engineer District under which the Los Alamos Laboratory was established. The Chairman also consulted Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, and informed the President through his confidential assistant, Mr. Clark Clifford, of the situation, inviting such advice or instructions as the President might wish to give the Commission. The Commission also asked and received written advices about Dr. Oppenheimer's work, character and loyalty from Dr. Bush (letter dated 11th March); the Secretary of War, Mr. Robert Patterson, who transmitted a letter from General Groves (dates respectively the 25th and 24th March); and from Dr. Conant (dated the 27th March). There was no dissent among those highly qualified authorities as to the superb quality of the work, the good character, and the loyalty of Dr. Oppenheimer. These questions had all been considered carefully before he received the award of the Medal for Merit. Immediately after Dr. Conant's letter was received -- the last one -- the Commission voted that Dr. Oppenheimer's Q clearance should be continued, and Mr. Strauss had the Institute Board convened, with the results related. The decision was made again by unanimous vote on the 6th August, 1947.[43]

During the delay it is probable that two of the Trustees learned something of the reasons for a part of the delay. Mr. Lewis, en route to Australia, visited the Oppenheimers in Berkeley, and Dr. Fulton, in San Francisco for a conference, lunched with them at their home, entering

the following account in his diary.

> The Oppenheimers have a beautiful house up in the Berkeley hills overlooking the Bay. Mrs. Oppenheimer is an energetic woman of about thirty who is passionately fond of gardening, and their two and one-half acres are planted in profusion with every conceivable shrub and flower, most of which she tends herself. They returned from Los Alamos to Berkeley a year ago expecting to settle down to a quiet existence teaching theoretical physics. But the demands of the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission on Oppenheimer's time have been incessant. Last week he was in Washington helping Mr. Truman with his speech on Greece. He has been deeply involved in the Lilienthal confirmation controversy, and his advice on using atomic energy for commercial power is being constantly sought. In physical appearance, he is slender with rather slight features, but he has a piercing and imperturbable eye, and a quickness in repartee that gives him great force, and he would immediately command respect in any company. He is only forty-three years of age, and despite his preoccupation with atomic physics, he has kept up his Latin and Greek, is widely read in general history, and he collects pictures. He is altogether a most extraordinary combination of science and the humanities.[44]

Dr. Weed had said that the only trustees "who knew what a Director should be" were Dr. Fulton and Mr. Douglas. When Mr. Strauss was first elected Fulton had written Mr. Lewis with some evidence of favor about the "bright young man from Wall Street being groomed to succeed Leidesdorf as Treasurer." But later, after making inquiries of some friends who knew the financier, he had heard that he was an arch-conservative, and had grumbled to Mr. Moe that the Board did not need "a Hoover Republican thinking in the last century."[45] With such views, and his obvious respect for the new Director, it would appear that Dr. Fulton decided to help Dr. Oppenheimer as much as was possible. And so, early in 1947, when he learned there was a movement afoot to elect Mr. Strauss Chairman of the Board at the next annual meeting, he wrote Mr. Maass, who was vacationing at Palm Springs, questioning whether the busy Commissioner

had the time to do justice to the office and the Institute, and saying he was not alone in his solicitude. If Mr. Maass wished to divest himself of one of the offices, Fulton commended Weed, a more experienced Trustee who had been Vice President since 1941, though he did not know whether Dr. Weed would be interested.[46]

Surprisingly, Mr. Maass replied that he had been quite remote from the Institute's affairs -- he did not even know the outcome of the offer to Dr. Oppenheimer. But he did know that Dr. Aydelotte wanted to become Chairman, and was opposed to that. It would not be good for the Institute. He liked Dr. Weed, and would have no objection to him as President. The Institute would be stronger if the two offices were held separately. As for himself, he wished to remain Chairman.[47] Fulton agreed that Aydelotte would indeed be the wrong man. "He does not have a flair for administration, and I feel sure he would multiply the difficulties which develop from time to time between the Chairman...and the Director." He had been able to confirm his impression that Dr. Oppenheimer would not welcome Mr. Strauss as Chairman.[48]

Strange as it may seem, Dr. Fulton's was apparently the first intimation that it might not be wise to elect Mr. Strauss to the higher office. In some way Mr. Leidesdorf, then Chairman of the Committee on Nominations, had been assured that the contemplated action would be agreeable to Dr. Oppenheimer. Now he learned it would not. It was a peculiar concept. Here were two men closely associated in two enterprises, both of a novel and rigorous nature. If they had been intimate friends, and knew that they held the same or similar views about the complex affairs of each, there might have been some reason for the

assumption that they would operate in harmony as Chairman and Director of the one, and Commissioner and Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the other, although the conclusion would have had to take into consideration the likelihood that one would be dominant, and the other relatively compliant, which was far from likely as between these two men. There was no history of close friendship or similarity of views here; the two had met but once or twice, according to their own accounts. Both were eager for power, both well able to acquire and use it. Any arrangement for a cooperative effort would have to take account of that fact. If it did not, the health of the Institute might be in jeopardy.

Shortly before the annual meeting of 1947, Dr. Aydelotte, resigned to the hopelessness of his aspiration to become Chairman of the Board, wrote Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass suggesting that, except for a few changes, the Committee on Nominations defer action on officers of the Board, and even leave vacant Mr. Moe's trusteeship. He conceded that Mr. Strauss should be elected Chairman, but he felt that other changes should await the presence and advice of the new Director.[49]

This was the second strong intimation on the record that it had been decided (but not otherwise recorded) that the new Director was not to be a Trustee, as the By-Laws provided. The first intimation was contained in a letter from Professor Earle to Mr. Strauss, written immediately after the Trustees' Committee meeting of the 24th January, saying he understood there was a vacancy on the Board, and reminding Mr. Strauss that he had suggested Mr. Forrestal for the vacancy: "I could imagine no one who could better grace the Board than your friend and my friend, the Secretary of the Navy."[50]

It is possible that the decision had been made about Dr. Oppenheimer's status in relation to the Board when it became known that he wished to become also a member of the Faculty. Some opinions on that subject appear in a bit of gossip earlier. In April, 1945, when Strauss and Lewis had been elected to the Board, Fulton wrote the latter giving him some background on the Nominating Committee's deliberations. He described Dr. Aydelotte's suggestions as "six...friends, all of whom were over sixty (one was seventy-three)...and with Maass pushing the matter, we voted them all down." Professor Veblen, he said, attempted to fill all vacancies with other Faculty members. While Veblen had been useful in conveying the opinions of the Faculty to the Board, Fulton said: "I share the conviction of Weed and Maass that it would probably be better not to have any Faculty members on the Board."[51] But if this were so, Veblen's position would also be subject to question, except for the mystique he had sedulously created that he was the spiritual and intellectual founder of the Institute.

When the Members of the Corporation met on the 18th April, 1947, two of three on the Nominating Committee were absent. Mr. Leidesdorf, the third member, said there would be no report. Nevertheless, the re-election of the Trustees whose terms expired then was accomplished as by right. Mr. Leidesdorf and Governor Lehman (who had rejoined the Board in 1946) were both given five-year terms. The single vacancy was not filled, and the members declined to accept the resignation of Lewis Douglas, who was now American Ambassador to England. An incipient deadlock appeared when the following action was taken by the Board:

> In accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on Nominations, it was moved, seconded and carried that the

> present officers and standing committees of the Board of Trustees remain in office until such time as a new slate is presented to the Trustees.[52]

At the next annual meeting, Mr. Maass moved to make all the Trustees members of the Executive Committee, with four constituting a quorum.[53]

And greatly to Mr. Lewis' surprise, Mr. Leidesdorf moved for the Committee on Nominations the re-election of Messrs. Bamberger and Maass for five-year terms. Seconded by the Director, the motion carried. Mr. Lewis, a member of the Committee on Nominations with Messrs. Leidesdorf and Rosenwald, admitted to Dr. Fulton that he was quite unprepared for the action, since there had been no meeting of the Committee. Otherwise, the freeze on election of officers and members of the standing committees continued. Mr. Maass was then seventy, and Fulton mentioned the Chairman's embarrassment.[54]

Dr. Aydelotte made his final report to the Board as Director in 1947. He had come to the conclusion that the most important accomplishment of his administration was in the new relationship between Director and Faculty. He said

> My conception of the government of an educational institution is a bi-cameral one: the Faculty constitute the lower house and the Trustees the upper. The members of the Faculty are not employees in the ordinary sense; they are also a part of the governing body. No institution can be successful and harmonious which does not have suitable forms of procedure by which each group can make its maximum contribution in the development of policies and in day to day administration....
>
> I think the greatest advance that we have made in the last eight years has been in free democratic discussion....
>
> We have worked out what I think to be an admirable system for the making of appointments to the Faculty. Recommenda-

> tions are initiated by the School or department concerned. They must then be approved by the Faculty as a whole before they come up to the Director for recommendation to the Trustees. I have given an undertaking to the Faculty that I would never recommend to the Trustees an appointment of which the Faculty did not approve. On the other hand, I have said that I would not promise to forward to the Trustees every recommendation made by the Faculty....Certainly the routine which we have adopted gives every promise of guarding us from mistakes....[55]

This was the first time Dr. Aydelotte had told the Board he had surrendered to the Faculty his power to initiate recommendations for academic appointments. His commitment was a personal one, and did not necessarily bind his successor. It was unlike the usual privilege inhering in a university department to nominate a member to its Faculty, for that even in Germany involved proposing three names for one position. That could hardly be tolerated at the Institute, where each nominee was the only outstanding available scholar or scientist who could be deemed worthy of appointment to its Faculty. And when Dr. Aydelotte remarked that it promised to avoid mistakes, he erred, for it guaranteed that the Institute would remain frozen in its pattern, except for the possibility that one School might absorb the place and resources used by the three.

In another matter he proposed a fundamental change to introduce some flexibility in academic status, without relating it to the role of the Faculty as he had just described it.

> In recruiting the staff...I have myself felt very seriously the need of flexibility. Our professorships, with a rigidly fixed salary, are suitable only for a limited group of men. They exclude young men entirely. They exclude, furthermore, a certain number of individuals whose scholarly qualifications may be first-rate, but who, for one reason or another, are not qualified for positions as members of our Faculty. To meet this need for flexibility we have established the status of permanent members....I think the nomenclature to describe the Faculty and members...fails to meet the situ-

> ation. We should, in my opinion, be much better off if we had only two classes: permanent members and temporary members.[56]

It is questionable that the Faculty at first regarded the category of permanent member as providing the flexibility the Director seemed to see in it. His efforts to cause a formal revision in academic categories had resulted in the Faculty's decision to limit the power of the Schools to appoint members to a period of two years; for a longer period, the consent of the Faculty was required.[57] Dr. Kurt Gödel was the first permanent member appointed; it was to give him permanent status and retirement benefits without elevating him to the Faculty that the title was created. It was usefully employed later for Dr. Mitrany as he left his professorship but wished to retain a connection with the right to return and study at the Institute. If it were to be recognized as a step in an escalation toward a professorship, it would threaten Professor Veblen's wish to retain the inflexibility of the high and uniform single salary rate.[58]

André Bedier's advice, which Dr. Aydelotte had emphasized in his report to the Committee on Policy in 1944, was still in his opinion good. He said now:

> I think the Trustees should consider the question whether some requirement of public lectures or seminars should not be made in connection with every professorship in the Institute.

The years of his administration had been marked by lack of funds and the war. He deplored the inability to expand the Institute. But he was also very proud of the record of service to the country which he and the Faculty had given, and which he had listed at a previous meeting at the war's end.[59] He was still convinced that his cultivation of

Mr. Bamberger at weekly luncheons in Newark had been responsible for the Founders' bequests. There was really nothing to indicate that Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld had ever changed their minds about the Institute's being their chief philanthropy, although it seems clear they did not want to authorize expansion during Dr. Aydelotte's administration, especially at times when Dr. Flexner was not enthusiastic about the program suggested. Dr. Aydelotte had tried but not suceeded inproving his claim that he was responsible for the Founders' bequests.

Dr. Aydelotte had reason to be proud of his provision of housing for Institute members at the war's end. It was a time when building materials and labor were virtually unavailable still that Miss Bernetta Miller, reading advertisements in the New York Times, came across a sale of unused permanent housing built by the government for war workers. Through quick action, the Institute purchased enough to provide housing for thirty-eight members and their families. They were cut into panels, shipped from Mineville, New York, to Princeton, reassembled and erected where the present housing project stands, and were occupied during the spring semester in 1947. Intrinsically and esthetically they were no bargain. Yet they had plumbing fixtures and other things which did not become available in the consumers' market for some time. Even with the thirty-eight units, the Institute continued to rent rooms and apartments in the Borough and Township where it was possible to do so, until new housing was provided and became available in 1958. The neighbors on Newlin Road vocally opposed the new rustic cottages, and the Institute mitigated the effect by careful placing and screening shrubs. This housing was largely replaced to make way for a new modern project in 1958.

Another cause for self-congratulation Dr. Aydelotte mentioned was his part in negotiating with President Dodds for the Institute's payment of a half-million dollars toward the cost of building and endowing maintenance costs of the Firestone Library on the Princeton campus. The Institute had redeemed a promise of sorts made by Mr. Bamberger in the early days when it was deep in Princeton's debt. When the Library was completed, the payment was announced by the University as the Institute's Trustees had described it -- a payment for past and future services of the University to the Institute. Dr. Oppenheimer transmitted the check to Mr. Brakeley, Vice President of the University in January, 1948, and President Dodds' letter when he returned to town showed deep appreciation

> for this most substantial assistance toward our new building. The action of your trustees...when your pledge was made, was a tremendous stimulus to our campaign for funds. It also stirred very friendly feelings toward the Institute on the part of our faculty and trustees as being a gracious act on your part, and as further establishing the philosophy of mutual aid and cooperation between the two institutions.[60]

Most important of the unfinished business left to his successor by Dr. Aydelotte were problems of State and federal taxes; a pending request from the State for some of the Institute's choicest land to complete a plot for a public park commenorating the Battle of Princeton; the need for additional offices for members, to be solved by construction of two small buildings to the southeast and the southwest of Fuld Hall; the provision of a fitting memorial to the Founders, on the nature of which the Director had agreed with Miss Lavinia Bamberger; provision of regular funds for publication of the books of the humanists, for which no provision had been made; the preparation of a bibliography of all publications

which had resulted from studies at the Institute, and a list of all members. These and a few other things the retiring Director listed for the Board and, later, for his successor.

The meeting closed with some expression from the Chairman for the Board of thanks to Dr. Aydelotte for his services, and with satisfaction at his continued "affiliation" with the Institute. Dr. Aydelotte was still a Trustee, of course, and would take an office in part of Dr. Lowe's quarters, from which to carry on his numerous commitments to other organizations, several of which he continued to discharge with the aid of his able secretary, Mrs. Elsa Jenkins, until his death in 1957.

CHAPTER XI - NOTES

1. Moe to Faculty, 10/26/45.

2. Moe to Aydelotte, undated draft with note asking his comments. Aydelotte files.

3. Alexander, Earle and Panofsky to Faculty, 2/4/46. See Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/4/46. Appendix.

4. Alexander, Earle and Panofsky to Stewart, 2/27/46. School of Economics and Politics files.

5. Alexander, Earle and Panofsky to Faculty, 3/5/46. Some members of the Faculty had been suggested, and were probably discussed. Panofsky suggested Morse, and also Moe; Stewart, Riefler.

6. Alexander, Earle and Panofsky to Moe, 3/5/46.

7. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/4/46.

8. Veblen to Strauss, 4/12/46. Veblen papers.

9. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/23/46, p. 8.

10. Dummy of By-Laws dated 7/7/44, showing revisions to print of 1937 adopted on 1/26/42; 6/8/43; and 5/23/46. Aydelotte files.

11. Moe to Maass, 10/13/46. Aydelotte files.

12. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/18/46, p. 3.

13. Maass to Aydelotte, 10/30/46; to Fulton 10/30/46. Aydelotte files.

14. Aydelotte to Maass, 11/2/46. Aydelotte files.

15. Aydelotte to Strauss, 11/2/46. Aydelotte files.

16. Earle to Strauss, 11/4/46. Aydelotte files.

17. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/18/46.

18. New York Times, 10/29/46. Lewis L. Strauss, Men and Decisions, Doubleday & Company, 1962, pp. 210-213.

19. Strauss to Earle, 11/7/46. Earle papers.

20. Earle to Meritt, 11/12/46; to Strauss, 11/13/46. Earle papers.

21. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/18/46.

22. Earle to Strauss, 11/21/46. Earle papers.

23. Strauss to Earle, 12/4/46; Earle to Strauss, 12/9/46. Earle papers.

24. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 12/13/46.

25. Ibid. Aydelotte to Maass, 12/17/46. Mass to Aydelotte, 12/24/46. Aydelotte files.

26. Earle to Strauss, 1/15/47; 1/21/47; 1/23/47 (telegram). Earle papers.

27. Earle to Aydelotte, 1/14/47. Earle papers.

28. Fulton to Lewis, Maass and Strauss, 10/31/46. Fulton papers.

29. Fulton to Veblen, 11/20/46; 12/3/46. Veblen to Fulton, 12/13/46. Fulton papers.

30. Fulton to Weed, 12/11/46. Fulton papers.

31. Minutes, Trustees special meeting, 4/1/47.

32. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 2/2/45; 3/5/45. Einstein and Weyl, Memorandum, undated. Veblen papers.

33. Memorandum cit.

34. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 9/26/45.

35. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 6/2/45.

36. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 2/4/46.

37. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 10/14/46.

38. Ibid.

39. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/19/45, pp. 9 ff. The computer and its building were financed by government grants. In the winter of 1946, Professor Veblen recommended that the Institute construct ten dwelling units for the families of employees of the computer at a cost of $100,000. But the Standing Committee of the Faculty then administering the Institute voted the proposal down. Mr. Maass told the Executive Committee (3/19/46) the proposed housing was not practical and would not pay for itself. The proposal died. (See Morse to Aydelotte, 3/20/46.) Aydelotte files.

40. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 5/14/46.

41. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/23/46, pp. 2, 3, 10.

42. Atomic Energy Commission Personnel Security Board, In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer. Transcript of Hearings, Washington, 1954. pp. 26, 27.

43. Ibid., pp. 179, 374-382, 424-425.

44. John Fulton, Diary, entry 3/15/47. Fulton papers.

45. Fulton to Moe, 4/18/45. Fulton papers.

46. Fulton to Maass, 2/3/47. Fulton papers.

47. Maass to Fulton, 2/8/47. Fulton papers.

48. Fulton to Maass, 2/13/47. Fulton papers,

49. Aydelotte to Maass and Leidesdorf, 4/15/47. Aydelotte files.

50. Earle to Strauss, 1/27/47. Earle papers,

51. Fulton to Lewis, 4/16/45. Fulton papers.

52. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 4/18/47, and of Trustees. 4/18/47, p. 6.

53. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/48, p. 1. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 4/15/48. The By-Laws had been amended on 6/8/43 to permit the Board to change the number of members on the standing committees by simple resolution. Mr. Strauss had not only attended but presided over the meeting of the Executive Committee meeting of 2/10/48. Mr. Maass, probably aware of the legal situation, evidently felt it necessary to legitimate Mr. Strauss' position.

54. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, 4/15/48. Fulton to Lewis, 4/21/48; 4/23/48. Lewis to Fulton, 4/22/48. Fulton papers.

55. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/47. Appendix, pp. 1, 2, 3.

56. Ibid., p. 4.

57. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 5/19/45.

58. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 12/13/45; 12/19/45. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/18/45. There was apparently no discussion of the use of the device in a broader sense than that needed to meet the problems of two individuals who needed a status not otherwise available.

59. The following Summary of Faculty War Work was presented to the Board

on 10/19/45.

The war service of the members of the Institute Faculty, now for the most part finished, has been extremely interesting and creditable. Fifteen members of the Institute Faculty have given part or all of their time to war work.

SUMMARY OF FACULTY WAR WORK

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

Professor James W. Alexander: Operational research; defense against enemy mining operations; spent some time in England in 1942 at Headquarters of Bomber Command of Eighth Air Force working on the problem of improving the bombing accuracy of our planes over Germany. Published several confidential reports.

Professor Albert Einstein: Consultant to Navy Bureau of Ordnance doing his work in Fuld Hall.

Professor Marston Morse: Consultant to Army Bureau of Ordnance; Member of Applied Mathematics Panel, and consultant to NDRC on photogrammetry. Wrote some eighty technical reports, the most important being ballistic data, performance of ammunition. Did important work in the development of the so-called radio or proximity fuse. Received citation for meritorious civilian service from the Army Air Forces.

Professor John von Neumann: Consultant to Ballistic Research Laboratory of Army Ordnance Department at Aberdeen since 1937. Consultant to both Army and Navy on shock waves and theory of high explosives. Directed project for the Applied Mathematics Panel. Studying computing methods suited to very high-speed computing devices which will become available in the near future. Since September 1943 consultant to the Manhattan District at the laboratory at Los Alamos, doing work which was so highly confidential as to make it unsuitable to give details at this time. The researches with which von Neumann was concerned had to be omitted from the Smyth report.

Professor Oswald Veblen: Consultant throughout the war to the Army Ordnance Department at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, both on technical problems and on personnel; operational research for the Navy in connection with submarine mine warfare. Member of Applied Mathematics Panel; made one trip to England for the Army Air Forces, advising both on technical and personnel problems.

Professor Hermann Weyl: Special adviser to NDRC; Consultant of Applied Mathematics Panel; did research on shock waves in Fuld Hall.

SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

Professor Edward Mead Earle: In 1941 and 1942 assisted in the organization of the Division of Research and Analysis of the OSS. Since 1942 special consultant to the commanding general of the AAF for the purpose of organizing the advisory committee on bombardment, subsequently named Committee of Operations Analysts which made the plans for the bombardment of Germany and later of Japan. Made two trips to Europe as adviser to the Eighth and Ninth Air Forces and has now been commissioned to write the history of the heavy bombardment effort in the European theater of operations from 1942 to 1945. Published "Makers of Modern Strategy" which has been warmly received as the outstanding work dealing with that subject.

