

February 20, 1974

Memorandum to Messrs Petersen, Solow and Dilworth,
and Mrs. Gray

You may have noted that I failed to send a copy of my letter to you of February 14th to Don Straus, because I knew he was away.

I have corrected this oversight. .

Sincerely,

Carl Kaysen

Mrs. Hannah H. Gray
Mr. Howard C. Petersen
Mr. J. Richardson Dilworth
Mr. Robert M. Solow

February 20, 1974

Don:

This somehow failed to get sent on
to you as it should have been, for which
I apologize.

Carl Kaysen

Attachment

February 14, 1974

Dear Howard, Hanna, Bob:

I write to put on paper my thoughts about the present state of the faculty discussion on the problems of governance, and some suggestions about the agenda for our meeting on the 23rd. Enclosed are three documents. One is a reduction to paper of the appointment procedure I spoke about briefly at our last meeting. This has been circulated around the Faculty by Geertz and Adler, as representing what the physicists and Geertz (and I) find acceptable. As yet there has been no broad indication of response in the other two Schools, but by next Saturday we may have more information, since both History and Mathematics will have School meetings before then.

The second is the Minutes of the last Faculty meeting, which I described to you briefly on the phone earlier. I call your attention to the three motions on pages 3 and 4. They originated in History and were passed by substantial votes in the whole Faculty: essentially all mathematicians and historians for, and a scattering of abstentions and negative votes from Geertz and the physicists present. The second motion needs no further discussion. It is, of course, a declaration of principle signifying that we have all been bad boys (and girls). Assuming that the Faculty will endorse something like the appointment procedure outlined in the first attachment, no attention need be paid to the declaration of principle one way or another; the Board can take note of the new procedure and leave it at that.

What is important, new, and raises questions for us is the third motion, especially part a. Like the others, it originated in the History Faculty, and was proposed by Professor Gilbert. As you can see from the final paragraph of the Minutes, Gilbert seemed to wish to go back to the old proposal that there be a joint committee of Board and Faculty to consider candidates for Director, despite the Board's explicit rejection of it when it was offered in 1971.

Since the Faculty meeting I have had a long talk with Gilbert. He starts from the idea that the Board should include two representatives of the Faculty--elected by at least a two-thirds vote of the whole Faculty, from different Schools, each to serve one term, representatives alternating among Schools. He thinks this would do much to make the

- 2 -

Board and the Faculty understand one another, and further would convince the Faculty that the Director indeed represents their interests and views to the Board. An arrangement of this kind is in force at Bryn Mawr, where Gilbert taught before he came to the Institute. In that case, it would be perfectly natural for Faculty Trustees to be on a search committee for a new director. In the absence of direct Faculty representation on the Board, Gilbert's proposal was an alternative means to the same end.

After my long explanation of why I thought this idea, whatever its general merits, was unsuitable to the Institute here and now, Gilbert agreed that paragraph 15, to which he was objecting (third attachment) would permit a committee of the Faculty to discuss its suggestions with the search committee of the Board and comment on the names that the Board committee had in mind. However, it would not participate in the final selection and ranking by the Committee, nor in the Board's final choice process.

That Gilbert expressed his acceptance of such an arrangement is not in itself significant, since he has generally been on my side in the great war. Moreover, his reaction is a poor indicator of how other historians and mathematicians will react. The atmosphere in which his broad and vague motion was passed in the Faculty meeting was one of cheering declarations of principle, aimed at Director and Board, rather than one of attention to matters of detail.

Motion 3 b., of course, is an attempt to give the Faculty a kind of veto power over the Board's choice, or at least inhibit their capacity to find a Director who is not already a member of the Institute faculty.

In the light of all this, I think the Agenda for next time should focus on the functions of the Director and the process of choosing him. One comment I hear on our meetings is that Board members have been too silent; the Faculty would like to hear their views. I think it would be most helpful if their wishes were acceded to in respect to the suggested topics.

