

**Shelby White and Leon Levy Archives Center
Institute for Advanced Study**

**Oral History Project
Interview Transcript**

**Carl Kaysen
Interviewed by Elliott Shore
July 6, 1994**

**Permission to use this material for anything beyond personal research
must be requested from the Institute's Archives. Please contact
archives@ias.edu with questions.**



DEFENSE AND ARMS CONTROL STUDIES PROGRAM
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
292 Main Street (E38-603)
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

CARL KAYSEN
D.W. Skinner Professor
of Political Economy, Emeritus

November 2, 1995

Dr. Elliott Shore
Institute for Advanced Study
Historical Studies -- Social Science Library
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dear Elliott:

Here is the transcript of our interview. As I said on the phone, I've made one or two revisions.

I am sending it to you with the following understanding which I would like you to acknowledge by signing and dating the enclosed xerox copy of this letter and returning it to me:

1. You may use all the information in the transcript and the tapes in your work on the history of the institute, except my specific characterizations of individuals.
2. You may quote from the interview again with the same exception but subject to my reviewing the quotation and agreeing to your use thereof.
3. The transcript and the tape will be kept in the institute's archives and remain sealed until after my death.

Cordially,

Carl Kaysen

INTERVIEW WITH CARL KAYSEN

Date: July 6, 1994
Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts
Interviewer: Elliott Shore

CASSETTE ONE, SIDE ONE:

Shore: Carl, as a first question I would like to ask you about your career before coming to the Institute, especially your work in government and in academia. Could you give us a little background?

Kaysen: When I came to the Institute I was a professor at Harvard. I was the Lucius N. Littauer Professor of Political Economy and at that time I was teaching in the faculty of arts and sciences but also in what is now the Kennedy School, which was then the Littauer School. I was an associate dean with some responsibilities for curriculum and I also taught in the law school -- a law and economics seminar taught jointly with a variety, a procession of law professors. I'd done that for many years. I had spent essentially my whole academic career since graduate school at Harvard, done my work for a Ph.D. and then was elected to the Society of Fellows in 1947 -- that's a three-year fellowship and has a certain prestige, eclat, attached to it. And in 1950, when I

finished that fellowship I became assistant professor of economics, and then marched up through the ranks.

Shore: You became Dean?

Kaysen: No. I never became Dean. I said I was an associate dean of the School of Public Administration, the Littauer School, which I had become a couple of years before, on my return to Harvard from Washington.

Shore: Could you tell us a little bit about how you were called to Washington and what you did while you were there?

Kaysen: Yes. The story of being called to Washington is amusing and has a certain drama to it. I remember the date very specifically -- February 1st, 1961. I was going to St. Louis to give a talk, an economics talk, at Washington University. A man called Harold Barnett, who'd been both a wartime colleague and a graduate school classmate at Harvard after the war, was then in that department. He may, in fact, have been chairman, and he asked me to come out and give a talk. It was just before the start of the spring term at Harvard, and I literally had walked in the door of the Barnett house where I was going to stay. The phone was ringing and Mildred Barnett said with astonishment in her voice, "Carl, it's the White House for you." And I immediately guessed what it was. It was Mac Bundy calling me. Mac and I were quite good friends, we had overlapped for two of the three years of my junior fellowship -- he was a year senior to me -- and we'd

become friendly. He had, of course, been Dean of the Faculty at Harvard and I knew him in that capacity. I was a member of one of the major faculty committees in which I met with him regularly, and we continued our friendship. And he said to me, "I'm here, I'm having a lot of fun, I need help. Would you want to come down and help me?" I remember my part of that conversation, I said: "Mac, have you forgotten so soon that Wednesday or Thursday is the first day of the term and I've got two courses in the catalogue? How can I do that." He said, "Come down and talk to me."

Shore: Did you know him as well during the war?

Kaysen: No, I met him first when I was a junior fellow and he was interesting to me in many ways. We are now good friends of almost 50 years standing, but he was the first sort of Bostonian swell that I'd ever met. His mother's maiden name was Sarah Lowell Putnam. Lawrence Lowell was his great uncle. His father was a midwestern boy who had gone to Yale and to Harvard Law School and made good, but made very good -- Harvey was a law clerk to Oliver Wendell Holmes. And Mac was a very interesting person, he's very bright, very lively, full of energy and charm -- he always was -- but he also was simply an interesting social phenomenon to me as I probably was to him, and we got to be quite good friends.