Professor David Mitrany: Has been on leave since 1939, first as a member of the Chatham House group working for the English Foreign Office, later as adviser on international affairs to Lever Brothers.

Professor Winfield W. Riefler: Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, September 1939 to January 1940. Drew up in July 1941 at the request of Vice-President Wallace, the first plan for the Board of Economic Warfare. Stationed in London, March 1942 to September 1944, first as Assistant to Ambassador Winant, then as head of the Economic Warfare Division in London with the rank of Minister, Professor Riefler built up an organization in which was concentrated all matters pertaining to the Anglo-American blockade of Germany, the management of the black list in the Eastern Hemisphere, economic and financial negotiations with European neutrals, the gathering and analyses of economic intelligence with respect to the enemy for the use of the armed forces and the civil government. Under this latter head, intimate and direct liaison was maintained with the Air Forces, the European Theater Commander, the American Naval Commander in European Waters.

Professor Walter W. Stewart: Full time adviser to the Secretary of the Treasury, September 1939 to 1940, and part time adviser 1940-1943.

Professor Robert B. Warren: Consultant to the United States Treasury throughout the whole period of the war on problems connected with the borrowing program and its relation to the banking system. Asked to go to Austria as a member of the American Mission in 1945, but finally felt it wisest to decline.

SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES

Professor E. A. Lowe: Member of Historians Committee studying the effect of the bombing of Germany. Assisted in the

preparation of a handbook for use of our aviators on archives and libraries of Italy.

Professor Benjamin D. Meritt: Began in 1941 work for the Foreign Nationalities Branch of Colonel Donovan's organization which afterwards became the OSS. Supervised study of foreign language newspapers published by 36 foreign national groups within the United States. Spent a year in Washington in this work. Assisted in the preparation of a geographical handbook on Greece for the use of the Armed Forces.

Professor Erwin Panofsky: Assisted in preparation of maps and tables of information about cultural monuments in Germany for the use of American bombers. Drs. Weitzmann and Frankl assisted in the preparation of this book, and Dr. de Tolnay assisted in the preparation of a similar book covering the city of Paris.

. . .

Dr. Frank Aydelotte: Chairman, New Jersey Enemy Alien Hearing Board, 1941-1942; Chairman, Committee on Scientific Personnel, OSRD, 1942.

60. Dodds to Aydelotte, 10/24/44. Aydelotte files. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 12/5/44, pp. 19 ff. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 2/10/48. See also Leidesdorf to Oppenheimer, 1/21/48. Dodds to Oppenheimer, 1/28/48.

CHAPTER XII

DR. OPPENHEIMER'S FIRST YEARS AS DIRECTOR

Dr. Oppenheimer arrived in Princeton with his wife and children in mid-July of an unusually hot and humid summer. The advantages of the planned overlap in terms were largely dissipated by a series of small crises. The Aydelottes' new home was not yet ready for their occupancy, and so Olden Manor was not ready to receive the travellers. After the Aydelottes moved, they went on vacation. Several changes in staff occurred. Wesley Dauncey, the resourceful factotum who took care of the physical properties of the Institute, was returning to Magnetawan, whence Dr. Flexner had taken him to maintain Fuld Hall. With him went Professor Meritt's research assistant, Mrs. Dauncey. Hopefully Dr. Oppenheimer would be able to rely upon Dr. Aydelotte's private secretary to help him learn the ropes, but she was leaving to take a law degree at Yale. Dr. Oppenheimer employed Mrs. Eleanor Leary as his private secretary, and together they learned about the Institute from the inside. She had been secretary to Mr. Justice Frankfurter, a friend of Dr. Oppenheimer.

The Director-Elect's first contacts with the Faculty were enlightening. One of the first was with the Standing Committee and Dr. Aydelotte, when he watched Professor Veblen, sitting in for Professor von Neumann, wrest Room 310 from the School of Economics and Politics, whose territory it was traditionally, after prying the School of Humanistic Studies from support of the possessor by feinting in the direction of Professor Herzfeld's great study, which the humanists were saving for Professor Thompson. The mathematicians wanted a room fitting for Pro-

fessor Siegel, who had just returned from a year spent in Germany on full pay. Dr. Oppenheimer had mentioned the possibility of supplanting the School secretaries and their helpers with a stenographic pool, and quickly reversed his field when he realized that academicians become as pleasantly inured to the custodial care of a good secretary as do businessmen and bureaucrats.[1]

Further enlightenment about the real nature of his new position -- and the retiring Director shared his chagrin -- came in the Faculty meeting which followed when he referred to the Institute for Advanced Study as "an educational institution." Indeed, this threatened to erase the work of years devoted to the transformation of the Institute from Dr. Flexner's concept of it. Professors Alexander and Einstein protested that if they had thought of it as an educational institution they would not have come to it; it was a research organization. Dr. Aydelotte was as surprised as was Dr. Oppenheimer. The word educational was relegated to silence until the new Director could study the founding documents and the laws under which the Institute had been incorporated. This he was to do some years later in connection with tax problems, when his original understanding that the Institute was in truth a part of the educational system of the country was sustained. Perhaps the most succinct modern statement of the facts is found in a letter Dr. Oppenheimer wrote to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1955 when the Chief of College Administration proposed to view the Institute as a research institution, and therefore to eliminate it from the directory of institutions of higher learning. The Director wrote that the Institute belonged in the directory for the following reasons: (1) it was chartered as an

educational institution; (2) it was explicitly so designated by legislation in New Jersey; (3) the Institute regards itself as an educational institution; (4) legal counsel takes the position that legislation exempting grants for fellowships is applicable to the Institute's members in part on the ground that it is an educational institution; (5) it was designated in 1946 by the Attorney General as one of the educational institutions approved for the attendance of non-quota immigrant sudents; (6) in 1950 it was designated as an educational institution by the Department of State in sponsoring the exchange-visitor program.[2]

Dr. Oppenheimer's first understanding of the power of the Faculty in the government of the Institute probably came on the eve of that first full Faculty meeting, when Mr. Stewart sent him a copy of a letter which he wrote to Dr. Aydelotte. He took exception to the Faculty's power to judge more than the academic qualifications of a nominee for an academic position. This arose as the recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Harold Cherniss was to be acted upon. He wrote:

> In general, I am not a believer in faculty government as we have experienced it at the Institute. On the relatively important issues this does not matter greatly except for the time consumed. But on the matter of a faculty appointment, a vote by the faculty seems to me to imply more than lies within faculty responsibility, and also a fuller knowledge of circumstances and policies than the Faculty possesses.

He then enumerated some of the factors which were taken for granted when the Faculty voted a new appointment, subject, of course, to the Board's approval:

1. a. A present and prospective income from endowment funds.

An endowment of $500,000 was required in providing for a

faculty member.

b. An adequate office for the new professor, and proper accommodations for the several members who will want to work with him.

2. a. A decision of policy that the new appointment, if made, should be in the particular School that presents the candidate.

b. That the special field of work represented by the candidate is the most desirable field to develop at the Institute.

3. That the candidate has a demonstrated ability in that special field and such other qualifications as fit him for faculty membership.

On all these points, the Director, partly because he is also a member of the Faculty and a Trustee, is in a better position to pass upon the advisability of a new appointment than the Faculty at large. He may wish to consult the Faculty in his own way, but a formal vote by the Faculty, unless made conditional by a reference to financial circumstances (largely Trustee responsibility) and to decisions of general policy (jointly reached by Director, Trustees and Faculty) seems to me vague and ambiguous.

Without decision on these major points, the policy of the Institute is likely to be a combination of drift and pressure. There is seldom an opportune time for the discussion of these questions of general policy. They cannot be considered merely in the abstract, and to discuss them when a specific candidate is under consideration tends to confuse questions of general policy with the particular personality....

As I indicated earlier, I do not intend to raise these questions at the Faculty meeting. In any case, the answers do not lie exclusively in the field of Faculty responsibility. It might be recognized, however, that the answers are assumed and that the discussion of general policy is postponed.[3]

Dr. Aydelotte's answer was wistful:

I wish very much that you would feel free to state to the Faculty your views about the appointment of Cherniss. At Swarthmore I always consulted the Faculty in an informal

way about appointments, taking what I considered to be the weight of opinion rather than any kind of majority vote. Quakers don't believe in voting and in that respect I am a good Quaker. I have the feeling, however, that the Quaker method of proceeding would not work with the Institute Faculty, partly because, alas, they have too little of the spirit of Quakerism.

It was for that reason that I made the reservation which you will remember that I would not promise to recommend to the Trustees any appointment merely because it was recommended by a majority vote of the Faculty. On the other hand, I did promise not to recommend an appointment to which the Faculty was opposed, and I think that policy is sound for the reason that any man who is invited here against the wishes of a substantial majority of the Faculty would have an unhappy time.

Let me repeat that I wish you would raise these points in Faculty meeting, or in some kind of general discussion after one of our Faculty luncheons. If you feel prepared to do the latter, I should be glad to see that an opportunity is provided, but I shall make no move unless I have a signal from you.[4]

The question was brought up, probably by Dr. Oppenheimer. For though the School of Mathematics apparently did not sharply question the qualifications of the School of Humanistic Studies' nominee and approved the appointment, they asked that action on it be deferred until the Faculty could satisfy itself that there were sufficient funds, and that it was the best possible move that could be made for the good of the Institute.[5]

It must be said that the attitude of the School of Mathematics in relation to this appointment differed radically from that heretofore shown in considering recommendations made by the other Schools. The group appeared to have grave misgivings about approving any recommendation but their own. There was, for instance, the episode of the 22nd May, 1945 in the matter of Dr. Viner. (See p. 575) Another occurred

when Professor Earle nominated Dr. Samuel Eliot Morison of Harvard for a professorship. Professor Weyl voiced discontent with the candidate's history of Columbus, and voted against approval. Professor Morse said he admired the maritime histories; Professor Veblen said the Institute needed a historian. Perhaps that was related to the fact that at the same meeting Professor Veblen was urging the approval of Dr. Gödel as a permanent member, not previously voted by the School of Mathematics, and that Professor Weyl was not in sympathy with the move. The ending was happy: both candidates were approved by the Faculty, But Dr. Morison felt he could not leave Harvard, where he had been all his life, and now was within ten years of retiring.[6] The discussion of the nomination of Dr. Homer Thompson in November, 1946 is another case in point. Dr. Thompson was an archaeologist of the Athenian Agora and, it developed under intensive questioning, a ceramist, an epigraphist, a numismatist and an historian. Professors Lowe and Weyl found the testimonials inadequate to support the nomination. Professor Meritt, supported by the School of Economics and Politics, insisted that recent offers from Harvard and Cambridge Universities were sufficient to bespeak the quality of his work; besides that, Professor Earle had solicited advice outside and was able to add strength to the case. While Weyl conceded that the candidate's reputation was well founded as "an excellent field archaeologist, an intelligent critical scholar, and one well aware of the historical implications of his material," he "had made no contribution as yet to the history of ideas." He opined that Dr. Albright, who had been approved by the Faculty in 1945, had "the broader mind, and was more distinguished as linguist and interpreter of ideas." Professor von Neumann

"characterized Dr. Thompson as the equivalent of a first-rate experimentalist." Professor Morse, who had a broader appreciation and knowledge of the humanities than his colleagues, defended subject as the kind of scholar who would "eventually synthesize knowledge on the basis of a great accumulation of facts," and suggested that the School revive its recommendation of Dr. Albright in addition. Here indeed was a threat! Professor Veblen then wanted to know if Dr. Thompson was not properly to be described as a topographist. And while this did not finish the argument, it is interesting to note that Professor Veblen then undertook to say what appointments "could be made":

> They fall into two categories: Those which would aid studies not getting adequate support elsewhere, and those which endeavored to integrate the Institute in the total academic world and to make a greater contribution to contemporary currents of thought.
>
> He added:
>
> The choice might well affect the financial future of the Institute.[7]

The Faculty approved the nomination.

Were these really sound principles for the Institute? Did they suggest perhaps that since mathematics was now well developed in many more American universities than in 1938, when Dr. George Birkhoff had proudly said there were thirty institutions in the country from any one of which might come creditable discoveries in its various branches, the Institute might do less in mathematics than before? Or did it imply that, since Hellenism might not be making great contributions to "contemporary currents of thought," the Institute might devote less of its substance to that field? Would "contemporary currents of thought" be construed

as the broad cultural development of the civilization? Could the members of this small group of men, representing widely scattered fields, speak with knowledge of any one of the intense specializations represented except each in his own one? Did not each man speak essentially as a layman of the interests and accomplishments of the others, except for the community of the School of Mathematics? Indeed, even there a mathematician was not always able to understand a paper in another branch of the subject; usually the more elegant and abstract the statement the more it defied his understanding.

The humanist could seek information about the qualifications of a person recommended for appointment in mathematics, but he would be likely to encounter the monolithic accord which was Dr. Flexner's opportunistic reason for launching the Institute with a School of Mathematics; mathematicians inclined to rate their great neatly in an agreed series; they did not readily step out of line to challenge such judgements. And so the humanist or the social scientist had little chance of appraising a nominee in mathematics, about which few or none of them knew anything. But the mathematician could read any book in a language he understood, and form conclusions about it just as could any layman. Moreover, there was no lack of opportunity open to the mathematician to seek critical judgments about the work of any humanist or economist. For their fields abounded in individualists who followed no leader in making their judgments, whose very growth and development depended in part on a free market in ideas and opinions. This bred freedom to criticize. It was always possible to get an adverse or conditional judgment on anyone's work. Dr. Aydelotte had said that a man chosen against the will of the

majority of the Institute's professors "would have an unhappy time."

The question to be asked here is how anyone could believe even so much as Stewart was willing to grant: that the Faculty of the Institute could vote intelligently on the qualifications of all possible nominees. They could -- and did -- logroll, a practice common to all legislative bodies. But without mutual confidence and respect for each other, and for the interests represented by each of the Schools, they could not fulfill faithfully the trust the Faculty Policy Committee had exacted of Dr. Aydelotte. A university faculty properly should have the right to nominate several men for each position. Here, the aim was to select only the one outstanding scholar or scientist for consideration. Who was to decide that a given mathematician was less distinguished than a named Hellenist? The faculty included men of gracious inclinations, but generally they were not disposed to let these sentiments dominate them when an opportunity appeared to suggest an appointment. For better or worse, the only impersonal criterion in any conflict between the Schools, in the absence of a powerful Director, was the maintenance of the staffing pattern Dr. Flexner had established. The history shows that was frequently determined by circumstances beyond his control.

The suggestion for delay in submitting the recommendation of Dr. Cherniss to the Board was not observed. Both Directors supported the humanist. He did so, Dr. Oppenheimer said, "in spite of the fact that it necessarily involved some impairment in the flexibility of future plans...He felt that the Institute was already deeply committed to research in...Hellenistic studies...It was highly desirable to enrich this work by the appointment of Dr. Cherniss, who is a philosopher as well as

a superlative classical scholar." The appointment was approved.[8]

The first substantial bequest made to the Institute other than the Founders' was announced to the Board at this meeting. Dr. Leon J. Sivian, a physicist associated with the Bell Laboratories at Murray Hill, New Jersey, died on the 23rd September, leaving his residual estate to the Institute in honor of his former teacher, Dr. Floyd K. Richtmyer. The proceeds were to be spent, if possible, for research in physics and biophysics, with the advice of Drs. Hans Bethe, A. H. Compton and von Neumann. If necessary, the bequest could be used for some other purpose within the Institute's discretion. Dr. Oppenheimer reported agreement between the three named that the proceeds should be used for grants to foreign scientists, and, if necessary, to support the "theoretical conferences" then financed by the National Academy should it cease contributing. The corpus of the bequest amounted ultimately to some $411,000.[9]

Dr. Oppenheimer announced to the Trustees that he was inviting Drs. Pauli and Hideki Yukawa to come the following year as visiting professors, and asked and received approval for a five-year appointment for Dr. Abraham Pais, a young Dutch theoretical physicist who first became a member in 1946. Dr. Aydelotte warned that while the Institute's income was meeting current obligations, it might not suffice to cover much more. Mr. Maass countered this, noting that $700,000 in surplus account, and, if need be, $1 million in capital gains, might be spent. Maass' feeling toward Aydelotte was not friendly, but Dr. Oppenheimer's tact provided a graceful ending to the meeting, after he had asked for a special session in December at which he might report his views. He thanked the retiring Director for transmitting an institution in which so many of the problems

had been solved, and the Trustees for their confidence in him. Dr, Aydelotte was voted the title of Director Emeritus.

The 16th October came and went. Dr. Oppenheimer was now Director of the Institute, but so far had received only oral information as to the terms of his appointment. He overcame his embarrassment, and wrote Mr. Maass the particulars as he understood them, asking the Chairman to initial them for reference should any question arise in future when present Trustees might not be available. He did not refer to his status with the Board, except as it related to his responsibilities:

> As Director, I shall be expected, with the advice and consent of the Trustees, to determine academic policy for the Institute as a place of learning and study.[10]

The first item of business at the December meeting was consideration of the recommendations of Dr, Fulton's special committee on disposition of the Gest Oriental Library. Dr. Aydelotte, like Dr. Flexner, had hoped that the Library might become the focus of studies in Chinese literature. But no use had been made of the collection during the past eleven years, either by the Institute or the University. Dr. Oppenheimer wrote Fulton that he had no hope of using it: "we are already scattered far more than makes for a healthy intellectual life."[11] The Committee had recommended that the Library be maintained either by the Institute alone, as in the past, or jointly by the Institute and the University, or sold or given (with the permission of the Rockefeller Foundation) to some institution having a department of Oriental studies. President Dodds had heard that Harvard and Yale were both hopeful of acquiring it, and called on Dr. Oppenheimer to assure him that the University wanted the collection kept in Princeton, since he hoped to make use of it in the

next ten years, even if it had not been possible to do so in the last eleven. Since the Rockefeller grant required that it be kept in Princeton, the Board asked the Director to write President Dodds that it expected the Firestone Library to house the Gest collection when it was completed and that the Institute did not intend to meet the costs of insurance or custodial care after that. But the Board did not relinquish its title to the collection, although as a matter of bookkeeping the approximately $140,000 in cost to the Institute which it represented was written off the books in 1948. The matter was to be reviewed in ten years.[12]

The Director opened his report with the observation that he was beginning "to get a feeling for how things are at the Institute." The minutes continued:

> The Director said he found the School of Mathematics a healthy and flourishing concern. With the very generous help already given to physics, he expressed the hope that that too will flourish.
>
> But in the other schools, perhaps because of a certain insularity in their efforts, the Director felt there are troubles. Very eminent scholars feel that their work is not appreciated; no one seems able to answer the question of why what is going on is going on. The Director saw no solution in blanket rules. He expressed doubt that all members of the School of Economics were in any strict sense interested in or qualified for 'advanced study.' And in the case of the School of Humanistic Studies there are obviously areas of great fruitfulness beyond the Hellenistic studies in which the Institute is already committed.
>
> He was not of the opinion that to found a new professorship was the right thing to do; such a solution to the problem is one of the reasons why the past has so seriously committed the future.
>
> There are many fields, in the Director's opinion, in which a beginning could be made. He pointed to two main classifications of effort: (1) the application of scientific methods to fields in which there is really pioneering, and (2) the

> encouraging of work by men to whom experience in the creative arts has brought deep insight.../He/ outlined no specific program for such efforts. His suggestion was that there be opportunity for exploring new fields outside and beyond the specific areas of the schools, which in some cases have narrow interests. For this purpose he asked that there be members who are not members of the schools.
>
> To accomplish his plan, he asked the Trustees to establish a General Fund of $120,000 on a five-year basis. This should be used for stipends, memberships and work not at present part of the activities pursued at the Institute. He suggested an Advisory Committee for the use of the Fund. He expressed the hope that in this way the Institute may carry out its functions in a more experimental way; and thus a coordinate community of scholars may be created.[13]

The Board approved his plan, and appropriated from surplus $20,000 to be used during the next year. It was to be known as the Director's Fund, and Dr. Fulton pronounced it a vote of confidence in Dr. Oppenheimer. It was a bold and beautiful plan, and promised to enable the Director to break the mold in which the young Institute for Advanced Study was already firmly set.

He now recommended an upward revision in salary and stipend scales, noting this would probably entail an increase in endowments since the budget was just balanced. He requested, and got, an annual appropriation of $10,000 for publication of the books of the humanists, pointing out that while the School of Mathematics had been receiving nearly $5,000 annually for publications, the School of Humanistic Studies had no prior arrangement made for its books, which frequently required underwriting.

He asked the Trustees to advise him on the problem of outside compensation as it was being received by some members of the Faculty, mentioning Professor von Neumann as example. The mathematician had consultancies with government departments, and had just signed a contract

as consultant to Standard Oil Company of New Jersey. The Chair appointed himself, and Messrs. Lehman, Oppenheimer and Weed to examine the problem and report to the Board. Dr. Oppenheimer also sought authority to encourage government fellowships, and received it, but was proscribed from seeking government aid for the Institute itself.[14] In addition, certain actions were taken in personnel which will be discussed later.

In February, the Executive Committee authorized the Director to circulate among the professors a memorandum on outside compensation which had been prepared by Dr. Weed. It read as follows:

> Full-time appointment in the Institute is considered to be compensation for the individual's total teaching and research efforts with assumption of such academic duties as may be assigned to him by the Director or by the Board of Trustees. A full-time member of the staff shall accept no other compensation for his personal services, except as follows:
>
> (a) Royalties on scientific books, monographs, atlases, etc.
>
> (b) Honoraria for occasional lectures delivered at other institutions.
>
> (c) Honoraria for occasional short-term investigations for the great philanthropic foundations.
>
> (d) Consultant's fees for services rendered to the federal government, where such service does not exceed 30 days per annum, where the field of consultation is in accord with the research interests of the individual, and where the duties of consultation do not invade the research-time and research-interests of the individual when in residence at the Institute.
>
> Before the acceptance of remuneration in any of the four categories above, the consent of the Director must be obtained by the individual on full-time appointment.[15]

Answers from six professors were sent to the members of the Committee. All professed agreement with the basic principles; Professor von Neumann most completely in the following:

> Employment in a full research institution like the Institute for Advanced Study should impose on the appointee a general obligation...to regulate his life and intellectual interests at all times so that the research interests are the dominant ones.