In accordance with our previous discussion, it seems to me it might be useful if Howard wrote to each faculty member of the Committee proposing the Director, functions and selection, as the agenda topic; saying that the first hour, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. would be reserved for such discussion of the role of the Director as would be made easier by my absence, and I would join the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

However, I think it essential that that period not be extended beyond the allotted hour. As you know, the desire of the actively dissident part of the Faculty to demonstrate that I am totally unnecessary to the functioning of the Institute is strong, and every occasion to underline that proposition is seized on. I have avoided drawing the issue in order to permit the continuance of peaceful discussion, and thus, the growth of some degree of mutual tolerance and civility. However, if my acquiescence on this process is extended indefinitely, the result will be seen by the Faculty as the Board's acquiescence in the proposition.

In general, my impression is that the war party remains eight to ten strong, and that the peace party--the majority--thinks mainly of finding peace by agreeing with the war party rather than opposing them. In an important sense I have less faculty support now than I had last spring, precisely because there is no active issue to crystallize support and those who genuinely would prefer to see me remain also prefer not to have to think about the whole problem if they can avoid it. Thus the time is near or at hand where the Board, in the first instance through you, has to express its views on the need for a Director and the Board's responsibility in choosing one.

Cordially,

Carl Kaysen

Mr. Howard C. Petersen
Mrs. Hanna H. Gray
Mr. Robert M. Solow

cc: Mr. J. Richardson Dilworth

Mr. David B. Gross

Enclosures

Sketch for IAS Appointment Procedure for Established Schools

Introduction

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

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

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

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

Procedure

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

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

3. If five or more members of the Faculty call for discussion of the appointment, there shall be a meeting for discussion at the earliest opportunity. If after discussion, the meeting takes no action, the Faculty shall be deemed to have concurred in the nomination.

4. After discussion, the Faculty may, by majority vote, refer the nomination to a Standing Committee on Appointments.

NOTE: The Standing Committee shall consist of two members from each School. The Director shall sit with the Committee but shall not vote.

-2-

5. If a majority of the Committee does not oppose the nomination, the Faculty shall be deemed to have concurred in it.

6. If a majority of the Committee opposes the nomination, the nominating School, with the agreement of the Director, may present it to a meeting of the full Faculty for a vote. If a majority of those present does not oppose the nomination, the Faculty shall be deemed to have concurred in it.

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

January 29, 1974

Proposed wording of Sec. 15 of "Responsibilities of the Faculty..."

15. When it becomes necessary for the Board to fill the office of Director under Section 3, Article VI, of the By-Laws, the Board will consult with the Faculty. The Board will welcome any nominations the Faculty wishes to offer for the post and will submit for the comments of the Faculty the names of any candidates it is considering seriously. The Board recognizes the Faculty may wish to express a collegiate view on both these matters and is open to receiving one, arrived at by whatever process the Faculty agrees upon. Nothing in the collegial process should inhibit any individual member of the Faculty who desires to do so from expressing his views to the Board.

DRAFT MINUTES

Faculty Meeting of January 15, 1974
10:00 a.m. - Board Room

Present: Professors Adler, Borel, Clagett, Dyson, Elliott, Geertz, Gilbert, Gilliam, Habicht, Harish-Chandra, Kaysen, Langlands, Lavin, Montgomery, Regge, Selberg, Setton, Thompson, Weil, White, Whitney

Absent: Professors Bahcall, Dashen, Gödel, Kennan, Meiss, Milnor, Rosenbluth

Chairman: Professor Setton

1. Chairmanship. The meeting was called by the Secretary at the written request of five members of the Faculty. By unanimous vote, Professor Setton was elected to the chair.
2. The Minutes of the previous meeting (November 21, 1973) were approved (as corrected January 8, 1974).
3. Report on the meeting of the Joint Committee on Governance held on December 8, 1973.

The Chairman called in turn on the four Faculty representatives.

Professor Geertz reported that discussion had centered on procedure in making professorial appointments. Trustee members of the Committee were concerned to know the present views of the Faculty as to what should be done in case of a disputed nomination: should a Faculty vote be binding or should provision be made for some form of arbitration?

Professor Adler agreed that the main topic of discussion had been procedure in professorial nominations. Within the School of Natural Sciences, he reported, there is a strong feeling that once a school is established, it should be allowed great latitude in making appointments so as to have the possibility of developing in an adventurous, perhaps novel way.