Shore: The call then wasn't totally unexpected in that sense.

Kaysen: Well, it was totally unexpected in the sense that I had no idea that it would come. I'd been on leave in 1959-60, and I'd spent most of that year in Greece and then I took some vacation in Italy during the summer, and came back in September for the beginning of term. I had not, as many Harvard people had, participated actively in the Kennedy campaign, although in the fall I did participate a little. I wrote a few papers on things that I thought were important as did some large fraction of the Harvard faculty and I know that Mac was active. I can remember another irrelevant but amusing story of going to a dinner party at Henry Kissinger's house, some time in the fall. It was probably in early October when Kennedy was at his peak in the polls -- it was a bachelor party -- and many people who in fact were in the administration at a later time were there, Bundy, Schlesinger, Abe Chayes. We were allocating the cabinet posts and I remember particularly because the party was nominally in honor of Pierre Mendes France, and almost nobody talked to him, everyone was so busy with the cabinet posts. I thought it was rather poor behavior on the part of most of us. So I was aware of all this ferment, but it had not occurred to me that I would be called to Washington.

Shore: And the first position there was special assistant to the President for national security?

Kaysen: No, my position first was a senior staff of the National

Security Council. I went down as a consultant. I spent spring vacation down there and then I started to go to work. But I did stay until the end of the term, fulfill my commitments, got my 2 years leave, and I was a senior staff member and Rostow, a man I knew very well -- we had worked together in the war, we were in the same enterprise during the war -- was Bundy's deputy. Bundy was a special assistant to the President, Rostow was the deputy special assistant. In November Rostow was moved over to the State Department, and I succeeded him as Bundy's deputy which is the position I held until I left and came back to Harvard.

Shore: I've read that you were called "Vice President for the rest of the world" during the Cuban missile crisis. Could you tell us about that?

Kaysen: Well, this was essentially true for two weeks. I knew what was going on. I was not a direct participant, but I talked to Bundy about it almost every day, and Bundy said that I should, to the extent possible, deal with everything that didn't deal with Cuba and, to the extent possible, not bother the President or the people who were deeply involved every day in this Cuba thing. And I did. The most interesting thing that happened was that the Chinese invasion of India occurred during this period and I was dealing with the Indian ambassador and letters from Nehru, but that's an irrelevant story to your concerns.

Shore: What might be relevant is the environment you were in in Washington. After the President's assassination you stayed on for a while on the President's task force on foreign economic policy.

Kaysen: Yes, well let me be very careful about that. Technically speaking, my leave was from July 1, 1961 to June 30, 1963. When my leave came, Harvard was very rigid in its policy of two years only. Bundy resigned, for example, the minute he went down there. I did not want to resign. I had no notion of being a government servant forever. I expected to go back, and I worked through the summer, and when the term started I stayed on as a consultant. I was no longer a full-time government employee. I was going down there 2 or 3 days a week and, with the assassination of the President, I decided that it no longer made any sense to continue -- whatever value I had was because I knew the President well. Now I did do a couple of things for Johnson -- one immediately -- I went to Vietnam over Christmas vacation on some mission, and then I chaired this task force on foreign economic policy in the summer of '64. My successor in the job was a man whom I'd known who had been a junior faculty member at MIT in the economics department, then been at Rand, then worked for George Ball in the State Department, Frances Bator, who is now at the Kennedy School.

Shore: When you came back to Harvard, was there a let down in

any way?

Kaysen: Yes. Yes. There was a let down. I was restless. I had begun a project just before I went to Washington. A very complicated project on the census, on a new way of organizing the census data which first involved a consulting job in which there was a new way of -- oh, I'm sorry, this is wrong, this is later. I did this when I came back. But I was restless.

Shore: And so the Institute came to you, I guess, in 1965, 1966. The archives are not very clear on this.

Kaysen: Well, the first I heard -- now, let me say, I had met Oppenheimer several times, quite by accident when I came to Harvard as a graduate student in the spring term of 1946-47. I'm sorry, the spring term of '45-6. I was discharged from the Army in September '45. I had a job, nominally, in the State Department. At the time of my discharge from the Army I was in the O.S.S. The whole of the research and the intelligence branch of O.S.S. was offered a kind of temporary home in the State Department. I took this temporary home, decided I had no use for it, and went to Harvard. I had previously started graduate school at Columbia in academic year '40-41. I was a part-time student and a part-time research assistant at the National Bureau of Economic Research in New York. During the war I'd met a man called Ed Mason who was a Harvard professor on leave in O.S.S. Without getting

into this in detail, Mason had said to me, "Do you like Columbia?" and asked what I was going to do. He said, "Why don't you come to Harvard and I'll arrange things." So I did.