But he objected to any administrative controls to assure the observance and added: "I think that the way in which the official vacations are spent should not be regulated." He saw a positive need for the professors in mathematics and physics to maintain "a certain contact with the strivings and problems of the world around us," although such activities should always be in accord with the individual's interests and never "invade his research time and interest."[16] Unlike the other five who answered, (Professors Earle, Morse, Panofsky, Thompson and Weyl) von Neumann did not mention the need for an increase in salary. The others agreed with his position that administrative controls were unnecessary, that the best restraint lay in the individual's conscience and integrity.

The responses left Dr. Weed optimistic, pleasantly surprised at the general agreement. He explained to Dr. Oppenheimer that he was willing to allow services to the federal government because that represented a unique individual responsibility. But, he said, "I should not be willing to extend this function of consultation to private commercial enterprises, as I feel there would be no line of demarcation between the acceptable and the unacceptable." He believed that another item of exception, or a change in wording, might resolve all differences.[17] But Dr. Oppenheimer understood the Faculty's reactions better. According to the minutes, he merely reported to the Board that "The memorandum...had been circulated to the Faculty, and the feeling of the Director was that its purpose was thus accomplished."[18]

There is no reason to think it accomplished more than Professor Veblen's hope to keep the School of Mathematics confined to puremathematics; when he was confronted by the possibility of losing Professor von Neumann to Harvard or Chicago or Massachusetts Institute of Technology to build a computer, he yielded and became von Neumann's chief support. It seemed to be irrelevant whether the need to maintain contact "with the strivings of the world," or what mathematicians have said about themselves, actuated von Neumann: i.e., that while the young man devotes his genius to abstractions, he turns to applications in his more mature years. One thing was true; the Faculty was not going to submit to the Director's control in these matters.

In October, 1947, Professor Alexander, who had been on leave of absence since February, moved to change his status from professor to permanent member at half-pay until his retirement, retaining existing arrangements for his pension, which were extremely favorable. His reason was that he found the duties of professor interfered with his work. Dr. Oppenheimer met the situation sympathetically; he chose to believe that Alexander might change his mind, and said:

> There is nothing in fact in Alexander's contract that requires his attendance at meetings or the performance of administrative duties.../Dr. Oppenheimer/ was very reluctant to believe that a professor could not follow his own separate path without the burden of administrative details.

He suggested a leave of absence, and said that a replacement was in order. The School approved of his attitude.[19] Dr. Oppenheimer presented the matter to the Board, suggesting the same flexibility he had shown, which clearly implied the right of the Professor to change his mind. On Mr. Maass' motion, the Board approved Alexander's appointment as permanent

member at half pay.[20]

Alexander's action perturbed Professor Veblen. Clearly he had relied upon his protégé to succeed him in administering the School of Mathematics and influencing the full Faculty. Thus the School of Mathematics met again in a few days, and recommended Dr. Dean Montgomery, thirty-eight years old and a topologist, for a five-year membership, at full or part-time, according to his wish.[21] Montgomery had taken his doctoral degree at Iowa State University from which Veblen had graduated. He had come to the Institute as National Research Council Fellow in 1934-1935, when Veblen was on the Board which administered these fellowships. In the intervening years he had attained a full professorship at Smith College, leaving in 1946 for an associate professorship at Yale. The Director emphasized Dr. Montgomery's comparative youth, (he was then thirty-eight years old) and commented that "the School feels it knows him better than anyone else who has been appointed, and strongly endorses his work." The Board approved the appointment.[22]

But Dr. Montgomery wanted security and a full-time position at the Institute, and so the School recommended him for a permanent membership. Dr. Oppenheimer referred to it as a sort of "interim professorship" since it was contemplated he would become a professor in about five years. This caused a discussion of nomenclature in the Faculty which resulted in a request to the Standing Committee to study and report on terminology with especial reference to distinctions between temporary and permanent memberships, and between those who had policy-making functions and those who did not.[23] Dr. Oppenheimer presented the recommendation for the changed status of Montgomery to the Executive Committee as in the

nature of "an associate professorship." The Committee approved him as a permanent member, and emphasized that no additional commitment was involved.[24] Here was a second instance within a few days in which the Director recommended a fluid position, and encountered a different idea in the governing body. In the case of Montgomery, the Faculty seemed in agreement with the expectations as to his future; it was in the Executive Committee that opposition to a fluid position appeared. Professor Veblen was the only man beside Oppenheimer present at both meetings. Was he responsible?

But Dr. Oppenheimer was correct about Professor Veblen's intention to train Montgomery in his own art: the administration of the School of Mathematics and leadership in the Faculty. For by the end of 1948 Dr. Montgomery was attending "by invitation" the meetings of the School of Mathematics, and observing the example of the master.

Dr. Oppenheimer sent the following memorandum on terminology to the professors:

> At the meeting of the Faculty on February 2nd, it was decided that the Standing Committee would explore the questions of nomenclature of members of the Institute, with two substantive points in mind: the distinction between temporary and permanent memberships, and the question of the right and duty of sharing in policy making. The Standing Committee met on March 11th, and its views were transmitted to the Faculty at luncheon on March 15th. No contrary opinions were expressed; I am presenting a summary.
>
> (1) There will be four general categories for people at the Institute: permanent members, members, assistants and staff. The permanent members include the Faculty and all other members who have academic appointments covering the whole of their career. Members include all others (for instance, those in the past characterized as visiting professors) who are here for shorter, less determinate periods, for the purpose of pursuing their own studies, either alone

or in concert. Assistants to professors have as an important part of their duties the carrying out of work of specific interest to the professor in question. The staff includes non-academic personnel.

(2) Among the permanent members, the Faculty have as their responsibility the formulation of policy for the Institute, and for the schools to which they are attached. Their income is taxable, as is also that of assistants and staff. The stipends of permanent members, who are not on the Faculty, and of other members, are non-taxable, since they 'perform no services' for the Institute.

(3) No member, except the Faculty, and no emeritus professor, has either the obligation or the privilege of determining Institute policy. The Faculty has the privilege of consulting with members and emeritus professors whenever this may be agreed between them.

(4) Should a professor desire to support the work of a man without requiring of him any specific assistance, he may designate him as a member. The title 'assistant' shall refer only to cases where service is rendered to the professor.[25]

Clearly the Committee recognized the need for members of long-standing in the academic appointments of the Institute. But they were careful to keep the designation of Faculty member for permanent professors who alone had the duty and responsibility to make policy. Nevertheless, it was a gain of the kind Aydelotte had sought to recognize:the need for escalation in academic appointments. Implicit in their recommendations was the competitive status of the young member on his way to a professorship. As Dr. Birkhoff had suggested, he could be called by another institution, leaving the Institute the choice of keeping or letting him go.

The will of the Faculty to eliminate professors emeriti from Faculty duties was made quite clear. Whether the Committee knew the exact terms of Dr. Aydelotte's resolution enabling him to publish their status as emeritus in the Bulletin is not known, but it would seem that

they realized it would not support a move to eliminate their participation now. (See p. 570)

Early in 1949 the Executive Committee decided that the Institute would continue to pay Professor Einstein his full salary during his lifetime. Almost immediately the Finance Committee reported that Professor and Mrs. Veblen were deeding their home on Battle Road to the Institute, with the hope that the Board would increase their pensions and that the house could be converted to a club for Faculty and members. The Board accepted the gift with thanks, and left arrangements to the Finance Committee.[26] There was an increase in Professor Veblen's pension, but the house was rented for a period, and then sold.

The professors of the Institute were gratified that, insofar as experience showed, the Board was willing to have them continue to use their offices after retirement. In April, 1950 Dr. Oppenheimer secured permission to budget for assistants to retired professors who needed them in their work, but with the understanding that they could not, as active professors could, convert the salary to a stipend for a member.

Early in 1948 the Director proposed that a Committee on Physics be set up within the School of Mathematics which would operate with the same "authority" in its field as the mathematicians had in theirs. This was agreed to, and Professors Einstein and von Neumann were appointed to serve with Dr. Oppenheimer. At the same time it was agreed that when the Committee invited such distinguished professors as Dr. Bohr and Dr. Pauli, their salaries would be paid from the budget and not out of the stipend funds, of which the Physics Committee disposed $15,000 and the

mathematicians $40,000 at that time.[27] But the "authority" seemed subtly to erode as the months passed. Dr. Oppenheimer reported the selections of the Committee to the School, and that early sufficed for the record. But gradually the School Secretary began to note the mathematicians' "agreement" or "approval" of the actions, and such notes ultimately became a regular accompaniment of the announcements of the Committee's actions. Soon also all distinction between physicists and mathematicians as to stipends awarded disappeared in the School's minutes, as it had in 1937, although the appropriations were separate.

Dr. Oppenheimer had recourse to the Director's Fund to experiment with possible changes in the Institute's pattern. The freedom this promised was to suffer from the reporting of an interview which he gave to a writer of the New York Times, in which he expressed too freely, perhaps, his own hopes, or was misrepresented by the writer. He was quoted as saying:

> 'We have been given a fund to use in experimenting in two directions.- First we expect to invite people who have had experience outside the academic field -- in business or politics, for example -- and who have reached a point where they have something to communicate, to take a year and write them down. Second, we are setting up a standing offer to help explore areas which have hitherto not been regarded as subject to scientific investigation.'

The reporter continued his own account as follows:

> As another part of the stepped-up interchange between the Institute and the outside world, Oppenheimer plans to have fewer life members and more people coming in for a semester or a year of specific study....
>
> Suppose you had funds at your disposal based on a $21,000,000 endowment, with the prospect of getting more by convincing benefactors of the need. Suppose you could use this fund to

> invite as your salaried house-guests the world's greatest scholars, scientists and creative artists -- your favorite poet, the author of the book that interested you so much, the European physicist with whom you would like to mull over some speculations about the nature of the universe.
>
> That's precisely the set-up that Oppenheimer enjoys. He can indulge every interest and curiosity, because his interests and curiosities correspond with the whole range of science and culture, and that coincides in turn with the scope of the Institute.[28]

Though there was no appearance of a reaction at the time, there could be little doubt that neither the Faculty nor the Trustees were of the same mind as the Director was thus reported to be. Did he intend to reduce the Faculty? Had he unlimited power to bring whom he would to the Institute, according to his intellectual whim? Could he call in non-academic persons? Had he presumed to say that the "interests and curiosities" of the Institute's Faculty corresponded with the whole range of science and culture? It is unlikely he thought so, even as a potential; as for the Faculty as it existed, they were highly specialized scholars and scientists. Dr. Oppenheimer had not taken the precaution, apparently, of having the article submitted to him before it was published.

A second indiscretion of the same kind followed in November, when he gave an interview to a reporter from Time Magazine. In this, which was evidently based on a long and leisurely conversation, the reporter dealt intimately with details of the Director's personal life, and only incidentally and sometimes humorously, sometimes sharply, with the Institute. However, even though he was reported as saying Professor Einstein was a "a landmark, not a beacon" to modern physicists; even though one heard that the Institute was a place where men could "sit and

think," but one could only be sure of the sitting, Dr. Oppenheimer described the Institute as having, in the light of the war's effect on the intellectual life of Europe, "something of the special glow of a mediaeval monastery." And again he spoke of the wondrous possibilities it offered for intellectual variety and fluidity in ideas. He was quoted as viewing the Institute as

> 'an intellectual hotel' -- a place for transient thinkers to rest, recover and refresh themselves before continuing on their way....Oppenheimer wanted a continuous world traffic in ideas. For such scholars as Denmark's Bohr and Britain's Dirac and Toynbee, Oppenheimer hoped to work out periodic repeat performances, so that they would never lose touch either with the United States or with home base....[29]

Such a characterization was likely to wound the sensibilities of the Faculty, whose members would have like to hear it said that they were the attraction in that "international hotel."

That it did was shown when the Director was constrained to refuse an interview with a reporter from the Saturday Evening Post in 1949, and with another from Colliers in 1950, on the ground that the Faculty opposed further publicity. Mrs. Leary corresponded for Dr. Oppenheimer with the first and said that the Faculty believed there had been too much publicity about the Institute. In the second, Dr. Oppenheimer himself answered; he had taken an earlier request to the Faculty, which he said,

> in many matters acts as a sort of custodial body. They expressed the very strong opinion that it would be undesirable to have anything written about the Institute at that time, and asked me to do what I could to discourage the writing of the article, and urged me under no circumstances to collaborate. This seemed to me an obligation that I ought to take quite seriously, irrespective of my own views as to the general virtue of some form of accountability, even on the part of a quite private institution....

> Under the circumstances, I would find it incompatible with my obligation to my colleagues to offer you cooperation in the writing of an article whose very existence they would deplore.[30]

The Director's hopeful statement that increased salaries and grants would require additional endowment fell on deaf ears. Mr. Leidesdorf had spoken about the investment problem: the Institute was earning 4%, but more income was needed. He said he was considering selling governments and some preferred stock, but hoped to minimize risk in reinvesting the money. The Founders' estates were now fully distributed; in April, 1948, the Board released the executors. It was on this occasion that Mr. Maass revealed that Mr. Leidesdorf had modestly made a hidden gift to the Institute of $50,000 in declining his legal fee as executor.[31]

Two factors helped to avert the threatened financial stringency during the early years of Dr. Oppenheimer's administration. The first was an increase in grants from the foundations, and government contracts. In 1947 the income from such outside sources amounted to $82,000. It grew to $170,000 in 1949, then diminished for two years, and grew again until it reached $181,000 in 1952. The second factor was the more important. It was Mr. Leidesdorf's brilliant success in managing the portfolio to increase simultaneously capital gains and income. Income grew from $643,000 in 1948 to $848,000 in 1951. In the same period, the market value of the portfolio rose from $17,511,000 to $21,000,000. Meanwhile, through the careful management of the Director, annual savings in income grew, and the total surplus account rose from $635,000 to $1,055,000. It was small wonder that the Director expressed his appreciation to the Treasurer at the annual meeting in 1949, and thanked him and

his committee for their excellent work. At the same time he announced the Einstein Award, a gift of the Rosa and Lewis Strauss Memorial Fund established in honor of Professor Einstein on his seventieth birthday. Fifteen thousand dollars was to be given every three years to men who made outstanding contributions to knowledge in mathematics and the physical sciences; it was to be administered by the Institute. The eligibility of mathematicians to receive such an award must have been gratifying to them, foreclosed as they were from being considered for Nobel prizes.[32]

Perhaps because of the financial stringency at the beginning of his term, Dr. Oppenheimer managed to achieve a measure of deliberation in the recruitment of younger mathematicians and physicists. Judging by past history, this could only have been true if Professor Veblen enjoyed a degree of confidence that no one was competing with him in the spending of available funds. Dr. Oppenheimer confined his first efforts to calling in for periods of a semester or a year several distinguished physicists and many younger men as members. He did not move to gather together a small permanent group until later. During his first two years, Dirac, Bohr, E. Hylleraas, Pauli, Hideki Yukawa, G. E. Uhlenbeck, and some younger men of distinction were in residence at various times. In the latter group were Freeman Dyson, George Placzek and Chen Ning Yang. But the first permanent member of the physics staff was Dr. Pais, the young Dutch physicist who had spent his first post-doctoral years in the Dutch underground, where, as a fixed contact point, he devoted most of his time to working intensively in physics, and to good effect. In the second year of his five-year membership, young Pais received and

declined several attractive offers, and Dr. Oppenheimer secured his appointment as a permanent member.[33]

Meanwhile, the School of Mathematics was humming with activity. The Director reported to the Board in April, 1948, that the number of members coming to the School of Mathematics in the next year would increase over the current year by 60%. Of them a number were physicists, some, he said, "coming for a year or two of research and advanced study before going into teaching, aside from the traditional pattern of members coming...to carry out their own plans." Dr. Flexner's heart would have been warmed by this report, which exemplified the Institute as he had conceived it would be. Professor Veblen added a rare note of commendation about the "scientific work going on in physics during the year... in the joint Princeton-Columbia-Institute weekly seminars which have been extraordinarily popular and stimulating."[34]

But the Director was distressed by the lack of any feeling of solidarity between the professors in the two non-mathematical Schools, and the consequent imbalance between them and the School of Mathematics within the Faculty. And so, with tact and patience, and a tough decision or two, he succeeded soon in reorganizing those Schools into one. Of course he did it with the agreement of the Faculty, although he acted with vigor at the end. It involved first the elimination of economics: indeed, that might even have been a condition precedent. But it was apparent from the beginning that he was impressed by the views of most of the rest of the Faculty, who felt that the three economists were "men of affairs," and did not really belong at the Institute. The School of Mathematics in particular took the position that only men in the

academic world could contribute to "basic" knowledge, or bring prestige to an academic institution. And in truth, the Faculty was entitled to deplore the violation of the full-time principle in Professor Riefler's contrived non-paid position at National Bureau of Economic Research, where what was done redounded only to the credit of the Bureau and the group of sponsors, and not to Professor Riefler or the Institute.

As Dr. Oppenheimer took over the reins, Professor Riefler was at the point of decision. Hillside was closed, and the remains of his projected studies in finance were being carried on within the Bureau itself. His family obligations were eased. He still wished above all to do the kind of research he had proposed to Dr. Flexner in 1935 and 1936, using a small group of people to gather data collected from sources by other institutions, located within or near the Institute in Princeton, and having a few colleagues with him in the Institute to carry on the theoretical studies resulting from the analyses developed by this group. Early in November he and Dr. Oppenheimer talked about the matter with complete clarity and mutual understanding. Manifestly the funds for the needed staff were not in the Institute, and Dr. Oppenheimer found Mr. Stewart quite uninterested in helping to make them available. Both men, in fact, looked with equanimity at the prospect that Professor Riefler would soon accept one of the offers being made to him by various outside interests. It was in these circumstances that the Director reported to the Board in December, 1947.

Riefler did accept a position; he left effective the 1st May, 1948 for work with the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, taking leave without pay from the Institute. At the end

of two years, the Director asked him what his intentions were, and Riefler left it up to Oppenheimer. It was thus agreed that the economist had resigned.[35]

The importance and significance of Riefler's program of studies in finance was made clear to Dr. Oppenheimer when in 1949 the economist resigned as the Institute's nominee to the directors of the National Bureau of Economic Research. The Executive Director wrote as follows:

> /Dr. Riefler's/ active participation...in the work of the Bureau has been a major influence in much of its work, especially in the field of finance. The leadership he gave to the Financial Research Program and to the execution of the many studies from it to date stands out as an exceptional contribution to economic research.[36]

A further appraisal of the importance of those studies in their substance and method was given in a report of the Executive Director in 1956:

> The program has borne fruit in a variety of ways: first of all, in distinctive contributions to basic knowledge.... /which/ has been and is being used increasingly in the making of public and private policies, in legislation, in judicial decisions, in the operations of financial institutions, and in the teaching of economics, banking, and finance in universities and colleges throughout the United States and abroad. Textbooks in money, banking and finance published in the United States have drawn extensively on the findings. Indeed, many that have been published since the war are based so heavily on the Bureau's work that they could not have been written without it.
>
> The contributions, however, go beyond the additions to basic knowledge. Universities and research groups have adopted the National Bureau's methods and techniques in studying finance. Public agencies have taken over and continued on a current basis data that the Bureau began in its studies. Members of the research staffs of banks and other financial institutions, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and of the Federal Reserve Banks, of banks in foreign countries, and of many government and private agencies, have visited the Bureau and drawn upon the experience of its staff

> and utilized its findings and methods. Many economists working at the Bureau on studies in finance have received training that strengthened them when they transferred to responsible positions in universities, government agencies and private institutions.[37]

But Dr. Oppenheimer did not know these things, nor did the Board, for it is doubtful that Riefler's plans and need for a budget were ever submitted to it by Dr. Flexner in those years of stringency after the purchase of the Institute's acreage, or by Dr. Aydelotte, although it is clear that when he first requested Dr. Willitts for funds for economics in 1940 it was with special mention of Riefler's need for a small fact-gathering staff at Princeton, which was evidently considered an improper basis for consideration by the Foundation's Board.[38]

Professor Stewart and perhaps even Professor Warren were somewhat influenced, in all probability, by the difficulties which inhered in the senior man's position as Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation in relation to the kind of economic research Riefler had wanted to do. For it had been a long-standing principle of the Rockefeller foundations to divorce themselves from direct contact with the researches which their money financed. And so, quite inevitably, as Stewart had made clear in his report of 1943 to Dr. Aydelotte, he had turned toward the humanities, in which, as one expressed it, he was an "amateur." Nevertheless, one of the humanists at the University pronounced him to be more of a humanist than any other man on the Institute's staff.

He was quite occupied with the Rockefeller Foundation, so that in April, 1948 he asked Professor Warren for a memorandum on the School's activity in economic research. In part Professor Warren said:

> ...The School of Economics has taken a wide view of its range of interests. Economics describes mankind in the act of making its living; but mankind engaged in making a living is a complicated being. He makes his living within the framework of social culture and a given political system. On the other hand, specific economic functioning is highly technical...Economics involves certain relations to space and time; no economy is exclusively national, and economic institutions have deep roots in the past.
>
> Hence we have considered as belonging to our field such diverse studies as...the measurement of changes in interest rates...Blackmur's biography of Henry Adams -- cultural history...[the study] of air law...the theory of social equilibrium...At first glance these subjects seem remote from each other; it was believed, and events have demonstrated, that they were integrated. The American educational system contains no other institution purposively expressing this theory of integration, but the School is persuaded that its concept is sound.[39]

This was, indeed, a broad view -- even for an institutionalist -- as broad as the cultural development of civilization. It surely bore little relation to the economics which Dr. Flexner had envisioned. He had made his ideals and ideas abundantly clear in appointing the staff at considerable cost to himself. And yet, as part author of the Rockefeller doctrine of dissociation from the actual management of or participation in researches in the social sciences financed by the foundations, he must have realized the element of conflict in Stewart's position as a professor performing with the aid of a Rockefeller grant. Certainly Flexner did not spare the Chairman of the Board when Willitts later asked whether he was free to discuss the application for the grant with Mr. Stewart, but told Willitts to consult the economist freely. It is possible that Flexner felt Stewart should be the judge whether his two positions were incompatible, and that he probably did not foresee Stewart's election to the chairmanship at the time he succeeded in appointing the

the economist to the Faculty.[40]

In November, 1948, Dr. Oppenheimer reported to the Board on the probability that the social sciences would leave the Institute with the resignation of Riefler and the retirement of Professor Stewart in 1950. He apparently found no one opposed to the prospect. In a separate memorandum he set forth his suggestions for possible substitutes: studies in methodologies, studies in jurisprudence, and the possibility that ad hoc panels of experts might be called in to study and report on situations in crisis in the social sciences. However, he saw no professor at the Institute capable of acting in future as the focal point in the latter two programs. It became clear that Mr. Strauss felt studies of critical problems in the social sciences might "affect the scholarly atmosphere of the Institute," a possibility which he evidently did not favor. The Director admitted that such studies might "mean a break from purely scholarly work."[41] Clearly there was no stomach here for the daring and dangerous studies Flexner had felt impelled to attack.