Professor Selberg observed that most of the talking at the meeting had been done by the Faculty members - the Trustee members listened. He himself had upheld the principles that nominating procedure is an internal matter for the Faculty, and that a Faculty decision regarding a nomination should be final. It will be desirable, of course, to work out a procedure as widely acceptable as possible to the Faculty, without its being too subject to overuse or misuse.

-2-

Professor Gilliam agreed that nominating procedure had indeed been the chief subject of discussion at the last meeting, and was likely to come up again at the next, though he himself did not regard it as the currently most pressing or substantial problem in the governance of the Institute. He felt that the Faculty should give consideration to Sections 14 and 15 of the statement formulated in 1972/73 on "The Responsibilities of the Faculty in the Governance of the Institute". Professor Geertz added that the Trustees wish to be apprised of the present views of the Faculty on these matters.

4. Discussion of the Report on the Meeting of the Governance Committee.

In Professor Borel's opinion, nominating procedure is a matter for the Faculty alone, and consequently the Faculty's recommendations on this subject as transmitted through the Joint Committee should be something of which the Trustees need only to take note. Professor Adler, however, reiterated his personal view that the Trustees should have the power to overrule a negative vote of the Faculty and that consequently they are involved.

Professor Dyson favored Alternative (1) of the proposals for nominating procedure circulated by Professor Adler on January 3, 1974 (copy attached to Minutes).

Professor Geertz opposed the idea of a completely sovereign Faculty for the following reasons:

1. He questioned the wisdom of eliminating ultimate control by the Trustees since this would result in a self-perpetuating Faculty that even now is free from such checks as are imposed in a normal university by students, alumni and administration.
2. He feared that a completely self-perpetuating Faculty would become ultra-conservative, unresponsive to current movements, hermetic.
- * 3. In building up a new school he felt a special need for counsel from the most relevant sources, and in his opinion the most appropriate people to evaluate the academic capabilities of a proposed member of the Faculty were his professional peers, not the members of the Faculty in other disciplines.

Professor Selberg expressed concurrence with Professor Adler's Alternative (1) and refused to share Professor Geertz's apprehensions. The Faculty is not without checks; it is subject to the scrutiny of a large community of outside intellectuals. As for professorial appointments, they are made by the Trustees; the Faculty makes only nominations. Hence an appointment requires an agreement between these two bodies. If, on the other hand, appointments could be made by the Trustees alone, this would result in a situation lacking in checks and balances. Conservatism in moderation is a virtue in academia, and perhaps less perilous than hasty innovation, nor did he believe there was much danger of fossilization in the Faculty. He did fear that to limit the powers of the Faculty would interfere with the recruitment of first-rate new members.

Professor Adler believed he was speaking for the School of Natural Sciences in stating his preference for his Alternative (1). He did not in any sense advocate that the Trustees should make appointments.

Professor Kaysen emphasized the fact that there has been no suggestion that the Trustees or the Director should make appointments in the sense of exercising initiative. In his experience, schools refrain from proposing nominations that do not command a considerable measure of agreement. The real issue is how much weight should be given in those rare cases in which the rest of the Faculty is unpersuaded by the views of the relevant school.

Professor Gilbert questioned the use of the term "unanimous" in connection with a vote on a nomination within a school, - he would prefer "without contrary vote". He went on to express his dislike of voting on nominations in the full Faculty because of the difficulty of forming a useful opinion of the scholarly qualifications of a specialist in another discipline. He would prefer an appointments committee made up of two members from each of the schools.

Professor Langlands asked Professor Adler whether it was right to infer that the School of Natural Sciences was perhaps contemplating the possibility of changes or innovations within the School of a sort that might be expected to meet with opposition from the rest of the Faculty. In reply, Professor Adler stated that in general the School was disposed to keep to its current policy of concentrating on basic research, but in some future time the state of physics might suggest a move toward a Faculty appointment in some new area outside the traditional areas of basic research. This, however, was not likely to happen within the immediate future.

Professor Cherniss questioned Professor Adler on his implied lack of confidence in the judgment and good will of his colleagues in the other schools, and emphasized the danger of the Institute breaking up into separate institutions.

Professor Gilliam, while reiterating his opinion that the question of procedure in making professorial nominations is not of the greatest urgency, particularly since the current procedure has on the whole worked well, questioned the wisdom of asking the Faculty to renounce its potential right to vote on nominations made by individual schools. He saw little danger from Faculty sovereignty or the appointment of a weak Director or hermetic tendencies.

5. Guidance for Faculty Members of the Governance Committee.

At the request of the Chair, Professor Gilliam circulated written copies of the following three motions which had been passed unanimously at a meeting on January 10, 1974 of the School of Historical Studies:

1. It is the sense of this meeting that the representative of the School on the Faculty-Trustee Committee on Governance should report to the Committee the following:
 - a. the School believes that no nomination to a professorship which is not approved by the Faculty should be forwarded to the Board of Trustees, and that no person who is not approved by the Faculty should be appointed to a professorship at the Institute.

-4-

- b. the School believes that only the Faculty of the Institute may determine the manner in which its approval of a nomination to a professorship shall be given.
2. The School disapproves the proposals circulated among members of the Committee and the Faculty:
 - a. to set up a mandatory outside Standing Committee for each School with the function of arbitrating disputed appointments among other things.
 - b. to assign a special role to academic Trustees.
3. The School is of the opinion:
 - a. that Section 15 of "Responsibilities of the Faculty in the Governance of the Institute" as formulated at present does not give the Faculty enough voice in the selection of the Director, and,
 - b. does not make it clear that if the Director is to be made a Professor he needs to go through the same procedures as the other Professors of the Institute.

*

Professor Gilbert stated, and Professors Cherniss and White agreed, that the approval of the Faculty required in 1 a. does not need to mean a vote by the entire Faculty but is compatible with any procedure agreed upon by the Faculty for expressing its concurrence or lack of concurrence with nominations to professorships.

It was moved by Professor Weil, seconded by Professor Montgomery that this body associates itself with the spirit of the above motions passed in the School of Historical Studies.

In the discussion that followed, Professor Adler recorded his negative view of the first motion. Informal criticism and advice from sister schools are welcome, but not the possibility of a mandatory veto, - should not the Faculty trust a school as well as vice versa? The rules for appointments should be reconsidered, and this should be done now when the issue can be dealt with in principle unrelated to any individual. The final judges of what appointments are made in physics should be from the outside community and not the Faculty. The same applies to decisions about fields to be supported by the Institute. On this, Professor Cherniss commented that in his opinion such matters were questions for the whole Faculty. Professor Weil recalled the salutary procedure followed in the 1950's when a joint Trustee-Faculty Committee was proposed as the best body for deciding on what is or is not an appropriate subject to be cultivated at the Institute. On the long view, one might better place one's confidence in the Faculty than on directors or trustees apart from the Faculty.

Professor White observed that the basic issue was whether the Faculty of the Institute should continue to function as a whole and not as a loosely knit combination of schools. He favored its continuing to function as a whole in the matter of professorial appointments. In particular, he believed that no

professorial appointment should be made without the approval of the Faculty; this need not deprive the Board of its right to decline an appointment favored by the Faculty, but it would deprive them of the right to override Faculty disapproval. To avoid the pain and danger of Faculty votes, and yet to preserve the Faculty's power of veto, he was prepared to accept Professor Gilbert's proposal for a standing Committee of Review comprising two representatives from each school, - a safeguard against a tyrannical majority. Failing some such solution, Professor White stressed the dangers of allowing any outside committee to have the final say regarding a disputed nomination. Such a course might again involve the Trustees in an unpleasant decision between a majority of the Faculty and a minority supported by outsiders. It might again lead to the appointment of a scholar who would come knowing that he was disapproved by a majority of his colleagues and aware that his appointment had depended on the recommendation of outsiders and on the ratification of the Board. There would be the further danger of periodically throwing the Institute into its present state of hostility and mutual suspicion. Nor will it be easy to recruit distinguished scholars if we are obliged to inform them that this Faculty does not have even the power to veto a nomination, much less determine one. Professor White maintained that the proposed plan was not incompatible with the principle that in general each school is the best judge of who should be a member. He felt sure that if the plan were adopted, an overwhelming number of the nominations made by schools would be accepted by the Committee of Review. On the other hand, he failed to see why a school should not be prepared at times to profit from criticism from colleagues in other schools or why it should shrink from defending its nominations. To meet the objection that no one not in the nominating school was likely to have the specialized knowledge to make a useful assessment of a nomination, Professor White claimed that at least between the School of Historical Studies and of Social Sciences, such cross assessments are possible and have indeed been made. In addition to its other advantages the proposed plan, in Professor White's judgement, would preserve the collegial spirit of the Faculty, and he reminded the group that if free rein were given to the principle of autonomy as between schools it would be very hard to avoid allowing it free rein within schools that are congeries of disciplines.