A few days later he met with the economists and Dr. Viner, and with Professors Cherniss, von Neumann and Weyl to discuss the future of the School of Economics and Politics. The minutes of that meeting are not available. But it seemed clear that Professor Stewart was not fully aware of the conclusions the Director had voiced to the Trustees, since he submitted a list of members for appointment: Dr. Alan Gregg, who wanted to write on psychology, Simon Kuznets, economist, and W. W. Rostow, and wished to discuss also permanent appointments. But Professor Stewart had waited too long to suggest the perpetuation of economics as

an Institute activity.[42]

Dr. Oppenheimer found Professor Earle's work of value. Early he drew a distinction between Earle and the economists, referring in complimentary terms to the historian's seminars as productive of stimulating concepts. His method of work consisted in selecting a subject, then to travel about consulting on its development, and inviting participants, who were largely supported by the great foundations. Professor Earle brought some very memorable scholars to the Institute in this way, among whom were Professor Ernest Llewellyn Woodward, eminent English historian, Dr. Jean Gottmann, French geographer, and Arnold Toynbee.

Dr. Oppenheimer had prepared the Faculty for the reorganization on several occasions, and had reached an understanding with the professors in the two Schools. Early in 1949 he spoke to the Faculty as follows:

> From the point of view of balance as well as from the functional standpoint, the Director felt the present administrative set-up inadequate. The two Schools are small in comparison with the School of Mathematics; the present growth of physics will only emphasize this. Particularly in the consideration of applications to membership the unification of the two Schools would be helpful. Many applications now fall between the two schools, and for practical purposes the faculties of both Schools advise on these. That both Schools use the historical method serves further to point up the fact that there are important elements of unity between them.[43]

He suggested that joint meetings of the School of Economics and Politics and the School of Humanistic Studies should be held. A month later he reported that two such sessions had taken place, that the unification had been accomplished, and that Professor Earle was the executive officer of the School.[44] Meanwhile, several possible titles were considered, and the Board approved the name which represented best the bond between

the Schools: Historical Studies. The unification was conceded to be contructive by all concerned; the finest result was the development of social and intellectual ties between the professors. It improved the balance within the Faculty, and aided the Director in the administration of the Director's Fund. At first he was frank to say that that Fund would not be needed in the School of Mathematics, but only for those who might belong as members in the School of Historical Studies. It is doubtful that he could have worked out some of his most fruitful innovations without first accomplishing the unification.[45]

In his drift into the humanities Professor Stewart had invited as a member in the School of Economics and Politics (1944-1946) Professor Richard P. Blackmur of Princeton, literary critic and writer, to enable him to complete work on a biography of Henry Adams. When Dr. Oppenheimer came to Princeton Professor Stewart had invited Messrs. T. S. Eliot and Kenneth Burke to carry on the tradition thus established. To these the Director added Francis Fergusson, literary critic and writer, a classmate at the School of Ethical Culture in New York City, and a friend through the years. The Director paid their stipends. With Professor Blackmur Mr. Fergusson inaugurated the seminars in literary criticism which were named for Dean Christian Gauss, and which have continued as a valued institution at the University. Other literators invited by the Director and financed out of his Fund were Erich Auerbach, Ernst Curtius and Amiya Chakravarty, each of whom came for a semester during 1949-1951. The professors of the School of Humanistic Studies seemed to find little in common with any of these men, several of whom, notably Eliot and

Fergusson, found their intellectual and social associations at the University. Indeed, the Institute's professors found little pleasure in the company and little pride in the accomplishments of Dr. Arnold Toynbee, who was occasionally at the Institute on a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation in the years 1947-1953. They inclined rather to the scientific attitude, and mistrusted the moral interpretation of history, it has been said.

Toward the end of Mr. Eliot's single semester at the Institute, the Director told the Faculty he intended to appoint the critic to a five-year term as member, with the understanding that he would return to Princeton at intervals during that period. The Faculty declined to lend its sanction, even when the Director said he wished to facilitate cooperation with Professor Blackmur. If Mr. Eliot returned, it would not be as a member of the School of Humanistic Studies; even though the Director chose to pay him. The Faculty opposed the Institute's entering the field of literature and particularly, it seems, when the effort was to cooperate with Professor Blackmur. Though the Director told the Board later that he intended to invite Eliot to return and encountered no opposition, Mr. Eliot did not return.[46]

The Director was later to say he could not afford to invite any member who would be unacceptable to one of the Schools as a member. This was curious, considering the terms upon which he had proposed and won the Director's fund. Did he mean what one of the professors of the University meant when he said that Mr. Eliot found his only intellectual and social contacts at the University, and rarely appeared at the Institute? A sensitive man might find his peace of mind disturbed by such a circumstance.

It is hard to imagine that a group of sophisticated and cultured scholars would be blind to the amenities due a guest, or so remote from humane values as to make a visitor feel unwelcome; it is even more difficult to believe that they sought to influence the Director by neglecting his appointee, though of course, the professors were free to do as they pleased.

With improving financial prospects, it was natural that the Schools should begin to consider the appointment of younger men to succeed those who were retiring. The School of Mathematics had toward the end of 1948 five active professors; the School of Historical Studies had seven. In the first, two would be gone by July, 1951: Professor Weyl by retirement; Professor Siegel by resignation to Germany. In the second, two were to be gone by July, 1950: Professor Stewart through retirement and Professor Warren by death in March, 1950. At this time the School of Mathematics added another young mathematician, a Norwegian, Atle Selberg, a specialist in number theory, who had been a member (1947-1948) and was now about to take a permanent position elsewhere. The School agreed he would be an admirable addition, but there was a quiet debate as to whether he should be inducted

> as a permanent member with a tax-free stipend of about $9,000 in a status like that of Dr. Montgomery, or as a Faculty member with a taxable salary of $15,000. Professor Veblen tentatively suggested the latter, Dr. Oppenheimer equally tentatively the former.

On the 9th November the School unanimously recommended Selberg's appointment on the same basis as Montgomery's. The Faculty and the Board agreed.[47] It looked more and more as though the flexibility which Dr. Aydelotte had so hoped for was at hand.

The recommendation went to the Board with a vita written by Professor Siegel. After noting three fine discoveries to Selberg's credit, he said:

> Selberg is already thirty-one years old. Perhaps he will never again do mathematical work comparable to his three discoveries, but he has already his place in the history of science in the 20th century.

This observation is bound to provoke thought about the purposes of the Institute. What if Dr. Selberg's fruitful period for discovery in pure mathematics were past? How would he spend the next thirty-four years of his active professorship in pursuits most useful to mathematics, the Institute and himself? When Dean Fine, Professor Eisenhart and Professor Veblen had inducted youngsters into the Department of Mathematics as preceptors because they gave promise of distinguished work, they taught and researched at the University, and their prospects were that they would continue to do so there or elsewhere during their active lives. But at the School of Mathematics as it had developed, not even the obligation to extend a helping hand to the few younger postdoctoral workers was recognized as due from a professor, except, perhaps, by Professor Weyl. What would a young man like Selberg do in such circumstances?

Furthermore, what obligation did the Institute, as a part of the educational system of the country, have toward the oncoming generation of men and women who were planning academic careers? If such a man as Selberg were through with constructive researches, did not his value in future lie in his relationship to students and young scholars, in inspiring them to emulate his earlier performance? Dr. George Birk-

hoff gave an answer when he proudly assayed fifty years of American mathematics in 1938, and spoke with all the fervor of an evangel:

> It is our duty to take an active and thoughtful part in the elementary mathematical instruction of our colleges, universities and technical schools, as well as to participate in the higher phases. To these tasks we must bring a broad mathematical point of view and a fine enthusiasm. Insofar as possible we must actively continue as competent scholars and research workers. Only by so doing can we play our proper part....
>
> It is not enough for the exceptional man whose early work has led to professional recognition, to take thenceforth an easy-going attitude; such a man should continue with the devotion of a leader in a great cause. Furthermore, we ought all to provide our share of first-rate elementary teaching, by which we justify our privileged positions in immediate practical terms. If we do these things, mathematics in America will rise to still greater heights and there will appear among us mathematical figures comparable to the greatest in the past.[48]

Dr. Flexner had envisioned a continuing and close scholarly cooperation between the Department of Mathematics and the School, believing that the influence of both faculties would be felt by the University's advanced students as well as the Institute's members, whom he thought of as young Fellows or grantees at the beginning of their academic careers. Now that the School was quite remote from Fine Hall and its faculty, the tendency to regard the younger men and women as important diminished. In the early years of the Institute it was said that Princeton -- the Department and the School -- was the center of American mathematics, and the world center of pure mathematics. Together the two faculties, acting ideally as one, could easily cover all branches of current interest in the complex field, especially with the capacity of both, but particularly the Institute, to call in as visitors specialists in other branches for changing patterns of work and interest. But

soon Professor Veblen's driving ambition became apparent; the Institute must have the most distinguished men as Faculty members and visitors in the Institute. It is interesting that the Department declined to join in inviting to Princeton the three eminent visitors to Harvard's tri-centennial celebration in 1936, when Mr. Hardy taxed the School with wanting a "monopoly."

Professor Veblen had freely admitted that the School placed its emphasis on arrivées in inviting members with the idea of avoiding Nirvana, which he had not envisioned as a threat when he projected his institute for mathematical research in 1924. While this admission was made to re-inforce his demand for many members, it must be said that the visitors got an opportunity to partake of a royal mathematical feast. They emerged refreshed, with their interest and ambition revivified. Not infrequently they returned to better salaries or even to better positions because of the distinction of having spent a year at the Institute. Professors who were not interested in research also benefited in these ways. Those who were working in a specialty which interested a professor of the Institute frequently found the fruits of collaboration quite rewarding. But the contribution to be made by the School to younger postdoctoral members was quite evidently a secondary consideration: witness the lack of National Research Council registrants in 1937 when they were called upon to elect to study with either the Department or the School, and not both.

To return to the way in which the young Professor Selberg might spend those last active thirty-four years if his period of discovery were past in 1948, other mathematicians and theoretical scientists have given

their answers. Usually they found something else to do which interested them, and where they were useful. One counseled a President of the United States in scientific matters, and devoted efforts to collegiate educational reforms. Another became president of a university, and later busied himself working for the reform of secondary education. Dr. Oppenheimer administered the Institute for Advanced Study, and advised and consulted government agencies on scientific problems in his field. Professor Veblen turned his not inconsiderable powers toward directing the affairs of the Institute, having completed his last successful major scholarly contribution to mathematics just as he came to the Institute. His ambition collided with Flexner's necessities, and Flexner retired. He influenced the Institute's policies largely through persuasion in the beginning of Dr. Aydelotte's term, and later, by compulsion. Dr. Weyl presented a different picture; he was interested, and was a power, in mathematics until he died. But his interests were catholic; he was primarily a scholar.

Indeed, a strange and somewhat perilous paradox existed within the Institute as Flexner organized it, and remains. Youthful appointments to the Faculty can not be made in the non-mathematical subjects. There, regardless of the hypercritical attitude of the School of Mathematics toward the other School's nominations to the Faculty, the only possible candidate has behind him years of study; he must be erudite, as only great preparation crowned by talent and high intelligence can make him. His learning must be expressed in books; no teacher, regardless of how superb might be his contribution through training others, could be considered for an Institute appointment in the humanities

unless he had produced writings upon which his capacity might be judged. His mode of life was not, then, so different when he came to the Institute. Of the first group in those schools of which we are speaking, only Professor Panofsky and Professor Riefler had Weyl's interest in training the young scholar of the future, although Professor Meritt occasionally taught a class at the University, from which he had graduated, and also accepted occasional visiting lectureships elsewhere. One must say to be truthful that when a scholarly man is confronted by the opportunity to research, with only an indefinite obligation to guide postdoctoral students, he favors the researches and neglects the training function.

But to return to the paradox: it was simply that the professors in mathematics who became middle-aged and older in the Institute's service tended to devote themselves to administrative affairs; the nominees of the non-mathematical schools were already mature scholars, and so deeply aware of the shortness of time to do what they had planned that they spent little time and thought, beyond taking care of their own immediate needs, on other problems. Nor did they winnow the fields to attract workers to the Institute, unless they were going to be of direct interest to their views.

In the intricate game of academic politics, the difference in ages gives to the mathematical group a superior opportunity to further their own discipline. Moreover, the humanist faces no Nirvana; he is used to working alone, as mathematicians are also reputed to be. Nor does he depend for the prestige attaching to his position upon the mature specialists he may be able to bring in as members, as a general thing.

It might be better if he were not intrinsically such an individualist, but his nature is understandable, since his disciplines are well established, and he is not busy building to a new and indispensable status in the culture.

In the sense that the Institute is part of the educational structure of the country, as Flexner planned it would be, an academic appointment in the School of Mathematics today may diminish the opportunities for training students to a greater extent than a similar one in the humanities, although to the extent that both Schools tend to invite only the more mature members, both do so. In the sense that the School of Mathematics is able to recruit younger men than the School of Humanistic Studies, who in the nature of things have more time and a stronger group interest in promoting the prestige of their calling, the Institute seems to be required in future to continue to spend more of its resources on mathematicians than on any of the theoretical sciences or all the historical studies.

The escalation to the professorship seemsto have been successfully established in the School of Mathematics at long last. But the permanent membership was not necessarily the answer to the Faculty's need for replacements in the policy-making function. For that reason, and the expectation that their non-faculty status was felt to be of short duration, both Pais and Selberg joined Montgomery in attending School of Mathematics meetings on occasion, and after their appointment to the Faculty by the Board on the 21st October, 1950, to be effective the first of the next fiscal year, they attended the meetings of the full Faculty by invitation,

and were cordially welcomed by the Director.[49]

Meanwhile Dr. Oppenheimer had availed himself of a procedure earlier suggested by Dr. Flexner, which provided for a continuing relationship with a few distinguished men attached to other institutions, usually abroad, with the understanding that they would come to the Institute at intervals. Such visits occurred during five-year memberships, which were given to Niels Bohr and Wolfgang Pauli, and to an eminent historian of mathematics in this country, Dr. Otto Neugebauer.

As the Director had earlier said, Institute salaries needed study; the maximum rate had placed the professors above competition in 1932 when it was established, but it was not received by Professors Alexander, Morse, von Neumann, Earle and Panofsky until 1946. The first step to improve rewards now was to elevate the minimum pension of professors to $6,000 from $4,000, as a substitute for a salary increase. It applied only to seven professors, becoming effective July 1, 1950.[50] Shortly after that, the Director reported that to his knowledge three permanent members had received attractive offers from outside; he believed that Institute salaries should be non-competitive in relation to those current in the great universities, and mentioned maximum rates of $12,000 for junior professors and $17,500 for senior men at Yale and Harvard.[51] Again a special committee of Trustees was appointed; it recommended rates of $12,500 and $18,000. The Board approved the new rates, and applied them to seven professors in the senior grade and three in the junior grade, effective July 1, 1951.[52]

Meanwhile, the salaries and wages of the clerical employees and

maintenance men were kept at competitive rates. Not only that, but the Institute's payments on behalf of seventeen non-academic employees who had contracts with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association were increased to eight percent from five, and their salaries were raised to compensate them for the addition in their joint payments. All the employees of the Institute, academic and non-academic, were permitted to vote themselves into the Social Security System on Dr. Oppenheimer's recommendation when an amendment in the law permitted.[53]

At the time there were three temporary members in theoretical physics whose work Dr. Oppenheimer found very worthy. They were Freeman John Dyson, professor at Cornell, George Placzek, who had worked at Chalk River and Los Alamos, and Dr. Chen Ning Yang. Dr. Oppenheimer was still the only active professor in theoretical physics in 1950 when he began to feel the need of a small group of permanent men in physics. Dr. Dyson had returned to his native England, and the Director feared he was lost to the Institute. But later, Dr. Oppenheimer was to be rewarded for his patience, for Dyson joined the Institute Faculty. Early in 1950 five year memberships were voted for Messrs. Placzek and Yang.[54]

The Director was leading a very busy life during these years, as Chairman of the General Advisory Committee, consultant to other governmental agencies, including the Joint Research and Developement Board of the Army and Navy, as the administrator of the Institute, and as guide to young physicists in their postdoctoral studies, and research professor in physics. He administered the Institute under difficult circumstances, for the deadlock continued within the Board: it appeared that Messrs. Maass, Strauss and Veblen were on one side of a division, and the

Treasurer and Dr. Oppenheimer with a number of liberal-minded Trustees on the other. It did not help the Director that because of his interviews in 1948 the Faculty was wary of his efforts to experiment in selecting members to be paid from his Fund. However, it is clear that he sought in every way to identify himself with the interests and desires of the Faculty, and to increase its stature, performance and prestige to the highest eminence possible. He had entered the Institute under the condition most feared by Mr. Moe, at a time when the Faculty -- or its leaders -- had hoped to govern entirely with the help of a friendly officer of the Board. The hope was dashed when Mr. Strauss was appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission, and decided that Dr. Oppenheimer would be the Director; the physicist was welcomed by most of the Trustees, and accepted by the Faculty.

Mr. Strauss' intentions, however, were not inconstant as far as a serious interest in the Institute was concerned. In 1948 when Professor Riefler left for Washington, the family vacated their home and, at Dr. Oppenheimer's request, put it on the market. Mr. Strauss was contemplating buying it with the idea of moving to Princeton to participate more intimately in the management of the Institute; his term of office at the Commission was, like that of his colleagues, first for only eighteen months. But Dr. Oppenheimer was apparently unwilling to accept a co-administrator, and made his view clear by advising the Institute to purchase the house. It was then rented for a time to members, and finally sold to Dr. Placzek because it was considered improper for the Institute to rent professors' housing to members.[55] The episode marks the apparent end for the time being of Mr. Strauss' hope to help govern

the Institute at short range, which promised little of value to anyone, and least of all to the Faculty and the Director of the Institute. For he had no scholarly approach to the programs of work, and his influence would almost inevitably have resulted in support of technology and invention, tastes which he had happily gratified while in the Navy Department.

It was inevitable that the Commissioner and the Chairman of the General Advisory Committee should find themselves in disagreement from time to time, as they appear to have been at times in their relations within the Institute for Advanced Study. Such an occasion arose in 1949, when Senator Bourke B. Hickenlooper ended months of discontent with Chairman David E. Lilienthal of the Commission by preferring "vague and ungenerous" charges of "incredible mismanagement" of the atomic energy program, and demanding Lilienthal's removal by the President. The opening gun in the campaign was fired by Senator McCarthy's mouthpiece, Fulton Lewis Jr. on the 7th May, 1949, and when the fire in the press was burning brightly, Mr. Lilienthal, reluctantly laying aside his work, asked the Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to schedule public hearings at which he might render an accounting of his stewardship. The charges were inspired by political and economic considerations; they had little particularity, and obviously fed on the testimony from day to day. There was one issue which involved Mr. Strauss, who had dissented from the Commission in its authorization of the export of certain radioisotopes to friendly countries of Western Europe, to be used in basic research in medicine and biology, in chemistry, in physics and metallurgy, all under specified conditions.

The record, made first by Mr. Lilienthal and the Commission's General Counsel, Joseph Volpe, covered quite completely the sanctions under which the exports had been made, and the fact that the General Advisory Committee had unanimously approved them on the scientific basis. Thereafter, Senator Hickenlooper called on Mr. Strauss to testify. He read his formal statement setting forth the basis of his dissent; he believed that the language of the Atomic Energy Act did not permit the sharing of these resources with other governments, nor did the manifest legislative intent, for, he said:

> ...they could be used as tools (1) in biological research (...citing possible mutation of agents for use in biological warfare); (2) in petroleum chemistry (...citing their employment in cracking processes); in metallurgical research (...I mentioned the race in which all nations with military establishments are engaged in order to find alloys which could withstand the intensities of heat and erosion which are the two great metallurgical hurdles in the design of jet and rocket motors)...[56]

Dr. Oppenheimer was required to make the rebuttal on the scientific issues raised by the Commissioner. He did so with enthusiasm, thoroughness and brilliance, demolishing the Commissioner's scientific case, showing that the uses to which the isotopes were being put in Europe were fully understood when the exportations were authorized, with the approval of the Military Liaison Committee attached to the Atomic Energy Commission; by the Department of State and by the President. The isotopes involved had been first discovered and used in Europe and were still being used there; as by-products of our atomic piles they were much cheaper than those available in Europe. Having demolished the Commissioner's scientific case, Dr. Oppenheimer went on to make him appear as an ungenerous dissident from the government's basic policy toward

Western Europe in the postwar era. The further reasons for the exports lay

> in fostering science; in making cordial, effective relations with the scientists and technical people in Western Europe; they lie in assisting the recovery of Western Europe; they lie in doing the decent thing....[57]

Undoubtedly this testimony, which was severe in its effect on Mr. Strauss, was the worse because he had made a gesture to exculpate the General Advisory Committee from conscious wrong-doing by protesting that they, too, were patriotic men and would not knowingly put this country at a disadvantage; they had not been consulted about the last shipment to Norway, which was a particularly controversial one. But clearly Dr. Oppenheimer rejected this assist.