Despite some hesitancy about taking a formal vote before the motion had been discussed in all the schools, it was agreed that a vote should be taken to assist the Governance Committee in its further deliberations. With the consent of the mover and seconder, the original motion was divided into three corresponding to the three motions of the School of Historical Studies, and the third was subdivided to match the division in the third of those motions. All four motions were passed as follows (the Chairman not voting):

Part 1:	in favor	17 (including a proxy from Professor Milnor)
	opposed	4
Part 2:	in favor	16
	opposed	4
Part 3a:	in favor	15
	opposed	2
	abstained	3
3b:	in favor	17
	opposed	1
	abstained	2

-6-

* Before the vote on the final pair of motions, 3 a. and 3 b., there was some further discussion in which a number of members of the Faculty took part. Professor Gilbert made plain that he wished to have an expression of opinion on the general proposition that 15, as shown in the attachment, was too vague and should be specified more clearly. Professors Clagett and Selberg shared this view. Professor Kaysen asked whether the inadequacy referred to in 3 a. was the one specified in 3 b. or whether there was a further one. Professor Adler pointed out that paragraph 15 had been circulated last spring but not discussed. Professor Gilbert, in further clarification of 3 a. suggested that in particular the Board Committee which considered names of candidates should do so jointly with a committee of the Faculty. Professor Kaysen gave a brief history of the present draft which had been formulated in a discussion between the Faculty Advisory Committee and the Executive Committee of the Board. Although it had been circulated to the Faculty last spring, the situation was such that it had not been discussed. Further, the present formulation resulted from an earlier discussion in which the Board had rejected, against his advice, precisely the suggestion that there be a joint Board and Faculty Committee, to which Professor Gilbert had referred.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Homer A. Thompson
Secretary

February 14, 1974

Dear Howard, Hanna, Bob:

I write to put on paper my thoughts about the present state of the faculty discussion on the problems of governance, and some suggestions about the agenda for our meeting on the 23rd. Enclosed are three documents. One is a reduction to paper of the appointment procedure I spoke about briefly at our last meeting. This has been circulated around the Faculty by Geertz and Adler, as representing what the physicists and Geertz (and I) find acceptable. As yet there has been no broad indication of response in the other two Schools, but by next Saturday we may have more information, since both History and Mathematics will have School meetings before then.

The second is the Minutes of the last Faculty meeting, which I described to you briefly on the phone earlier. I call your attention to the three motions on pages 3 and 4. They originated in History and were passed by substantial votes in the whole Faculty: essentially all mathematicians and historians for, and a scattering of abstentions and negative votes from Geertz and the physicists present. The second motion needs no further discussion. It is, of course, a declaration of principle signifying that we have all been bad boys (and girls). Assuming that the Faculty will endorse something like the appointment procedure outlined in the first attachment, no attention need be paid to the declaration of principle one way or another; the Board can take note of the new procedure and leave it at that.

What is important, new, and raises questions for us is the third motion, especially part a. Like the others, it originated in the History Faculty, and was proposed by Professor Gilbert. As you can see from the final paragraph of the Minutes, Gilbert seemed to wish to go back to the old proposal that there be a joint committee of Board and Faculty to consider candidates for Director, despite the Board's explicit rejection of it when it was offered in 1971.