Of course, there were sequelae to this dramatic episode. It has been recorded that when Dr. Oppenheimer left the witness stand and asked Mr. Volpe how he had done, the counsel, who had watched Mr. Strauss' face "darken with fury," replied: "You did much too well for your own good."[58] Mr. Strauss later submitted for the record an exasperated letter belaboring a point which Oppenheimer had conceded in his testimony. He need not have felt too badly about the Joint Committee's report, which vindicated the Chairman and the Commission, for he had not overtly allied himself with the Senator in Hickenlooper's other complaints.[59]

Of what must have been lively communications on this conflict in the Institute's Board and Faculty little is available. Mr. Strauss had mailed copies of his formal statement to the Trustees. Dr. Fulton replied that he expected Mr. Strauss to resign from both the Commission and the Institute Board, since his testimony had been against the Chairman of the one and the Director of the other. He sent a copy to Mr.

Maass, who disagreed hotly, on the ground that Mr. Strauss had testified on a legal and not a scientific issue. Moreover, he said that if Dr. Fulton believed the Board members took his position, he might test their sentiments; Maass believed most of the Trustees would favor Strauss' retaining his position. Fulton had the last word. He objected mainly to Mr. Strauss helping "that fellow" Hickenlooper. And he added: "I don't think Robert Oppenheimer will ever feel comfortable as Director of the Institute for Advanced Study as long as Mr. Strauss continues on our Board of Trustees."[60]

By a seeming coincidence, Mr. Maass precipitated a crisis within the Board just as this storm blew up. He resigned from the presidency, thereby checkmating Mr. Leidesdorf's apparent design to have Dr. Oppenheimer's status in relation to the Board clarified before or as Mr. Strauss' ambition to become one of the two chief officers of the Board was satisfied. The members of the Corporation had met that year informally as luncheon guests of Dr. and Mrs. Oppenheimer at Olden Manor, and adjourned subject to call from the Chairman after electing Mr. Clarence Linder to the Board. It does not appear that Mr. Maass' resignation was before the Trustees at that time. However, on the 6th May, the day before Fulton Lewis fired the first gun for Senator Hickenlooper in his political campaign against the Chairman of the Commission, the Committee on Nominations met in Mr. Leidesdorf's office to consider the resignation, and to recommend appropriate action. Present were Messrs. Lewis, Chairman, Leidesdorf and Rosenwald, and Dr. Oppenheimer, who recorded the minutes.

The Committee turned first to the need for revision of the By-

Laws, finding that they were "not entirely consistent with each other... not consistent with practice as it had been established during the past years...and...there were many important respects in which... /they/ could be improved." Thus, the Director had been given a permanent appointment, the report continued, instead of an annual one. He was not a Trustee. The Committee recommended that the Chairman appoint a special committee to revise the statutes of the Institute, naming himself and the Director to it. It recommended acceptance of Mr. Maass' resignation as President; the separation of the offices of President and Chairman; further, that the adoption of an "ad interim definition, to be supplemented by the new By-Laws, of the duties of these two offices be determined," and that Mr. Strauss be elected President of the Corporation. The Committee deemed it "inappropriate" then to "take formal action on the membership of the Board," and suggested that the Board ask the members whose terms expired in 1949 (Messrs. Aydelotte, Douglas and Veblen) to continue to serve "until the By-Laws have been rewritten to form a workable basis."[61]

The Board convened two weeks later, and elected Mr. Strauss President after amending the By-Laws to provide that

> The offices of President and of Chairman of the Board may be held by different persons or the same person, and the office of Vice President and Vice Chairman may likewise be held by the same person or by different persons.

No mention was made of any temporary change in statutes.[62]

Mr. Maass side-stepped responsibility for revising the By-Laws, naming Messrs. Leidesdorf, Oppenheimer and Strauss to the special committee. Thus Mr. Leidesdorf's generosity in giving his friend an opportunity to have his say in recommending certain revisions having to do with

the duties of the President and the Chairman was in effect rejected. (Mr. Leidesdorf was supplanted some time later by Mr. Rosenwald, though no special mention was made of it.)

Left unrevised were the amendments passed on the 26th January, 1942, when Mr. Maass succeeded Mr. Houghton as President and Mr. Hardin succeeded Mr. Houghton as Chairman, both at Mr. Bamberger's option. That change restored the duty of the President to sign official communications and documents authorized by the Board. As has been said, no up-to-date copy of the By-Laws was available then. Dr. Aydelotte kept the dummy in his office, and the print of 1937 was the last in circulation. The newer Trustees must have been quite confused about what the statutes did in fact provide. This was not to trouble the Committee on Revision during the next year, for, Mr. Strauss said, its members had not found a convenient date on which to meet.[63]

One of Senator Hickenlooper's charges concerned the granting of Atomic Energy Commission fellowships for education and research in basic (non-secret) physics to persons who had not been "cleared" by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after full investigation. The Commission had delegated the award of such fellowships to the National Research Council, which had always been in charge of disposing the fellowships in mathematics, chemistry and physics, and had never required an oath of loyalty to be taken by the Fellows, usually young postdoctoral scientists. Mr. Strauss had agreed with the Commission in the assignment of this function to the National Research Council, and did not testify for the opposition on the issue.

The Institute had entered into a contract with the New York office of the Atomic Energy Commission by which some of the research Fellows came to the Institute for their work. The Director and the Faculty were suddenly confronted with a policy issue when the Congress passed an appropriation bill with a rider providing that all such Fellows must be cleared by the Commission after full investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The policy was repugnant to most scientists. Those who had testified at the recent hearings were frank to say that any such restriction would have an adverse effect on students and young postdoctoral workers who might not want to have their families and friends disturbed by such inquiries, and might turn away from scientific careers which the government wanted as a matter of policy to facilitate. Dr. Lee DuBridge of the California Institute of Technology testified that the Institute would harbor no secret contract work on its campus.

The Director promptly consulted the Faculty, and informed the New York office of the Atomic Energy Commission that the Institute would not in future administer any such funds. He said in part:

> In view of the nonsecret nature of our work and of the traditions of the Institute for Advanced Study, we should be unwilling to make any appointments to membership in the Institute conditional upon an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. We shall therefore make no further grants-in-aid, the funds for which would be derived from subjects contract....I need hardly add that unless a new basis for the support of basic, unclassified work in the sciences can be developed, the Institute will be unwilling to renew the contract.[64]

When Dr. Oppenheimer reported the matter at the next meeting of the Board, it was obvious that some of the Trustees felt the action might place the Institute in a "political controversy, or involve its relations with

other agencies." While the position taken was approved, the Board directed that in future situations of similar nature, it should be consulted before action.[65]

From the time of the reorganization of the two Schools Dr. Oppenheimer had wanted to see Dr. Otto Neugebauer, Professor of the History of Mathematics at Brown University, appointed member by the two Schools jointly as a symbolic link between them. Neugebauer, eminent in the pre-history of mathematics and astronomy, had been recommended to Flexner by George Sarton of Harvard in 1933, because, said Dr. Sarton:

> The history of science...is the best introduction to the philosophy of science and synthetic knowledge; next, because it is the best means of humanizing science, and last, because it would be an excellent preparation for increasing the number of people getting general scientific knowledge and understanding rather than a specialized and technical knowledge.

And Sarton pronounced himself a dilettante as compared with Dr. Neugebauer.[66]

But Flexner had to content himself with a wish that some day the Institute might develop the history of science or the history of culture which would include both science and the humanities. American scholars might thus be enabled to gain perspective, such as few of the younger ones possessed, he said. It was some such hope that Dr. Oppenheimer nourished now. The attitude of the School of Mathematics was less than enthusiastic, as was shown by the minutes noting approval of the Director's request:

> In order that the stipend of Professor Otto E. Neugebauer may be removed as an obligation of the stipend fund of the School of Mathematics, it was voted to recommend that Pro-

fessor Neugebauer be given a five-year appointment with stipend of $5,000 a semester for one semester each year.[67]

Usually the Director mentioned the appointments of physicists in informing the School of Mathematics of actions of the Physics Committee. The minutes of that same meeting imply a difference between the Committee and himself:

> Dr. Oppenheimer discussed the problem of long-term appointments in physics, reporting the conclusions of the Committee on Physics. On the basis of this report, the School of Mathematics endorses the proposal to appoint Professors Richard P. Feynman and Julian Schwinger as professors of physics, provided they are ready to accept such positions, and subject, of course, to faculty and trustee approval. The School of Mathematics also endorsed the proposal to give Dr. Chen Ning Yang and Dr. George Placzek appointments as members for a term of five years with stipends of $5,500 and $9,000 respectively.[68]

Dr. Yang was a brilliant young man who had worked under Fermi at Chicago where he had taken his Ph. D. He had been a member since 1949. Dr. Placzek, forty-five years old, had worked with Bohr, Bethe and Rabi, all of whom commended him highly. He had been at Chalk River and Los Alamos; he was at the Institute first in 1949 on an Atomic Energy Commission fellowship. Dr. Oppenheimer said he had found ample evidence of Dr. Placzek's "good and fastidious work in physics." The Director was obviously responsible for the nominations of Placzek and Yang. When the Faculty met five days later, he did not mention the names of Feynman and Schwinger. Whether they were consulted is not shown; they may well have been unavailable, as they were previously. The Executive Committee received his recommendation for the two physicists and for Drs. Neugebauer and Pauli. Curiously enough, a question of budgetary implications was raised, which gave rise to an instruction that the Director take especial

care to specify in the letters of appointment given Placzek and Yang just what they were getting; indeed, on second thought, the Director was asked to compose the letters with the help of Mr. Strauss. Ever since the 8th October, 1935, letters of appointment to members had been drafted with care, to prevent disappointment on the part of the members.[69]

Manifestly there was trouble, despite the fact that the Director was the last appointment made in physics, and deserved to have a small and somewhat stable staff about him. Moreover, he needed yield to no man in his use of the language. That the trouble arose over a difference within the School of Mathematics over the Director's choice of men was to be shown later, when he asked authorization for permanent memberships for them. Then the School of Mathematics legislated, presumably on Dr. von Neumann's motion, that while Dr. Yang might some day become a professor, Dr. Placzek could not, "unless circumstances now unanticipated supervene."[70] The position of the Director was very difficult at this point. Moreover, the School's action rather effectively disposed of permanent memberships as stepping stones to professorships -- which was a great pity.

The next item was presented in a manner which suggested that with it, too, Dr. Oppenheimer was having trouble. He reported that with the use of his Fund he was appointing Mr. George Kennan member for the next year to study and write on American foreign policy of the past fifty years. Mr. Kennan was on leave from the State Department, where during the secretaryship of General George C. Marshall, he had headed the Policy Planning Staff. The Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Yale, Harvard and Princeton Universities all competed to give him the opportunity to do so, but Mr. Kennan had chosen to do his work at the Institute for Advanced

Study. Dr. Oppenheimer asked whether, "as a matter of policy," the money for Mr. Kennan's grant should be sought from an outside source; he thought that either the Rockefeller or the Carnegie Corporation would gladly support this work. Again the minutes show a special and strange concern:

> It was decided that such support should be obtained, if possible, the Institute supplementing any money raised. The Board (sic) gave lengthy consideration to this appointment as a matter of policy, and an example of the type of appointment which might be subject to Board approval.
>
> The consensus was that such one-year appointments were a directorial problem, but that for a clearer understanding of the types of memberships, and general Institute relationships, a closer integration of the Faculty and Trustees was desirable. A manual of information was suggested; it was decided that as an initial step the Trustees would make the coming annual April meeting a two-day visit to the Institute...[71]

It does not appear from what source the obvious criticism of the Director's selection came, but coming events cast their shadow. Some of the members of the School of Mathematics were later to oppose Dr. Kennan's appointment as professor on the ground that his career had not been academic. It was the same issue which was raised against the economists.

Seen in that light, it was clear that Professor Veblen, who had led the opposition to them after their appointments, was now determined to cast such serious doubt on the judgment of the Director in spending his Fund that the gap between the Trustees and the Faculty must be closed; but Veblen was far too remote from government practices to have suggested that a "manual of information" might help delineate proper appointments. But he was to show a passionate determination to block the appointment of Mr. Kennan as a professor later.[73]

In the event, the Committee did not forbid Mr. Kennan's appointment. Dr. Oppenheimer paid the first year's grant (1950-1951) from his

Fund. He later arranged for a most excellent and liberal series of grants from the Ford Foundation for Mr. Kennan's work during the next five years, during which period he became a member. His studies were interrupted during 1952 when he served as American Ambassador to the Soviet Union.[74]

The Trustees did meet for two days at Princeton in April, but there is no indication that the Faculty met with them, or that they busied themselves with establishing rules to apply to the Director's Fund or Trustee-Faculty relations. Rather, the first day seems to have been devoted to discussions of proposed revisions of the By-Laws, and was informal, so that no minutes were kept. The second day saw the regular annual meetings of the Members of the Corporation and the Board.

As reflected by the minutes of the formal session on the second day, three main questions had emerged: (1) should there be a retirement age for Trustees; (2) should there be an interval between successive terms for Trustees; and (3) should Faculty members also be Trustees.

Mr. Maass said that the existing By-Laws were better than they were credited with being, and that the first and third questions had been discussed and resolved by the Board. (There is no record of such discussions.) As to an age limit for Trustees, he said that Mr. Bamberger had wanted a self-perpetuating Board, and then related this to perpetuation of "control."

Dr. Oppenheimer observed that

> He did not believe any suggestion had been made that the Board should not be self-perpetuating; that concern for control could well be irrelevant to the proposed study,

> since in such an undertaking as the Institute a good measure of cooperation was the essential condition for wise policy.

He then suggested that Faculty members might serve one-year terms as members ex officio of the Board. Mr. Maass, who apparently now supported Faculty Trustees, conceded that rotation of Faculty representation might be desirable. Discussion concerned the nature of Faculty representation: was it for liaison only, or for voting? Dr. Weed and Mr. Leidesdorf said they were convinced by experience in other institutions that Faculty Trustees were not desirable. The functions of Trustees and Faculty were separate and distinct. Dr. Weed said that the Director should be the sole link between the two bodies. Professor Veblen disagreed emphatically; he favored Faculty Trustees. Throughout the discussion Messrs. Maass and Veblen allowed the implication to lie that Faculty Trustees were established at the wish of the Founders. Both knew better. Dr. Oppenheimer supported Professor Veblen, relying on a reading of the Founders' Letter to the Trustees of the 6th June, 1930. No vote was taken on the issues raised; that awaited the consideration of the special Committee and its recommendations. Meanwhile it was understood that the Trustees whose terms had expired (to whom were now added Messrs. Lewis, Rosenwald and Strauss) would continue to serve without formalities until revisions should be voted by the Board.[75]

It may be said that some revisions were recommended and voted a year later. Then the Committee proposed an amendment which read as follows:

> The two Founders of the Institute shall be Honorary Trustees for the terms of their respective lives. Honorary Trustees may be elected at the annual meeting of the Corporation. They may meet with the Board, and participate in its delib-

> erations, but shall not vote. They may be appointed to serve on committees of the Board, but shall not vote.[76] (emphasis supplied)

The clearly honorary Trustees must be re-elected each year at the annual meeting. However, it was not done; Dr. Aydelotte and Professor Veblen, elected honorary Trustees in October, 1951, served without re-election throughout their lives.

The second revision concerned the powers and duties of the Director, who presented and explained the new text. No mention was now made of his term of office. He was to be a Member ex-officio of the Corporation, and of all the committees of the Board. He was responsible "for communicating to the Trustees views of the Faculty on all matters affecting the Institute," and for organizing the Faculty. He was to determine "in consultation with the Faculty members the admission of members and the employment of staff." He would "exercise general supervision over the Institute in respect to its academic phases," and was, "with the approval of the Faculty...and the Board or the Executive Committee, to make appointments to the Faculty for indeterminate terms or for limited periods." His duties with respect to the budget remained unchanged, but he was no longer required to prepare and submit to the Trustees an annual report.[77]

"As a supplementary action," the Committee recommended the elimination of the provision authorizing Faculty Trustees.[78]

Mr. Strauss objected to abolishing the requirement for the annual report. Despite his statement to Mr. Miller that even a private institution owed the public some accounting, Dr. Oppenheimer, perhaps because Professor Veblen had so opposed the Director's annual Bulletin,

favored the elimination. The Bulletin had not appeared since October, 1946. Dr. Weed objected to requiring the Director to obtain the approval of the Faculty for academic appointments, suggesting consultation only. But Dr. Oppenheimer said he was convinced that it would be inadvisable "to proceed with an appointment in the face of Faculty opposition." The recommended changes were approved.[79]

Mr. Rosenwald put forth "an idea on his own responsibility... as an expression of opinion":

> The Board of Trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study believes that the limitations on the age of Trustees and limitations on the length of continuous service of Trustees are desirable in such a custodial body. Within the next five years such limitations should be incorporated in the By-Laws.

Still no reference was made to the duties of President and Chairman.

Mr. Strauss foreclosed discussion of these issues then because of the absence of Mr. Leidesdorf, and the fact that the Committee on By-Laws had not approved them. It was not until October, 1952 that they were brought up for consideration, unfortunately when Mr. Maass had just returned to the Board after a year's illness due to a stroke. The minutes note that after a long discussion, in which division was evident, they were tabled. One possible reason why was noted in a letter Weed sent to Fulton, deploring Mr. Maass' excitement, and predicting another arterial break.[80]

The Members of the Corporation met, accepted the long-pending resignation of Mr. Lewis Douglas, and with the election of Messrs. Aydelotte and Veblen to honorary trusteeships, disposed of the "class of 1949," electing in their places Messrs. Edward S. Greenbaum, Thomas S. Lamont and Sidney A. Mitchell. Messrs. Lewis, Rosenwald and Strauss were

re-elected to serve until 1955, and Messrs. Fulton, Schaap and Weed until 1956. With these actions Dr. Oppenheimer's distress over the confusions seemed to be allayed.[81]

Once more it is worthy of note that in some strange way the constraints which had been imposed on the Board by the aged but dominant Louis Bamberger, donor with Mrs. Fuld of the financial resources of the Institute, again seemed to have descended on the Trustees. It is difficult to understand, and impossible to explain, except insofar as it appeared to be associated with Mr. Strauss, and that there was a strong bond between him and Professor Veblen and Mr. Maass which made him extremely powerful. And it further appeared that even though Professor Veblen ceased attending School and Faculty meetings at the end of academic year 1949-1950, he still exerted an extraordinary amount of power over his School's attitude in the Faculty, probably in part because of his uniquely favored position as a Trustee. Mr. Strauss profited through the exercise of Veblen's political skill, and Mr. Maass did also, having long ago tested the Professor's sagacity and found it reliable. The open rupture between Dr. Oppenheimer and Mr. Strauss in light of this alliance made his position doubly dangerous. One further effect of these events appears to have been the first visible difference between Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass, who had until the time Dr. Oppenheimer was appointed seemed always in complete harmony as to their policies, performance and purpose. The break apparently did not end with the solutions so far achieved.

In the first Faculty meeting of 1950-1951 Dr. Oppenheimer showed a tendency to relax procedures which had come to be recognized as useful.

These appertained to notice of proposed appointments extending from the meeting at which notice was given to the next at which action was taken, so that the other School might have time to inquire into the qualifications of the candidate. Another omission of approved procedure occurred when the Director secured only the informal approval of the School of Historical Studies to elevate Messrs. Montgomery, Pais and Selberg to the Faculty. Nevertheless, Dr. Oppenheimer invited the three to the first faculty meeting after this happened, even though they did not become professors until the first of the following year.[82] There was, of course, a good reason, for Professors Einstein and Veblen had discontinued attendance.

But this was not all. The Director presented the nomination of Dr. Jean Leray of the Collége de France, to whom the School of Mathematics had informally offered a professorship. But Leray would not leave France, and so the authorization was for a three-year membership at whatever terms the School could arrange. Dr. Oppenheimer also presented for the first time the recommendation of Professor von Neumann for permanent memberships for a mathematician and an engineer attached to the computer project, on the ground that he could not operate the project with temporary help. The Faculty gave its consent, despite the absence of biographical data or prior notice.[83] Neither man had been a member of the Institute, since it had been determined by the Standing Committee of the Faculty and Dr. Aydelotte in 1946 that they were employees of the computer project. The proper period for deliberation might have indicated the unwisdom of providing permanent personnel for an impermanent machine in a field where technological advances were

so rapid. Nevertheless, the Faculty confirmed its action at the next meeting, but asked that the same formalities attend recommendations for permanent memberships as for professors in future.

When the Director opened the preliminary discussion of the recommendations of the School of Humanistic Studies, he gave evidence of strain and uncertainty. Two distinguished scholars were recommended for professorships: Dr. Ernst Kantorowicz, Professor of Mediaeval History of the University of California at Berkeley, and Professor Ernest Llewellyn Woodward, Professor of Modern History at Oxford. They were fifty-five and sixty years old respectively. The Director introduced the discussion with the following statement:

> /He/ outlined the frequent and informal discussions of the School of Humanistic Studies in which he had participated. He thought it important for the Faculty to know that the School in considering new permanent appointments had made a rather broad canvass: the fields of philosophy, anthropology, belles lettres in the broad sense of the history of literature, had been considered. But the conclusion was reached that no suitable candidate was known in these fields...[84]

He had in his extremity consulted four professors of the University at luncheon in his office, with what results as to the candidates does not appear. But there was little doubt that the professors consulted considered the occasion important, for one among them suggested that some means be taken to improve cooperative relations between the two institutions. The Director was advised by the Faculty to discuss this with President Dodds before acting on it.[85]

At the following meeting -- the day of decision -- the Director posed two questions for answer:

(1) Whether everyone present considered these appointments

at least justifiable and good appointments, and had no strong misgivings about them;

(2) Whether everyone considered them not only acceptable, but the best appointments possible at this time.