Since the Faculty meeting I have had a long talk with Gilbert. He starts from the idea that the Board should include two representatives of the Faculty--elected by at least a two-thirds vote of the whole Faculty, from different Schools, each to serve one term, representatives alternating among Schools. He thinks this would do much to make the

- 2 -

Board and the Faculty understand one another, and further would convince the Faculty that the Director indeed represents their interests and views to the Board. An arrangement of this kind is in force at Bryn Mawr, where Gilbert taught before he came to the Institute. In that case, it would be perfectly natural for Faculty Trustees to be on a search committee for a new director. In the absence of direct Faculty representation on the Board, Gilbert's proposal was an alternative means to the same end.

After my long explanation of why I thought this idea, whatever its general merits, was unsuitable to the Institute here and now, Gilbert agreed that paragraph 15, to which he was objecting (third attachment) would permit a committee of the Faculty to discuss its suggestions with the search committee of the Board and comment on the names that the Board committee had in mind. However, it would not participate in the final selection and ranking by the Committee, nor in the Board's final choice process.

That Gilbert expressed his acceptance of such an arrangement is not in itself significant, since he has generally been on my side in the great war. Moreover, his reaction is a poor indicator of how other historians and mathematicians will react. The atmosphere in which his broad and vague motion was passed in the Faculty meeting was one of cheering declarations of principle, aimed at Director and Board, rather than one of attention to matters of detail.

Motion 3 b., of course, is an attempt to give the Faculty a kind of veto power over the Board's choice, or at least inhibit their capacity to find a Director who is not already a member of the Institute faculty.

In the light of all this, I think the Agenda for next time should focus on the functions of the Director and the process of choosing him. One comment I hear on our meetings is that Board members have been too silent; the Faculty would like to hear their views. I think it would be most helpful if their wishes were acceded to in respect to the suggested topics.

In accordance with our previous discussion, it seems to me it might be useful if Howard wrote to each faculty member of the Committee proposing the Director, functions and selection, as the agenda topic; saying that the first hour, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. would be reserved for such discussion of the role of the Director as would be made easier by my absence, and I would join the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

However, I think it essential that that period not be extended beyond the allotted hour. As you know, the desire of the actively dissident part of the Faculty to demonstrate that I am totally unnecessary to the functioning of the Institute is strong, and every occasion to underline that proposition is seized on. I have avoided drawing the issue in order to permit the continuance of peaceful discussion, and thus, the growth of some degree of mutual tolerance and civility. However, if my acquiescence on this process is extended indefinitely, the result will be seen by the Faculty as the Board's acquiescence in the proposition.

In general, my impression is that the war party remains eight to ten strong, and that the peace party--the majority--thinks mainly of finding peace by agreeing with the war party rather than opposing them. In an important sense I have less faculty support now than I had last spring, precisely because there is no active issue to crystallize support and those who genuinely would prefer to see me remain also prefer not to have to think about the whole problem if they can avoid it. Thus the time is near or at hand where the Board, in the first instance through you, has to express its views on the need for a Director and the Board's responsibility in choosing one.

Cordially,

Carl Kaysen

Mr. Howard C. Petersen
Mrs. Hanna H. Gray
Mr. Robert M. Solow

cc: Mr. J. Richardson Dilworth

Enclosures

THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY 08540

Telephone-609-924-4400

THE DIRECTOR

February 14, 1974

Dear Howard, Hanna, Bob:

I write to put on paper my thoughts about the present state of the faculty discussion on the problems of governance, and some suggestions about the agenda for our meeting on the 23rd. Enclosed are three documents. One is a reduction to paper of the appointment procedure I spoke about briefly at our last meeting. This has been circulated around the Faculty by Geertz and Adler, as representing what the physicists and Geertz (and I) find acceptable. As yet there has been no broad indication of response in the other two Schools, but by next Saturday we may have more information, since both History and Mathematics will have School meetings before then.