Despite the rigor of these conditions, the Faculty voted the appointments unanimously (except that Professor Siegel abstained from voting for Professor Kantorowicz). Professor Morse, while expressing his approval, said he hoped that the School would encourage younger members to join its Faculty.[86]

When the Executive Committee convened on the 1st December, the recommendations of the School of Mathematics were approved without question. But Mr. Strauss objected to the rebellious action of Mr. Kantorowicz in his differences with the California Board of Regents; to him it seemed to be resistance to constituted authority, a breach of convention, and an unjustified refusal to swear loyalty to the United States. His was apparently the only dissent among the eight Trustees present. The meeting adjourned, with the understanding it would be convened again if the President did not change his mind. Apparently the adjourned session on the 29th December convinced Mr. Strauss of something -- either of the merits of the Professor's position in the light of the California Regents' action, or that Mr. Kantorowicz was no less an eminent scholar for his disagreement with that august body. The second discussion ended with unanimous approval.[87] Mr. Maass rejected minutes which reflected what had happened, demanding that all trace of differences be obliterated, and the appointments appear as accomplished together on the 29th December. But Mr. Maass had to sign the resulting minutes.[88]

Again, one wonders at the sensitivity with which Mr. Strauss

was treated. Would the appointment of Professor Kantorowicz have been sacrificed had he not changed his view?

As for relations with the University, Dr. Oppenheimer with the consent of the Institute Faculty talked with President Dodds about means of encouraging better relations, and they reached an agreement which the Director confirmed as follows:

> This note will put in writing the proposal which we discussed this morning. The purpose of the proposals to provide a simple and appropriate mechanism for the discussion between the faculties of the University and the Institute of problems of common interest which may arise in our policies for advanced study and research. The specific proposal is that each of us designate a committee of three from the faculties ...that the joint committee meet from time to time to consider problems of interest, and that, likewise from time to time, it report its findings to us.

The Committees were to be "broadly representative of the fields" in which the Institute was active. The members were appointed, and have met on occasion since. But apparently the device has had but little effect on relations, which continue as before. Cooperation takes place quietly between professors and members interested in the same problems and studies. Institutionally, the University and the Institute are quite remote from each other.[89]

Dr. Whitney Oates became Chairman of the Classics Department in 1945, succeeding one of the most unregenerate foes of the Institute, and promptly sought to improve relations. He persuaded Professors Cherniss, Meritt and Thompson to permit themselves to be enrolled with the officers of instruction of the University in his department, and occasionally one or another of the three have given a course to advanced students, or lectured at the University, without stipend. But the surest

contribution of the Joint Committee has simmered down to an occasional meeting, and the transmission each semester of the Institute's Directory of Faculty and members to the interested University departments and the President.[90]

When Wilmarth Lewis first visited the Institute he wrote Dr. Aydelotte:

> My first and clearest impression is how pleased I would be if I had been the donor of the Institute. It seems to me that Mr. Bamberger's wishes are being carried out with fidelity and success....

He said then that the absence of a large library, which Princeton did not compensate fully, since it had a "good" library but "not a great one...would appear to put a premium for us upon such studies as mathematics, philosophy and criticism."[91]

By the end of 1949 the Library of the Institute has used all the original space allotted to it, and had absorbed also the beautiful studies on the second floor east in Fuld Hall, which had been converted to stack rooms. Mr. Lewis again visited the Institute as member of a Trustees' Academic Committee (created on motion of Dr. Oppenheimer in October, 1949) and decided that a large general library was needed. He asked that money be raised to build and operate it. However, a Faculty Committee, consisting of Professors Cherniss, Thompson and Weyl felt that the Library should remain a seminar facility, since finances did not permit building a new one, or the acquisition of appropriate collections. Even the minimum program would require additional space, and so they recommended that an adjunctbe built close to the Fuld Hall, to be connected with the main reading room by a gallery which would lead from its central

window to the second floor of the new building. The Director, aware that such a plan would ruin the Hall with its terrace and lovely view to the south, persuaded the Faculty to content itself for the time being with expansion of the library through the conversion of the offices west of the reading room to accommodate stacks. This had the virtue of saving the esthetic values of Fuld Hall, and still allowed the Faculty and members to walk dry-shod in their labors. His plan also made it inevitable that a separate library would be built, because Fuld Hall had not been constructed to bear such weight. Then the lovely offices on the second floor of the Hall on the south side could be restored to use as professors' offices, and the reading room, an admirable accommodation for a common room for Faculty and members, could be converted to such use.[92]

In marked contrast with the disposal of the valuable libraries and collections of Professors Herzfeld and Lowe, Professors Goldman and Meritt gave their libraries and collections to the Institute, receiving the grateful acknowledgment of the Trustees. These were augmented by Mr. Rosenwald, who started a rare book collection by giving the Herbert Evans Rare Book Collection. It was appropriately dedicated in a ceremony, and the Institute voted later to expend $5,000 a year to add to it.[93]

Two problems with the State of New Jersey were left unsolved by Dr. Aydelotte when he retired. The first was a legal matter, requiring legislative relief for the Institute from the operation of the State Inheritance Transfer Tax Law, which made its appearance in the settlement of the Founders' estates. Dr. Aydelotte mentioned the taxes paid by the

executors on the Institute's inheritance of approximately $7,000,000 variously as between $500,000 and $700,000, apparently failing to take into account the fact that about half the latter amount would have been paid anyway, since both testators required that taxes on their specific bequests be paid out of the residuary portion which came to the Institute. Under State law, the only charitable or educational institutions exempt from the inheritance transfer tax were those to which the State made a contribution. For some time Dr. Aydelotte pondered how the Institute might be made to qualify, but without success. A threat arose when the State tax authorities investigated to ascertain whether the gifts of the Founders were made "in contemplation of death," deciding at last, greatly to everyone's relief, that those were really gifts, and therefore exempt.[94]

While matters stood thus, the State requested the Institute to contribute about thirty acres of its best land to a public park to commemorate the Battle of Princeton which followed the taking of Trenton early 1777. They were part of a substantial addition to Institute property on its western border, purchased in 1945.

Dr. Aydelotte took counsel with a golfing friend, a man-about-the-Legislature, who advised him to take no action on the land proposal until the Legislature should by law exempt the Institute from inheritance taxes on bequests for educational purposes. He was also interested in securing the exemption retroactively: i.e., he believed it was possible to recover for the Institute the amount it had paid on the Founders residual estates. Dr. Aydelotte left for Palestine after placing the problem in Professor Morse's hands with instructions. Professor Riefler,

also a member of the Faculty Committee, urged that since Princeton University and Rutgers were also subject to the tax law, the Institute would do well to join with them to secure relief for all three. But Professor Morse answered that he was carrying out Dr. Aydelotte's instructions, and asked Mr. Edgar Bamberger to inform Messrs. Maass and Schaap of details which are not available.[95]

A bill was shortly introduced in the Legislature providing for the relief of the Institute, and Mr. G. G. Gabrielson, Aydelotte's friend, was sheparding it. After Mr. Bamberger's report, Mr. Maass took over the park matter, on which no action had been taken, for further study.[96]

When Dr. Aydelotte returned early in May, he resumed control of affairs. He encountered some difficulty with Professor Veblen when he suggested in Faculty meeting that the Institute could afford to be quite generous in ceding land for the Park. This had been frankly stated by him to the Standing Committee: "The action of the State on the question of the Institute's taxes will, of course, have some bearing on the size of the Institute's gift."[97] He also suggested, and the Faculty discussed, the incentive value of a change of name to the New Jersey Institute for Advanced Study, or the Mercer, together with other possibilities such as special residential quarters for Jersey residents as members, or a course of lectures of special interest to the inhabitants of the State.[98]

The relief bill of 1946 failed of enactment. On the 30th July, 1948 a new Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, elected in 1946, signed a bill which had been prepared in cooperation with representatives of Princeton University and Rutgers, exempting all three from taxes on bequests for

educational purposes. The State's money for the Battlefield Park had been appropriated in 1946, but the Commission's request was still unfinished business with the Institute until in 1950 the Director urged action on the ground that failure to do so was hurting the Institute's reputation in the community.[99] Then the Board, determined not to part with some of its best land, informed the Governor through the Director that it had no authority to alienate any of the Institute's property for a purpose so foreign to the Founders' purposes.

The Governor replied that he had signed the legislation exempting the Institute after, but not because, he had received assurances from representatives of the Institute that "the Institute for Advanced Study would at an appropriate time indicate its appreciation for the action..." He deplored its failure to act, and opined that the whole subject "perhaps should be reconsidered again." (sic.)[100]

The Board dissented vigorously from the Governor's charge; Dr. Oppenheimer wrote him the burden of its discussion:

> As I had anticipated, your account of the origin of this legislation, and your belief that its adoption was in some way a condition for the Institute's ceding to the State land for the use of the Battlefield Memorial, did not in any way correspond with the memory of the members of the Board of Trustees. In fact, they asked that I communicate to you their unequivocal dissent from the views expressed in your letter. The tax exemption granted the Institute appears to the Board, as it does to me, a natural and proper legislative grant -- to us and to other educational institutions -- of an equity which we would enjoy in other states, and which certain educational institutions in the State already enjoyed. The Trustees were of the opinion that the large estate taxes already paid by the Institute to the State of New Jersey were themselves not equitable, and that the legislation granting future exemption was rather less than more than the minimum required of the State in its relations with educational institutions.

> With regard to the substantive issue of contribution to the Battlefield Memorial, the Trustees reaffirmed their view that it was beyond their legal power to make a gift of properties held in trust for another purpose. I understand, however, that the Chairman of the Board...who has had this under consideration from the beginning, would be glad to go over all questions raised in your letter...I hope that in this way the disturbing misunderstandings of the past may be resolved.[101]

Without awaiting Dr. Oppenheimer's call for an appointment date for Mr. Maass, the Governor reiterated his assertion. Mr. Maass replied; he was "completely at a loss to understand your suggestion that any promise or intimations were given for or on behalf of the Institute at the time the legislation exempting it from future taxation was passed." He objected specifically to the size and location of the area asked for, and prepared to meet the Governor in Trenton to discuss the matter further.[102] As a result of several conferences, it was finally agreed in 1951 that a few low-lying acres would be leased for ninety-nine years to the State with a reservation for its reversion to the Institute should the primary purposes of the Park change.[103] The details were finally worked out satisfactorily, and the papers signed in the spring of 1952.

Other tax problems plagued Dr. Oppenheimer and the Institute, notably claims from the Internal Revenue Service that stipends for members were taxable income. Other institutions and the foundations suffered from the same cause. Once again the Institute, because of its special arrangements with some members, deemed its problems not to be in common with theirs, and for a time handled its cases alone. It took a period of years to secure appropriate action and rulings in all cases.

There was one tax problem which the Director handled alone, without the help of assistants from the office of Mr. Maass. His success

was notable, for he immediately secured a ruling from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue declaring the Institute to be an educational institution within the meaning of the statute making an additional 10% of gross adjusted income deductible from taxation when contributed to it. The effect was purely academic for the time being, since no gifts were received.[104]

The narrative of the events of the first twenty years of the Louis Bamberger-Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation has been set down in as complete detail as it can be made with the materials at hand. It is a record of fidelity to the plans which Dr. Flexner produced in 1931, with certain exceptions. The first and perhaps the most significant of these is the lack of a warm cooperative relationship between the University and the Institute. Despite this, the historians of art still use the facilities of McCormick Hall and Marquand Library, without which they could not work in Princeton. But relations between Fuld and Fine Halls are not close, though on occasion men from one attend a lecture or seminar in the other, according to their interests.

The Institute is a brilliant success. Its Faculty is of the highest order of excellence; its members come from many countries.

Another respect in which the dream of Flexner has not substantially realized. has been discussed before: the Schools have not brought in as many young postdoctoral workers as he had hoped for. Instead, having an indefinite obligation to train young men and women who had taken their doctorates, and possessing complete freedom to choose members and carry on as they wished, the professors have quite naturally

emphasized research in their activities. This meant that in general they have used their stipend funds for arrivées working in fields which particularly interest them, or are thought necessary to represent the pattern of specialties which are not included in the Faculty but are considered to be important.

Nevertheless, the Institute is highly successful in its realization of the purposes Dr. Flexner wanted to achieve, which were admirably stated by a member in mathematics from India as follows:

> /It/ provides the scholar with three matchless opportunities: first, the level of association is of the highest in the world; second, there are absolutely no limits set upon the academic and political freedom of the members; and third, which follows naturally from the first two, it is of a completely international nature.

Scholarship is not only a matter of research or of individual merit, he said, but also an appreciative state of mind and a way of life. He felt the Institute was effective in integrating the standards of scholarship, bringing the scientist into rapport with the cultural as well as the scientific thinking of colleagues from all over the world. As to the Institute's effect on teaching, the spokesman believed it would be considerable. After a year at the Institute, he thought, a professor would be likely to put less stress on his students' performance of routine exercises and examinations, and instead to work to develop their imaginations and creative powers.[105]

These were the effects Flexner had foreseen and planned for. In effect the concentration on arrivées in membership might be said to constitute a transferance to the teachers of the next generation of scholars of the benefits of the Institute's influence, rather than the

giving of the benefits directly -- benefits which Gilman had seen in the union of research and teaching. In his day research was rare indeed in American colleges; his concept was an inspiriting breeze, a shifting of objectives from routine disciplinary instruction to animate the curiosity to learn, and to join in the exciting work of expanding man's knowledge. This certainly can be said of the Institute's work in mathematics and physics.

It was a fortunate thing for the Institute that Dr. Oppenheimer is himself a champion of the humanities, and of communication between them and the sciences. His was the bold endeavor to unite the two non-mathematical Schools. Despite Dr. Aydelotte's commitment of the heart and intellect to the humanities, it is doubtful that he could have withstood the strength of the School of Mathematics in its drive to take for itself more than its already large share of financial resources; his action in May, 1945, when he had every evidence of the School's will to this, foster the doubt.

Indeed, Flexner's ideal of the Institute has become more real under the strong leadership of Dr. Oppenheimer than under his own or Dr. Aydelotte's. Nevertheless, it should not be forgotten that Flexner was the author of the plan, and had the vision and strength to bring it about. His greatest weakness was, perhaps, a tendency to idealize scholars and scholarship, and perhaps to believe that the first always represented the second. He was a man of intense enthusiasms, and of equally strong anger once his confidence was seen to have been misplaced. It was these qualities which caused him to fail in establishing economics at the Institute. He learned neither from Charles Beard nor Dr. Mitrany

-- nor from the lack of enthusiasm with which Stewart greeted his move to appoint Dr. Riefler -- that it was necessary to bring together a compatible group interested in working harmoniously for the success of that undertaking.

But Flexner succeeded in his highest objective: to dignify learning and the status of scholars. This he did partly by providing high monetary and retirement rewards, as long as he found it possible to do so. And when, through no fault of his own, he was compelled to chose between completing the preliminary representation in the humanities at the temporary expense of that worthy objective, he did so. But he never justified his action by anything but the harsh facts; he stood firmly for the maximum salary and better retiring allowances than he had been able to provide when the Founders objected to the fast and unanticipated growth of the School of Mathematics, with its uncomfortable repercussions in relations with the University, and to the large acreage for the Institute which they had not been adequately prepared for. The Institute was known for the high regard in which it held its faculty and members, and for the conditions which made work there so eminently desirable.

In his devotion to these things, Flexner was deeply influenced by the status of scholars in Germany, as he made clear throughout. The American community must recognize the value of learning, and give the scholar responsible for its generation respect and a living compatible with the standards enjoyed by business executives. He did not think of these as symbols of worldly success as much as of the wherewithal to live a life with all reasonable amenities, so long denied the teaching frater-

nity in this country during its period of material growth and prosperity, and even in its concentration on "conspicuous waste." (Flexner was closer to Thorstein Veblen than might be suspected; it was not an accident that he referred to the professoriate as a "proletariat" in 1930.)

It is true that the onset of Nazism gave Flexner his great opportunity to set the stamp of excellence on the Institute with the appointment of Professor Einstein, and that many more outstanding scholars from Europe were to migrate during the thirties, to England and America, giving an international flavor to learning. That, coupled with the growth of science and technology following World War I, was an invaluable aid to the influence of scholarship in the United States, on which Flexner could build. But the Institute rode ahead of the tide, secure in prestige and influence, setting an example in standards of scholarly accomplishments and rewards.

It will be recalled that Flexner had pointed to the California Institute of Technology at Pasadena as the prototype -- along with the Hopkins of Gilman's day -- of the small university, untrammeled with undergraduate concerns. He admired greatly its achievement in attracting graduate students in science from all over the country because of its small but excellent Faculty, when he was far from sure a new small graduate institution in the East would attract either students or money, as he sought to persuade the President and some of the Trustees of the Hopkins to "suppress" the college and undertake graduate work exclusively.

When he was compelled to revise his plans in April, 1930, as he learned the Founders were not willing to undertake a "small university,

in the central scientific and cultural disciplines," he pointed to the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research as the prototype for the Institute for Advanced Study. It was not wholly apposite, since it researched only in biology, chemistry and physics, and the medical sciences, but it was the one institution in the country which admitted only postdoctoral workers. Flexner observed a significant difference in proposing his actual plan for the Institute for Advanced Study: postdoctoral workers to be invited to it, unlike those of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, were to be trained and guided by the Faculty in the arts of research and advanced study.

For over fifty years the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research performed valuable researches in the sciences and particularly in medicine. Then in 1954, it changed its charter and purpose, and became "a university," a graduate school in the sciences, with almost the precise character (described in no small part with Flexner's expressive terms) which he had urged the General Education Board to create in 1922 and later, and first proposed to the Founders early in 1930. Thus President Detlev Bronk said that it was the aim to use the rich resources of the Institute "to help young men and women to become scientific scholars of significance to higher education."[106] In the environment created by over two hundred members of the faculty interested mainly in research, with a student body which numbered about seventy in 1959 when the first doctorates were awarded, "the student lives and works as a member of a society of creative scholars." He regarded the training of such a group of future scholar-teachers as of primary importance. Residential quarters for the students and many of the faculty members are on the grounds.

Dr. Bronk invited fifteen of the world's most eminent scientific specialists to spend from one to two weeks on campus, lecturing to the students and then to the faculty, saying that the appointment of so distinguished a group "has added greatly to the vitality of the Institute."[107] The lectures he saw as "furthering the development of the Institute as a great international center of science." In his annual presidential reports, Dr. Bronk has announced plans and accomplishments in the conversion of the original faculty from Lecturers, Associate Members and Associates to Professors, Associate Professors and Assistant Professors. Since this was done in recognition of the joining of the Institute to the "world-wide informal association of universities," it presumably indicates the adoption of the same system of tenure. He spoke gravely of the special problem of the Institute, which did not afford the opportunity to place non-creative men in undergraduate work or the professions. This led him to say that "if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the younger members of our faculty, we should critically evaluate their competence and promise. We must distinquish between those who should be the nucleus of our future faculty and those who should be aided to find other opportunities for service."[108] Undoubtedly the Institute in making the change has been greatly influenced by Dr. Bronk's remark in granting honors to several great universities which had contributed to medical and scientific knowledge in the past that "next to churches, universities have become the most enduring of human institutions."

One wonders what Dr. Abraham Flexner thought of these events. It is probable, if he noted it at all, that he was torn between his loyalty to the Institute for Medical Research which his brother had

built up over more than thirty years of service (during which the Rockefellers gave it over $60 millions), and his enduring ideal of the small university and his passionate belief that training of the young at the higher levels is best done by scholars alive with eagerness to advance knowledge and convinced that they owe it the next generation of academic careerists to hand on the torch personally, and not only in books and published papers.

And so Dr. Flexner's prototype for the Institute for Advanced Study has changed to become the thing he himself wanted to establish in the first place: a small university, a society of free scholars, both teachers and students. It is possible that the very success of postdoctoral studies in the United States promoted this change. It had played an unique role in scientific and medical research, but even as early as 1926, Dean Gordon Laing had implied that it was too remote from a university for its own good health.[109]

It is of especial interest in noting the success of postdoctoral studies, which Flexner did not originate but did "institutionalize" for mathematics and other subjects not represented at the Rockefeller Institute of Medical Research, that a study has been recently made of the incidence of such workers by a competent sociologist, Dr. Bernard Berelson. His studies were made in the spring of 1960, and he secured his information from the sources of grants -- the government, mainly, and the great foundations, as well as from the thirty-nine universities comprising the American Association of Universities. He estimated that there were in the neighborhood of 25,000 postdoctoral workers. Omitting three

groups: i.e., house officers, or interns and residents working in hospitals, and in medicine only, (between 12,000 and 13,500) and another group designated as college teachers taking "refresher" courses, mostly interested in teaching, and not research; and another category called Visiting Faculty: i.e., professors taking sabbaticals, etc., mainly interested in research, Dr. Berelson estimated there are some 10,000 men and women doing postdoctoral work in 1960.[110]

There was a distinct international flavor. An estimated one-third were foreign nationals, and some of the Americans were doing their work abroad. By way of comparison, he said there were between 130,000 and 140,000 doctoral candidates in American universities, half of them full-time students. There were about 10,000 Ph. D. degrees awarded annually, and approximately 7,000 M. D. degrees. The startling thing about his figures, however, aside from the large number of postdoctoral workers was his estimate that of the 10,000, about 60% were in medicine, 35% in science and engineering, and only 5% in the social sciences and the humanities.

Dr. Berelson's inquiry led him to question whether the universities are the place for such extensive basic researches, which have become big business since the war. In view of the undoubted needs for such researches, he pointed to the existence of special institutions for basic research such as the quasi-academic but independent corporations like the Rand, and others like the Argonne National Laboratory and the Bethesda institutes. Inside the universities there have arisen special research institutes, bureaus, and offices to handle the growing pressures. These

have enormously complicated university administration, to the point where too much effort goes into activities not strictly of university kind or quality. In a real sense, a modern Flexner might inveigh as bitterly against this diversion of purpose and effort as did the author of Universities against the inter-collegiate athletics and the "home Service" courses and other expedients for real education, all engaged in because they brought in money.

The Institute for Advanced Study, remote, quiet, busy but not hurried, offers now as it did in 1933 unique opportunities to scholarly men and women. There is no slightest doubt that its Faculty and the members who come to it are grateful for this haven, which resembles "the mediaeval monastery" without the monastic character.

CHAPTER XII - NOTES

1. Minutes, Faculty Standing Committee, 9/29/47. Working draft. Aydelotte files. Dr. Oppenheimer first attended a School of Mathematics meeting on 5/7/47 to choose members in physics for 1947-1948.

2. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 10/8/47. Draft. Aydelotte files. See also Oppenheimer to E. V. Hollis, 9/1/55.

3. Stewart to Aydelotte, 10/3/47. Aydelotte files.

4. Aydelotte to Stewart, 10/4/47. Aydelotte files.

5. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 10/8/47.

6. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 12/13/45.

7. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/18/46.

8. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 10/9/47, p. 7. Terms: Salary, $15,000. Retirement at 65; joint contribution to Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. Effective 7/1/48.

9. Ibid., p. 1. Executive Committee, 2/15/49.

10. Oppenheimer to Maass, 10/30/47. The other terms were: salary, $20,000; retirement at age 65 in 1969; Pension, $12,000, with half that to Mrs. Oppenheimer in event of his death in active service or after retirement. Joint contributions of 5% to Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

11. Oppenheimer to Fulton, 10/27/47.

12. Minutes, Trustee Special Meeting, 12/16/47, pp. 1, 2. Treasurer's Report, fiscal year 1948.

13. Ibid., pp. 5, 6.

14. Ibid., p. 6.

15. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/10/48, appendix.

16. Von Neumann to Oppenheimer, 2/19/48.

17. Weed to Oppenheimer, 3/18/48.

18. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 4/15/48, p. 2.

19. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 10/21/47.

20. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 12/16/47, p. 4.

21. Minutes, School of Mathematics, 11/3/47.

22. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 12/16/47, p. 3. The grant was to be $8,000 for full-time, less for part-time. No retirement benefits.

23. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 2/2/48.

24. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/10/48.

25. Oppenheimer to Faculty, 3/17/48.

26. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/15/49; Minutes, Trustees' Special meeting, 5/20/49, p. 1. Treasurer's reports indicate that the property was valued at $40,000, and Professor Veblen's pension was increased by $2,500 per annum.

27. Minutes, School of Mathematics, 2/4/48.

28. Harry M. Davis, The Man Who Built the A Bomb, New York Times Magazine, 4/18/48, pp. 20 ff.

29. The Eternal Apprentice, Time Magazine, 11/8/48, pp. 70 ff.

30. Kermit Roosevelt to Oppenheimer, 4/19/49; 10/7/49; 10/10/49. Mrs. Leary to Roosevelt, 10/18/49. Merle Miller to Oppenheimer, 3/11/50. Oppenheimer to Miller, 3/21/50.

31. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 4/15/48, p. 3. Interview with Mr. Maass.

32. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 4/15/49, p. 2.

33. Ibid., p. 4.

34. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 4/15/48, p. 5.

35. Oppenheimer to Riefler, 2/15/50. Riefler to Oppenheimer, 3/19/50.

36. Arthur Burns to Oppenheimer, 4/28/49.

37. Report, NBER on Current Research in Finance, 2/6/56.

38. Aydelotte to Willitts, 3/18/40. School of Economics and Politics files.

39. Warren, Memorandum, 1948. School of Economics and Politics files.

40. Fosdick, op. cit., pp. 201, 202.

41. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 11/16/48, p. 5. The Report and discussion were incorporated only by reference in minutes, and embodied in a separate memorandum, made available on request.

42. Stewart to Oppenheimer, 11/23/48. School of Economics and Politics papers.

43. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 2/10/49.

44. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 3/8/49.

45. Although the Faculty agreed to the reorganization, Professor Veblen was later (11/15/55) to say bitterly that the appointment of George Kennan as Professor was consented to by the Faculty because of the reorganization: in other words, through the establishment of a better balance between the School of Mathematics and the School of Humanistic Studies, and to imply that because of it, closer relations between the Trustees and the Faculty were in order.

46. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 11/9/48. Minutes, Trustees' Meeting, 11/16/48, p. 5. A Joint committee of Trustees and Faculty were later (1956) to conclude that "advanced studies" did not include creative works of art or literature, although those might be subjects of studies. Mr. Eliot spent his time at the Institute writing on a play, The Cocktail Party, although he devoted some effort to criticism at the University.

47. Minutes, School of Mathematics, 10/25/48; Minutes, Faculty, 11/9/48. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 11/16/48, p. 3.

48. George D. Birkhoff, Fifty Years of American Mathematics. Reprint from American Math. Society, Semicentennial Publications, Vol. II, pp. 278-279.

49. Minutes, Faculty meetings, 11/14/50; 11/20/50. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/21/50.

50. Minutes, Executive Committee, 11/15/49.

51. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/20/50, p. 3.

52. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/1/50.

53. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/21/49, pp. 1, 2.

54. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/21/50.

55. Mrs. Leary to Strauss, 5/6/48, 5/15/48. Strauss to Mrs. Leary, 5/13/48.

56. Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Hearings, Investigation into the Atomic Energy Project. 82nd Congress, First session, pp. 234, 235.

57. Ibid., pp. 281-283.

58. Joseph and Stewart Alsop, We Accuse, Doubleday & Company, 1954, p. 20.

59. The Forrestal Diaries, Edited by Walter Millis, The Viking Press, 1951, contain reference to several occasions on which Senator Hickenlooper consulted Mr. Strauss and/or Secretary Forrestal about his misgivings over Mr. Lilienthal and affairs at the Atomic Energy Commission. See pp. 240-241; 255; 319; 379-380; 399; 471-472. Fairly typical is an entry by Mr. Forrestal that Senator Hickenlooper had joined him at lunch with others to express certain rather vague misgivings which he was experiencing in connection with the Atomic Energy Commission and its activities. He could put his finger on no one action or policy, but said that the character and number of speeches which Lilienthal was making, the emphasis upon the future possibilities of atomic power as a source of energy for industrial and general purposes, and his constant reference to control of atomic energy by 'the people', all made a pattern with ultimate indicated objectives as follows: (1) the indispensability and therefore the perpetuation of Mr. Lilienthal in power; (2) the general underlying idea of statism. (February 24, 1948, pp. 379-380.)

60. Strauss to Fulton, 6/9/49. Fulton to Strauss, 7/18/49, with copy to Maass. Maass to Fulton, 7/22/49. Fulton to Maass, 8/1/49.

61. Minutes, Committee on Nominations, 5/6/49.

62. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/20/49, p. 1.

63. Minutes, Members of the Corporation meeting, 4/21/50.

64. Oppenheimer to H. Marshall Chadwell, 9/26/49.

65. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/21/49, p. 3.

66. George Sarton to Flexner, 9/6/33.

67. Minutes, School of Mathematics, 2/8/50.

68. Ibid.

69. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 2/13/50. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/21/50.

70. Minutes, School of Mathematics, 4/2/52. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/52, p. 2, and appendix.

71. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/21/50.

72. Ibid. The Director had promised to pay a stipend of $15,000 from his Fund.

Please note that page 713 of the Beatrice Stern manuscript has been found to be missing from every copy known to the Institute for Advanced Study.

This page would include footnotes #73 to #77, which are referenced from pages 683 to 686 as numbered on the manuscript.

ceive from each School its recommendations as to its needs and plans for the coming year. These recommendations shall be considered and amended as may be deemed advisable by the Director and the Chairman of the Board and then submitted to the Budget Committee with power to amend. In case of a vacancy in the directorship a special committee shall be created to consider the appointment of a successor. No action shall be taken for the election of a successor until after the report of such committee.

The term of the Director was decided by the Board on the 19th January, 1945; all Directors must in future retire at the end of the fiscal year in which they reached sixty-five years of age.

78. Ibid.

79. Ibid.

80. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/24/52, p. 6. Weed to Fulton, 10/31/52. Fulton papers.

81. Minutes, Members of the Corporation, Special meeting, 10/25/51.

82. Minutes, Faculty, 11/14/50.

83. Ibid.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid.

86. Minutes, Faculty, 11/20/50.

87. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/1/50; 12/29/50. Both were recommended and approved at the new salary rate of $18,000 adopted by the Executive Committee for senior professors on 12/1/50. In Professor Woodward's case, the Director was to work out with him special arrangements for his retirement benefits. Professor Kantorowicz and the Board would each contribute 5% to Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association.

88. Maass to Oppenheimer, 1/2/51.

89. Oppenheimer to Dodds, 11/16/50: 1/15/51. Dodds to Oppenheimer, 11/22/50. President Dodds appointed as Committee members for the University Messrs. W. J. Oates, Harold Sprout, and Eugene Wigner. Dr. Oppenheimer appointed -- or the Faculty chose -- Messrs. Cherniss, Earle and von Neumann.

90. Interview, W. J. Oates.

91. Lewis to Aydelotte, 10/25/45.

92. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/21/50.

93. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/25/51, p. 4; 10/24/52, p. 2.

94. Minutes, Executive Committee, 12/18/45.

95. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/19/45, p. 2. Minutes, Faculty Standing Committee, 4/29/46.

96. Morse to Aydelotte, 3/20/46. Aydelotte files.

97. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 5/3/46; Standing Committee, 4/29/46.

98. Minutes, Faculty meeting, 5/3/46.

99. Minutes, Executive Committee, 2/21/50.

100. Driscoll to Oppenheimer, 8/11/50.

101. Oppenheimer to Driscoll, 8/21/50.

102. Driscoll to Oppenheimer, 8/23/50, Maass to Driscoll, 8/25/50.

103. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 5/4/51, pp. i, 2.

104. Internal Revenue Bureau, 10/2/56.

105. Quotation from K. Chandrasekaran, 1948.

106. New York Times, 5/21/59, 25:7.

107. Rockefeller Institute, President's Report, 1955-1956, p. vi.

108. Ibid., 1956-1957, pp. vi, vii.

109. Laing, op. cit.

110. Bernard Berelson, Postdoctoral Work in American Universities, in Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 33, March, 1962, pp. 119-130. Berelson was the Director of the Bureau of Applied Sociology at Columbia University when he made his survey.

APPENDIX I

Suggestion for proposed Codicils to Wills of Mrs. Fuld and Mr. Bamberger effectively to carry out their present plan for a Foundation.

The form of this Codicil should be prepared by Mr. Hardin's office, and what is herein proposed is merely intended to outline the substance of what is desired.

I, LOUIS BAMBERGER, being of sound and disposing mind and memory, and mindful of the uncertainty of life and the certainty of death, do hereby make, publish and declare this Codicil to my Last Will and Testament, which said Last Will and Testament bears date the ----------day of ----------, 19--.

FIRST:

WHEREAS, my late brother-in-law, FELIX FULD and his widow, Mrs. Felix Fuld, and I had always intended and desired to establish a Foundation for some beneficent purpose, to which we intended to devote our respective residuary estates; and

WHEREAS, my said sister and I have now, in and by letter dated the -------- day of ----------, 1930, defined the purpose thereof and the manner of establishing the same; and

WHEREAS, my said sister and I have made mutual Wills, and I desire to provide for the contingency which may arise in the event that we may die in or as the result of a common accident:

NOW, THEREFORE, in the event that during my lifetime I shall not have organized or caused to be organized, in conjunction with my sister, Mrs. Felix Fuld, a corporation or Foundation to receive and carry out the purposes expressed in the aforesaid letter, it is my wish and I hereby authorize, empower and direct my Executors and Trustees hereinafter named, as soon as

may be practicable after my decease, to organize or cause such corporation or Foundation to be organized and created, which shall be authorized and empowered to carry out the purposes and designs mentioned, described and set forth in the aforesaid letter dated the --------- day of ----------, 1930, and thereupon, in the event that my said beloved sister, Mrs. Felix Fuld, and I shall die in or as the result of any common accident or catastrophe, I give, devise and bequeath to any such corporation which may have been so organized by my said sister and me, or which may be organized by my said Executors and Trustees, as hereinbefore provided, all of my residuary estate of every name, nature and description, whether real, personal or mixed and wheresoever the same may be situate, to hold and continue to hold the same and use and apply the income thereof for the purposes defined and set forth in the Charter, Certificate of Incorporation, special statutory enactment or other method of bringing the said corporation into legal existence.

SECOND:

In all other respects I hereby ratify and confirm my said Last Will and Testament bearing date, as aforesaid, the -------- of ----------, 19--.

THE LETTER

It has always been our intention to devote our accumulated wealth to a public benefaction which in its very nature would achieve several thoughts we have in mind: first, that it be of a character which, so far as possible, would avoid duplication of the good works of others, or lie in a field already amply supplied with funds commensurate with its purpose. What we desire to accomplish is to extend the operation of plans already in effect which would enable some institution to carry on to a point not yet achieved some vital educational function.

Second: Mindful of our obligations to the community of Newark and to the State of New Jersey, of which we are residents and citizens, and wherein our labors have been so handsomely rewarded, to locate whatever institution we may endow in such State and in the vicinity of such City, thereby reflecting in part upon that City and State the benefits of the results we seek to bring about.

Having made an extensive survey of the field, guided by expert advice, we are presently of the opinion that the best service we can render mankind is to establish and endow a graduate college which shall be limited in the scope and nature of the studies it proposes to teach; which will attract to it the highest calibre of men and women to specialize as teachers in the subjects in which they have achieved unusual proficiency; to offer as the basis of such attraction, the facilities which will be afforded to them to continue the pursuit of their respective specialties and enlarge the field of their knowledge and, by virtue of the environment in which they shall be asked to live and teach, to insure them the opportunity of imparting their knowledge to selected students under the most favorable conditions:- in short, to set up a graduate school of limited scope, but of the highest quality, in which the teaching staff will have unlimited opportunity to continue to pursue and enlarge their knowledge of the subjects in which they are expected to teach: to free such school from all of the impediments which now surround graduate schools because of the undergraduate activities connected therewith and which so largely dominate the same, by selecting students based upon their qualifications and adeptness, to create an atmosphere within

the institution which should afford the opportunity therein to develop great specialists in particular fields of the arts and sciences.

Such institution is to be operated upon lines which pay no regard to race or creed, and no preference is to be given or be denied therein to any person because of these.

While the foregoing sets forth our present state of mind, it is our intention and desire not to limit the scope of the activities of such organization as may be created to carry out our purposes, and if, for any reason, it shall be impracticable to establish such a graduate school as is herein outlined, we reserve to ourselves during our respective lifetimes, and to the trustees of the Foundation which we may cause to be erected to carry out our purposes, the uncontrolled judgment and discretion at any time or from time to time to alter or modify the purposes thereof, to the end that the income of the funds which we may thus establish shall in any event and at all times be used and applied for a beneficent public purpose in which all who are in a position to benefit thereby shall be privileged so to do without distinction of a religious or racial nature.

More fully to accomplish the purposes herein outlined, we are about to organize a corporation under the laws of the State of New Jersey (or such other state as may be best) which it is our purpose and intention presently to endow with the sum of $-------, and upon the death of the survivor of us, to devise and bequeath to such institution the residue of our respective fortunes.

We make, nominate, constitute and appoint ---------- to be the first trustees, or directors of such corporation, the succeeding Boards of Directors to be elected and appointed from time to time as in the Charter and By-Laws of such corporation may be provided, and we desire that unless, during our respective lifetimes, we shall have changed the pruposes herein set forth, or the trustees of such corporation in their judgment and discretion shall at any time thereafter change the purposes thereof, that such fund and the income thereof be used and applied for the purposes herein defined, restricting the operation thereof only insofar as we require that such institution shall be located in the vicinity of Newark, N. J. upon lands which we may convey or devise to it for that purpose, or, failing which,

upon such lands as it may acquire for that purpose in such location, and that so far as may be commensurate with the purposes herein set forth, preference be given as students in said school to residents of the City of Newark and the State of New Jersey.

From Legal Papers. Working Papers. Formation of Institute.

APPENDIX II

January 20, 1930

MEMORANDUM

It is our purpose to devote our entire residual estate to the endowment of an institution of higher learning situated in or near the City of Newark and called after the State of New Jersey in grateful recognition of the opportunities which we have enjoyed in that community.

We are persuaded that there is now little or no lack and that there will in the future be still less lack of schools and colleges for the training of young men and women. Neither now nor in the future is there likely to be an overabundance of opportunities for men and women competent to advance learning in all serious fields of human interest and endeavor and to train younger men and women who may follow in their footsteps. It is our desire therefore that the proposed university shall contain no undergraduate department, that as long as present conditions continue, it shall bestow only the Ph. D. degree or professional degrees of equal value, and that its standards of admission and its methods of work be adapted to these ends and these only.

As conditions in the realm of advanced instruction and research improve, it is our desire that the trustees of this institution advance the ideals of the institution so that it may at all times be distinguished for quality and at no time be influenced by consideration of numbers.

It is our express and inflexible desire that the appointments to the staff and faculty of this institution and in the admission of workers and students no account be taken directly or indirectly of religion or sex. In the spirit characteristic of America at its noblest, we desire that this fund be administered with sole respect to the objects for which it is set up and with no respect whatsoever to accidents of creed, origin, or sex.

It is our belief that the sum which we shall ultimately provide will be adequate to start and to maintain at the

highest possible intellectual level an institution devoted to the central cultural and scientific disciplines. It is no part of our immediate intention to institute professional schools. It is our wish that our trustees should not countenance development in that or any other direction unless funds are assured which permit the undertaking of additional responsibilities at the same high level at which the enterprise has been started.

It will probably devlop that most candidates for the doctor's degree will have received a collegiate degree or the equivalent thereof, but it is our wish that the facilities of the institution will be open to any student who can demonstrate his fitness to profit in the highest degree by their use and to no others. It is also our purpose that many of those who enter the university which we propose to establish will hope to become professors in other institutions of learning, but we desire to emphasize the fact that the institution itself is set up not to train teachers, not to produce holders of degrees, but to advance learning and to train persons competent to participate in that fundamental and most important endeavor. For the execution of this purpose we temporarily create a committee made up of
---

In the event of the death of both of us before further steps can be taken, this committee is authorized to constitute itself as the first Board of Trustees by adding to its number _____ members. We commend to their consideration as representing the ideals of scholarship and service to humanity that we have in mind the following:

It is our hope that site, buildings, and equipment can be provided without impairment of the capital sum with which the institution will be endowed. No gifts from outside sources shall ever be accepted conditioned upon the modification of the fundamental aim for which this institution is created.

It is our hope that the most cordial and cooperative relations may at all times exist between the trustees and the faculty of the university. To that end we suggest that at least three members of the faculty be chosen ultimately by the faculty itself to become members of the board of trustees, and we further hope that the opportunities of the institution may prove attractive to men of the most distinguished standing because of the freedom and abundance

of opportunities which they will enjoy in the prosecution of their own work and in the selection and training of students and in the maintenance of the highest possible standards in science and scholarship.

1. The buildings should be modest, adaptable to their purpose and yet sufficiently attractive to exercise a beneficial influence on the architectural taste of the community.

2. The trustees shall be empowered to establish within reasonable limits such fellowships and scholarships as from time to time may be needed in order to support in whole or part younger men and women whose previous training has been adequate and whose development promises to be significant.

Note. The amendments consisted in striking the last two paragraphs above, together with the clause in the paragraph just preceding them which begins with "and we further hope that the opportunities," etc. For these the following paragraph was substituted.

In conclusion we enjoin upon our executors and the committee herein mentioned the following: should investigation and inquiry lead to the conclusion that the sum which we propose ultimately to devote to the endowment of a University is inadequate to the fulfillment of our ideas in the manner herein described, they shall modify or change the plan to the end that the income of the fund finally established shall be used and applied for a beneficent public purpose in which all who are in position to benefit thereby shall be privileged so to do without distinction of religious or racial nature, and under similar circumstances we reserve to ourselves jointly and individually also the right to make such change or changes.

From Legal Papers. Working Papers. Formation of Institute.

APPENDIX III

April 23, 1930

Newark, N. J.

To (naming proposed Trustees):

We are asking you to serve with us as Trustees of an Institute of Higher Learning or Advanced Studies to the endowment of which we propose ultimately to devote our residual estate -- the proposed Institute to be situated in the State of New Jersey in grateful recognition of the opportunities which we have enjoyed in this community.

We are persuaded that there is now little or no lack, and that there will be in the future still less lack, of schools and colleges for the training of young men and women; but there is not likely to be an overabundance of opportunities for men and women competent to advance learning in all serious fields of human interest and endeavor and to train younger men and women who may follow in their footsteps. It is our desire therefore that the proposed Institute shall contain no undergraduate department, that as long as present conditions continue, it shall bestow only the Ph. D. degree or professional degrees of equal value, and that its standards of admission and its methods of work be adapted to these ends and these only.

As conditions in the realm of advanced instruction and research improve, it is our hope that the trustees of this institution may see fit to advance the ideals of the institution so that it may at all times be distinguished for quality and at no time be influenced by consideration of numbers.

It is our express and inflexible desire that in appointments to the staff and faculty of this institution and in the admission of workers and students no account be taken directly or indirectly of race, religion, or sex. In the spirit characteristic of America at its noblest, we wish this fund to be administered with sole respect to the objects for which it is set up and with no regard whatsoever to accidents of creed, origin, or sex.

It is no part of our immediate intention to institute professional schools. We hope that the trustees will not countenance development in that or any other direction unless funds are assured which permit the undertaking of additional responsibilities at the same high level at which the enterprise has been started.

It will probably develop that most candidates for the doctor's degree will have received a collegiate degree or the equivalent thereof, but the facilities of the institution should, in the discretion of the trustees and staff, be open to any student who can demonstrate his or her fitness to profit in the highest degree by their use. Many of those who enter the institute will probably become professors in other institutions of learning, but the institution itself is set up, not to train teachers, not to produce holders of degrees, but to advance learning and to train persons competent to participate in that fundamental and most important endeavor.

It is our hope that site, buildings, and equipment can be provided without impairment of the capital sum with which the institution will be endowed. No gifts from outside sources shall be accepted conditioned upon the modification of the fundamental aims for which this institution is created.

It is our further hope that the most cordial and co-operative relations may at all times exist between the trustees and the faculty of the institute. To that end we suggest that certain members of the faculty be chosen ultimately to become members of the board of trustees.

In conclusion, we desire to make it plain that this letter is written in order to convey to the trustees the conception which we hope may be realized; but we should not wish it or any part of it to hamper our trustees in years to come if experience and changing social needs and conditions require a departure from the details to which we now draw attention.

Signed _____

_____

From Legal Papers. Working Papers. Formation of Institute.

APPENDIX IV

CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

of

"Institute for Advanced Study -- Louis Bamberger

and Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation"

This is to Certify that we, the subscribers, desiring to form a corporation pursuant to the provisions of an act entitled, "An Act to incorporate associations not for pecuniary profit," approved April 21, 1898, and the several amendments thereof and supplements thereto, do by this our certificate set forth.

1. The name by which the corporation is to be known in law is "Institute for Advanced Study -- Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld Foundation."

2. The purpose for which this corporation is formed is the establishment, at or in the vicinity of Newark, New Jersey, of an institute for advanced study, and for the promotion of knowledge in all fields, and for the training of advanced students and workers for and beyond the degree of Doctor of Philosophy and other professional degrees of equal standing.

3. The business of the corporation is to be chiefly transacted in this State, but it may have occasion to act outside of this State and/or in other States and foreign countries, in the accomplishment of the pruposes for which it is incorporated. The location of the office of the corporation within this State is 602 Centre Street, in the Village of South Orange, in the County of Essex, and the resident agent in charge thereof, upon whom process may be served, is Louis Bamberger.

4. The business of the corporation shall be conducted by Trustees, in number not less than twelve nor more than fifteen. The Trustees shall be members of the corporation and they shall be elected by the members in such manner and for such terms of office as the By-Laws may prescribe. Any Trustee ceasing to be a member of the corporation shall thereupon cease to be a Trustee.

The names of the Trustees selected for the first year are: Louis Bamberger, Mrs. Felix Fuld, John R. Hardin, Abraham Flexner, Samuel D. Leidesdorf, Herbert H. Maass, Julious Friedenwald, Florence R. Sabin, Alexis Carrel, Herbert H. Lehman, Frank Aydelotte, Alanson B. Houghton, Lewis H. Weed, Edgar S. Bamberger, and Percy S. Strauss.

5. The members of the corporation shall be adult persons, who shall be eligible under the laws of this State to be Trustees of this corporation. The original members are the undersigned incorporators and the additional persons named herein as Trustees for the first year. The members, at any regular or special meeting, may fill vacancies in the membership and may by a majority vote elect additional members. Election to membership shall be plenary proof of qualification for membership.

6. The purposes of the corporation shall include power to buy, sell, lease, and mortgage real and personal property; to improve real estate and erect buildings thereon; to accept gifts, bequests, and devises of real and/or personal property; to make contracts of all kinds; to make, amend, alter, and repeal by-laws not inconsistent with the laws of this State or of the United States; to make amend, alter, and repeal rules and regulations for the government of the institute to be established, maintained, and conducted by the corporation, and in respect to the appointment and duties of executive officers and members of the staff and faculty, and in respect to the admission (with and/or without payment of dues or charges) and discipline of the students and workers, and in respect to the granting of diplomas, and the awarding of degrees (including honorary degrees); and any and all other powers now or hereafter conferred by law upon corporations organized under the said act entitled 'An Act to incorporate associations not for pecuniary profit,' and the supplements thereto and amendments thereof, whether conferred by said act or supplements thereto or amendments thereof, or by other acts of the legislature, necessary, convenient, expedient, or appropriate to carry out the purposes for which this corporation is organized. Any of the powers of the corporation may be exercised, unless expressly prohibited by law, outside of this State and/or in other States and foreign countries, whenever necessary, convenient, expedient, or appropriate to carry out the purposes for which this corporation is organized.

In appointments to the faculty or staff, or in the admission of students and workers there shall be no discrimination because of race, religion, or sex, and no gifts, bequests, or devises of real and/or personal property shall be accepted, from other sources than from Louis Bamberger and Mrs. Felix Fuld, which shall be conditioned upon the modification of the fundamental purposes for which this corporation is created.

In Witness Whereof we have hereto set our hands and seals this 20th day of May, One Thousand Nine Hundred and Thirty.

Signed, Sealed, and Delivered
in the presence of

John R. Hardin, Jr.

Louis Bamberger (LS)
Mrs. Felix Fuld (LS)
John R. Hardin (LS)
Samuel D. Leidesdorf (LS)
Herbert H. Maass (LS)

APPENDIX V

LETTER ADDRESSED BY FOUNDERS

TO THEIR TRUSTEES

Newark, New Jersey
June 5, 1930

Dear Sir:

We are asking you to serve with us as Trustees of an institution of higher learning which we propose to endow with a substantial initial sum, to which we expect from time to time hereafter to add amounts which in our belief will provide adequately for the establishment of the proposed enterprise.

There is at present little or no lack of schools and colleges for the training of young men and women for the ordinary baccalaureate degrees. This need will in the future be apparently even more fully supplied than at present. There are also attached to many of our colleges post-graduate schools doing effective work in guiding students in qualifying themselves for post-graduate degrees.

There is never likely to be an overabundance of opportunities for men and women engaged in the pursuit of advanced learning in the various fields of human knowledge. Particularly, so far as we are aware, there is no institution in the United States where scientists and scholars devote themselves at the same time to serious research and to the training of competent post-graduate students entirely independently of and separated from both the charms and the diversions inseparable from an institution, the major interest of which is the teaching of undergraduates.

It is our desire, therefore, that the proposed institution shall contain no undergraduate department and that it shall bestow only the Ph. D. degree, or professional degrees of equal value, and that its standards of admission and methods of work shall be upon such a basis and upon that alone.

In so far as students are concerned, it is our hope that the Trustees of the institution will advance the ideals upon which it is founded in such manner that quality of work rather than number of students shall be the distinguishing characteristic of the enrollment.

It is our hope that the staff of the institution will consist exclusively of men and women of the highest standing in their respective fields of learning, attracted to this institution through its appeal as an opportunity for the serious pursuit of advanced study and because of the detachment it is hoped to secure from outside distractions.

It is fundamental in our purpose, and our express desire, that in the appointments to the staff and faculty as well as in the admission of workers and students, no account shall be taken, directly or indirectly, of race, religion, or sex. We feel strongly that the spirit characteristic of America at its noblest, above all the pursuit of higher learning, cannot admit of any conditions as to personnel other than those designed to promote the objects for which this institution is established, and particularly with no regard whatever to accidents of race, creed, or sex.

In endowing this institution we recognize that many worthy and capable persons are unable for financial reasons to pursue study or research to the extent justified by their capacities. It is expected, therefore, that the Institute will supply means whereby through scholarships or fellowships such workers may be supported during the course of their work or research, to the end that the facilities of the institution may be available to any man or woman otherwise acceptable possessing the necessary mental and moral equipment.

While the institution will devote itself to the teaching of qualified advanced sutdents, it is our desire that those who are assembled in the faculty or staff of the institution may enjoy the most favorable opportunities for continuing research or investigations in their particular field or specialty, and that the utmost liberty of action shall be afforded the said faculty or staff to that end.

It is not part of our immediate plan to create a professional school, and we do not contemplate that the Trustees will sanction the development of the institution in that

or any other direction unless separate funds are assured which permit the undertaking of additional responsibilities upon the high level at which the enterprise is started and consistently with the whole spirit of the undertaking.

It will doubtless develop that most of the students admitted to this institution for the purpose of obtaining a doctor's degree will before entering have received a baccalaureate degree or the equivalent thereof. The facilities of the institution should, however, in the discretion of the Trustees and the staff, be open to any acceptable student who may demonstrate his or her qualifications and fitness.

Many of those who enter the institution will probably qualify themselves for professorships in other institutions of learning, but the institution itself is established not merely to train teachers or to produce holders of advanced degrees. The primary purpose is the pursuit of advanced learning and exploration in fields of pure science and high scholarship to the utmost degree that the facilities of the institution and the ability of the faculty and students will permit.

It is intended that the proposed institution be known as 'Institute for Advanced Study,' and, in grateful recognition of the opportunities which we personally have enjoyed in this country, that it be located in the State of New Jersey.

It is our hope that the site, buildings, and equipment can be provided without impairment of the capital sum with which the Institute for Advanced Study will be endowed.

It is our express wish that gifts from outside sources shall never be accepted conditioned upon any modification of the fundamental aim for which this institution is created.

To the end that the most cordial and cooperative relations may at all times exist between the Trustees and the faculty of the Institute, it is our further desire that certain members of the faculty shall be chosen to become members of the Board of Trustees.

This letter is written in order to convey to the Trustees the conception which we hope the Institute may realize, bur we do not wish it or any part of it to hamper or

restrict our Trustees in their complete freedom of action in years to come if their experience with changing social needs and conditions shall appear to require a departure from the details to which we have herein drawn attention.

Faithfully yours,

Louis Bamberger
Mrs. Felix Fuld

APPENDIX VI

CONFIDENTIAL

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, confortable, 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 hve 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 havecreated 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 is 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 recommen-

dations. 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 Halevy 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 institute" 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 cooperation, 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 deplores 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 coöperation. 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 administra-

tor 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 indipendent 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 so 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 Collége 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 Collége 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 deter 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 accomodate 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 fell 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, studdents, 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 forego 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 forego 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 contertious 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 andof 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 posses - 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.

APPENDIX VII

December 18, 1944

The Director and Faculty have never wavered in their enthusiasm for the idea of the Institute as stated by Dr. Flexner in his book on "Universities," in various Bulletins and reports to the Board, and as outlined in general terms by Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld in their letter to the Trustees of June 6, 1930. The high and severe purpose set forth in these documents appealed strongly to scholars all over the world. It is, furthermore, a purpose which the members of the present staff of the Institute believe can be carried out, and the members of the staff are delighted to pledge their utmost efforts towards its realization.

The greatest obstacle at the present moment to the realization of the high purposes of the Founders of the Institute is the lack of any established orderly procedure for carrying those purposes into effect. The Institute is not just another college or university. It has some resemblances to the Collége de France, to All Souls College of Oxford and to the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft of pre-war days. However, its end should be different from all of these, planned to meet American conditions and American needs. Its aims are two-fold: (1) Original contributions to knowledge and (2) the training of young scholars who have already received the doctor's degree or its equivalent in research and in the ideals of scholarship.

Dr. Flexner's admirable plan for realizing these purposes was to organize a small institution with the following characteristics:

(1) That the members of the staff should be men and women capable of work of the highest possible excellence judged not merely by national but by world standards.
(2) That the scholars of the Institute should enjoy complete freedom in their work, that there should be no attempt at planning or regimentation, that they should be left on their own responsibility to do what seemed best to them in research and in the direction of the activities of younger men.
(3) That in the consideration of men for the staff or for membership in the Institute, no account should be taken of race, sex or creed.
(4) That while the Trustees should have the ultimate legal authority, the actual control of scholarly and educational policies should be in the hands of the Faculty.
(5) That the members of the Faculty should have the dignity and security which comes from adequate salaries and retiring allowances.

(6) That the Institute should be experimental in character, not sticking to safe and conventional paths, but daring to make innovations and to try out new ideas.

The Institute is a young institution and the Trustees, Director and Faculty have now before them the interesting task of devising such orderly procedures and precedents as will make it possible to carry this great conception into reality. As compared with that great task, individual interests are unimportant. What is important is that Trustees, Director and Faculty should face together the problem of designing a new type of academic institution. The task is a difficult one and we shall hardly succeed in our pioneering quest unless we are unified and unless we have a clear conception of the goal we are trying to reach. For various reasons it has not been possible to face that task single-mindedly in the past. Now we are free to do our best and upon the achievements of the next few years the character and reputation of the Institute will depend for a long time to come.

While it has not been possible hitherto to take definite steps toward the establishment of orderly procedures for the Institute, the problem has been the subject of many discussions between the Director with members of the Board of Trustees and the Faculty. (sic.) It would be too much to say that there is unanimity of opinion in these two groups but it can be said that the weight of opinion is in favor of the following principles.

(1) We must make every possible effort to maintain the quality of the Institute Faculty at the highest possible level. The best method of reaching this goal is to place the responsibility for initiating appointments upon the Director and the Faculty. The Trustees, of course, must have the power of approving or refusing to approve recommendations made to them by the Director and Faculty, but neither the Director nor the Trustees should have the power of making appointments of which the majority of the Faculty does not approve. Only thus can the unity of the Institute be preserved. The selection of men for the Institute Faculty should not, however, rest only on the judgement of the Faculty and the Trustees. We aspire to stand at the head of American scholarship in the fields which we touch. Appointments which are made to the Institute are of concern to scholars outside, and outside advice should be sought in some formal and responsible way in connection with every appointment.

(2) The Trusttes should recognize the authority of the Faculty over the scholarly and educational policies of the Institute. No other course is possible if the members of the staff are to work in harmony. There is, of course, always the danger that members of the Faculty may seek to serve selfish and departmental interests. Against this risk the veto power of the Trustees is our only protection.

(3) It is important that the Trustees should recognize that the best interests of the Institute and of scholarship in general will be served by allowing members of the Faculty the utmost possible freedom in their work. Men and women of the high type we are seeking will feel the moral responsibility which accompanies such freedom and will do their best to justify it. They will, furthermore, be powerfully stimulated by the presence of younger scholars seeking their advice and direction, and by the critical appraisal of the scholarly world outside, of which they will not cease to form a part.

(4) Dr. Flexner suggested in one of his early reports that he hoped the Trustees would demand from the Faculty a formal critical public accounting at least once a year of the work in progress and of plans for the future. It is not easy to see in just what form such an accounting could be made other than in the Director's reports which present to the Trustees a continuous story of the activities of the Institute, a story which is recapitulated in a briefer form in the annual Bulletin. This is one respect in which the Institute has evolved so far no satisfactory policy. It is a matter which should be carefully studied by the Trustees and the Faculty in the future.

(5) The Trustees and Faculty should recognize the right of scholarly groups outside the Institute to be consulted not merely on appointments but also on policies, including subjects in which research should from time to time be undertaken.

(6) Dr. Flexner believed strongly in Faculty representation on the Board of Trustees and the Founders included a recommendation to this effect in their deed of gift. At one time Dr. Flexner suggested that a committee of members of the Faculty should sit with the Trustees in an advisory capacity without vote.* The plan actually adopted was the selection of members of the Faculty by the Nominating Committee of the Board and one or more members of the Faculty so selected have acted as Trustees since 1935. The principle that the Board of Trustees should seek the advice of the Faculty on everything relating to the scholarly and educational policies of the Institute is sound and necessary. This end could be reached by the organization of an advisory committee selected by the Faculty, or by giving the Faculty power to elect a certain number of Trustees, or by such a clear division of authority between the Faculty and Trustees that such representation would be unnecessary.

*See p. 199. Dr. Flexner did not originate the plan for advisory Faculty members. It was suggested by the Founders when he asked for an increase in the total number of Trustees to provide for Faculty Trustees.

(7) The Trustees should recognize finally the interest of the Faculty in the election of a Director. Any individual chosen for this office should be jointly chosen by the Faculty and the Trustees, and the Trustees should pass a resolution that no Director unsatisfactory to the Faculty would be appointed.

The approval by the Trustees of these recommendations as to procedure would give to the Institute security, stability and peace which it has never had. This end could be reached by formal adoption of resolutions by the Trustees. It would probably be better, however, for Trustees and Faculty to give sympathetic consideration to these problems and to endeavor jointly to work out precedents which might embody them and even improve upon them.. In devising orderly methods for the conduct of a new and unique institution, time and experience are necessary. For the first time since the foundation of the Institute the Trustees and Faculty are free to face these problems, and upon judicious action during the next few years the whole future of the Institute will depend.

To this great endeavor the members of the Faculty pledge to the Trustees their best and most unselfish efforts to the end that the two groups working together may realize in actual practice the Institute of which Dr. Flexner dreamed.

Not appended, but added on a separate sheet, was the following:

THE USEFULNESS OF USELESS KNOWLEDGE
By Abraham Flexner

What Rutherford and others like Bohr and Millikan have done out of sheer curiosity in the effort to understand the construction of the atom has released forces which may transform human life; but this ultimate and unforeseen and unpredictable practical result is not offered as a justification for Rutherford or Einstein or Bohr or Millikan or any of their peers. Let them alone. No educational administrator can possibly direct the channels in which these or other men shall work.

Harper's Magazine, Vol. 179, p. 548.
June, 1939 -- November, 1939

January 2, 1945

The intention of the donors in establishing the Institute for Advanced Study as outlined in their letter to the Trustees of June 6, 1930 was to found a small institution of the highest possible quality with the two-fold purpose of making original contributions to knowledge and of training young scholars in research and in the ideals of scholarship. In order to accomplish these ends, the following policies have been worked out by the Directors, Trustees and Facylty:

(1) That the members of the staff should be men and women capable of creative work of the highest possible excellence judged not merely by national but by world standards.
(2) That the scholars in the Institute should enjoy complete freedom in their work, that there should be no attempt at planning or regimentation, that they should be left on their own responsibility to do what seemed best to them in research and in the direction of the activities of younger men.
(3) That in the consideration of men for the staff or for membership in the Institute, no account should be taken of race, sex or creed.
(4) That while the Trustees have the ultimate legal authority, the actual control of scholarly and educational policies should be in the hands of the Director and Faculty.
(5) That appointments to the staff of the Institute should be made only with the advice and consent of the Faculty.
(6) That the members of the Faculty should have the dignity and security which come from adequate salaries and retiring allowances.
(7) That in order to secure cordial and cooperative relations between Trustees and Faculty, certain members of the Faculty should, as suggested by the donors, be chosen to become members of the Board of Trustees.
(8) That the Institute should not be permanently committed to any particular field of research but that different fields might be cultivated or abandoned from time to time according to their importance and according to the men available to represent them.

These policies were most of them stated or implied in the letter of gift. They have been repeated and emphasized many times by the two Directors and have been accepted by the majority of the members of the Facylty and Board of Trustees. They are the foundation upon which we must build.

These policies constitute, however, only a foundation. The Institute is a young institution and for various reasons it has not hitherto been possible to establish upon the basis of these fundamental policies a superstructure of orderly procedure and precedent. With the new era now opening before us, the Trustees, Director and Faculty

are faced with this responsibility. The task is a difficult one and we shall hardly succeed unless we have a clear conception of the goal we are trying to reach.

The Institute is not just another college or university or research foundation. It has some resemblances to the College de France, to All Souls College, Oxford and to the Kaiser Wilhelm Gesellschaft of pre-war Germany. Its purposes are, however, different from all of these; it is an American institution, planned to meet American needs.*

The Institute for Advanced Study is an institution in which a small permanent group of professors serve as the nucleus of a larger, temporary group of mature, though generally younger scholars. It has been found that the scholars thus brought together are so much interested in their respective tasks, in their own development and in the development of knowledge that the usual academic arrangements such as regular courses, required attendance, degrees, examinations and administrative supervision can be dispensed with.*

In these respects which are all consequences of the fact that it limits its membership to scholars of a high level of maturity, the Institute differs from all American universities. It is like a university in that its success depends on the influence that it has on its temporary members as well as on the individual discoveries of its professors.*

It is like a "research institute" of which there are several good examples in America, in that the members of its staff are contributors to knowledge. It differs from a research institute in two major respects (1) the emphasis on the treatment of temporary members which flow through it and (2) the absence of a specified program of research and of all regimentation.*

Essential to the success of the Institute is the quality of the group of professors who constitute its nucleus. No professor should be appointed who is not already an eminent creative scholar. Second-rate men, however meritorious, are a handicap. The best method of maintaining the quality of the Institute at the highest level is to require that appointments recommended by the Director should first be approved by the Faculty. The same principle should be applied to the selection of a Director when the occasion arises. The unity of the Institute cannot be preserved unless the Trustees make it their policy not to appoint a Director or a Professor who is not supported by the majority of the Faculty. On the other hand, the Trustees are the court of last resort and are free at their discretion to approve or disapprove any recommendations made to them by Director or Faculty.

In the appointment of members of the Faculty and in selecting fields for research, the Trustees should not, in an nstitution of this character, rely solely upon the advice of the Faculty. The institution we aspire to build will be so significant in all the fields of scholarship we touch that our appointments will be a matter of concertn to scholars everywhere. Competent outside advice should be sought in

some formal and responsible way.

Finally it should be repeated that the interest of the Institute and of scholarship in general will best be served by allowing members of the Faculty the utmost possible freedom in their work. Men and women of the high type we are seeking cannot be regimented. Their work cannot be planned for them. They may themselves choose to collaborate on a given task, but no enforced collaboration, no organization of team work, no planned research will ever work with first-rate minds.

Dr. Flexner has put tis point very well in an article which he wrote a few years ago on "The Usefulness of Useless Knowledge."

> "What Rutherford and others like Bohr and Millikan have done out of sheer curiosity in the effort to understand the construction of the atom has released forces which may transform human life; but this ultimate and unforeseen and unpredictable practical result is not offered as a justification for Rutherford or Einstein or Millikan or Bohr or any of their peers. Let them alone. No educational administrator can possibly direct the channels in which these or other men shall work."

The government of the Institute, including appointments, policies, choice of fields of work and financial arrangements, should be the joint responsibility of Trustees and Faculty. The proper division of responsibility between the two bodies should be determined by careful and free discussion in order to arrive at a solution which will be simple, flexible and democratic. When that solution is reached it should be affirmed by formal resolutions of the Board of Trustees.

*These four paragraphs incorporating Professor Veblen's account dated 12/23/44 of the evolution of the Institute were removed by the Director and incorporated in Bulletin No. 11 (March, 1945) at page 3 with the following prefatory paragraphs:

> One purpose of the Founders, that the Institute should confer the Ph. D. degree, was during the 1930's with their full approval, abandoned. It is licensed to do so under its charter, but experience has shown that the need of facilities for postdoctoral research are so much more urgent and so much less fully met in other places that the Institute has concentrated upon this field.
>
> As it has developed, the Institute has become not a college or a university or a research foundation. It is an institution in which a small permanent group of professors serves as a nucleus of a larger, temporary group of mature, though generally younger scholars. It has been found that the scholars thus brought together are so much interested in their respective tasks, in their own develop-

> ment and in the advancement of knowledge, that the usual academic arrangements such as regular courses, required attendance, degrees, examinations and administrative supervision can be dispensed with as superflous....

It is perhaps unnecessary to say here that the above paragraphs make a matter of groping evolution what Dr. Flexner had decided upon, described and put into effect in the beginning.