The second is the Minutes of the last Faculty meeting, which I described to you briefly on the phone earlier. I call your attention to the three motions on pages 3 and 4. They originated in History and were passed by substantial votes in the whole Faculty: essentially all mathematicians and historians for, and a scattering of abstentions and negative votes from Geertz and the physicists present. The second motion needs no further discussion. It is, of course, a declaration of principle signifying that we have all been bad boys (and girls). Assuming that the Faculty will endorse something like the appointment procedure outlined in the first attachment, no attention need be paid to the declaration of principle one way or another; the Board can take note of the new procedure and leave it at that.

What is important, new, and raises questions for us is the third motion, especially part a. Like the others, it originated in the History Faculty, and was proposed by Professor Gilbert. As you can see from the final paragraph of the Minutes, Gilbert seemed to wish to go back to the old proposal that there be a joint committee of Board and Faculty to consider candidates for Director, despite the Board's explicit rejection of it when it was offered in 1971.

Since the Faculty meeting I have had a long talk with Gilbert. He starts from the idea that the Board should include two representatives of the Faculty--elected by at least a two-thirds vote of the whole Faculty, from different Schools, each to serve one term, representatives alternating among Schools. He thinks this would do much to make the

- 2 -

Board and the Faculty understand one another, and further would convince the Faculty that the Director indeed represents their interests and views to the Board. An arrangement of this kind is in force at Bryn Mawr, where Gilbert taught before he came to the Institute. In that case, it would be perfectly natural for Faculty Trustees to be on a search committee for a new director. In the absence of direct Faculty representation on the Board, Gilbert's proposal was an alternative means to the same end.

After my long explanation of why I thought this idea, whatever its general merits, was unsuitable to the Institute here and now, Gilbert agreed that paragraph 15, to which he was objecting (third attachment) would permit a committee of the Faculty to discuss its suggestions with the search committee of the Board and comment on the names that the Board committee had in mind. However, it would not participate in the final selection and ranking by the Committee, nor in the Board's final choice process.

That Gilbert expressed his acceptance of such an arrangement is not in itself significant, since he has generally been on my side in the great war. Moreover, his reaction is a poor indicator of how other historians and mathematicians will react. The atmosphere in which his broad and vague motion was passed in the Faculty meeting was one of cheering declarations of principle, aimed at Director and Board, rather than one of attention to matters of detail.

Motion 3 b., of course, is an attempt to give the Faculty a kind of veto power over the Board's choice, or at least inhibit their capacity to find a Director who is not already a member of the Institute faculty.

In the light of all this, I think the Agenda for next time should focus on the functions of the Director and the process of choosing him. One comment I hear on our meetings is that Board members have been too silent; the Faculty would like to hear their views. I think it would be most helpful if their wishes were acceded to in respect to the suggested topics.

In accordance with our previous discussion, it seems to me it might be useful if Howard wrote to each faculty member of the Committee proposing the Director, functions and selection, as the agenda topic; saying that the first hour, from 10:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. would be reserved for such discussion of the role of the Director as would be made easier by my absence, and I would join the meeting at 11:00 a.m.

- 3 -

However, I think it essential that that period not be extended beyond the allotted hour. As you know, the desire of the actively dissident part of the Faculty to demonstrate that I am totally unnecessary to the functioning of the Institute is strong, and every occasion to underline that proposition is seized on. I have avoided drawing the issue in order to permit the continuance of peaceful discussion, and thus, the growth of some degree of mutual tolerance and civility. However, if my acquiescence on this process is extended indefinitely, the result will be seen by the Faculty as the Board's acquiescence in the proposition.

In general, my impression is that the war party remains eight to ten strong, and that the peace party--the majority--thinks mainly of finding peace by agreeing with the war party rather than opposing them. In an important sense I have less faculty support now than I had last spring, precisely because there is no active issue to crystallize support and those who genuinely would prefer to see me remain also prefer not to have to think about the whole problem if they can avoid it. Thus the time is near or at hand where the Board, in the first instance through you, has to express its views on the need for a Director and the Board's responsibility in choosing one.

Cordially,



Carl Kaysen

Mr. Howard C. Petersen
Mrs. Hanna H. Gray
Mr. Robert M. Solow

cc. Mr. J. Richardson Dilworth
Mr. Donald B. Straus

Enclosures