Shore: This is where you met Oppenheimer?

Kaysen: Now, I started to say, that, by accident, among the first people I met in Cambridge who were not economics graduate students, were a bunch of physicists, who had worked in Chicago or Los Alamos. It's not worth explaining how this happened, but it did happen. In particular I met a man called Victor Weisskopf who was the deputy head of the theoretical division at Los Alamos and who was a friend of Oppenheimer. Through Weisskopf I met Oppenheimer, and then I met him again through other connections, so I'd been with him two or three times before I went to the Institute. I later learned that Oppenheimer had suggested my name to the Trustees, but I knew him only at a distance as a great man. I was quite a young man, a graduate student when I first met him. He was a very charming and fascinating man.

Shore: So, the search committee searched you out?

Kaysen: I got a call from a man I did not know named Barklie Henry. He was the chairman of the search committee. Barklie McKee Henry. And he said he wanted to talk to me about the Institute. He asked if he could come and call on me. What does one say in these circumstances? I'd be

delighted, and we arranged to meet for lunch, had a conversation, and he said that the Trustees were interested to bring the Institute in some sense more into touch with the everyday world. I think he put it that way. The first thing he asked me is what I knew about the Institute. I did not know much about it, but I knew a little about it.

Shore: Is this in 1965?

Kaysen: This was in 1965, sometime probably in October of '65, I would guess, although the records, the archives probably shows this, or maybe not. Do you know Ken Auchincloss?

Shore: No, I don't.

Kaysen: Is it a name known to you?

Shore: As a writer? Journalist?

Kaysen: He used to be an editor of Newsweek. He served as secretary to a Trustee Committee which preceded the search for a new director which wrote a report.

Shore: This is the Committee on the Future of the Institute?

Kaysen: That's right. And he essentially drafted that report which then was improved. So that was the background to Henry's calling me. What I said in substance, and obviously this is a thirty year-old recollection, but what Henry asked me is whether I thought the Institute was too detached from the world, and we talked about what the Institute did. And I said two things, that one, I didn't think it made any sense to try to make the

Institute into a think tank about current problems. That was not its spirit as I understood it, there were plenty of those, and it would be a mistake to do that. Did I think it could do something in the social sciences? Yes. And I'll say in a minute what I thought it could do, but let me begin by saying that I myself had always been interested in a broader view of social science than a collection of disciplines, the "social sciences." The second book I had published and the first book I had written was a collaborative work called The American Business Creed which I wrote with Frank Sutton, a sociologist, and Jim Tobin, fellow economist, a contemporary of mine as a Junior Fellow -- quite unusually both of us were elected in the same year. They made one good and one bad choice, as you know, Tobin won a Nobel Prize. And this book was a sociological explanation of two economic ideologies, what we call the classic ideology and the managerial ideology, of the American business community. It was quite an interesting book -- I have looked at it from time to time since, I think it was a very good book -- but the big point is that it was an interdisciplinary book. And I was interested in that, and I was also a little dissatisfied because of my Washington life with returning to the tasks of economics that I had left.

Shore: Do you think the impulse for the social sciences at the

Institute came out of the changes in American society at the time or do you think they came out of the internal dynamics of the Institute?

Kaysen: It's hard for me to say but I think from the several conversations I had with the selection committee, and we'll get to that, that they came out of the dynamics of the Board in two ways: one, Henry himself -- a very unusual person about whom I'll say a little bit more -- had this kind of curiosity, and two, the Institute was a very contentious and quarrelsome place, and had become increasingly contentious and quarrelsome in the last few years of Oppenheimer's directorship. I think they thought that somehow getting it off in a new track would help. This is not something anybody said to me, this is an inference I draw from my recollections.

Shore: So this was a Board initiative and not an initiative from the faculty or from Oppenheimer himself?

Kaysen: It may have been something of an initiative from Oppenheimer. My take on Oppenheimer (and we're now jumping forward chronologically) -- whom I talked to several times that spring, summer and fall before his death -- was that he was a deeply defeated man. He knew he was dying and that doesn't cheer you up any, but I think, and as I went back into the archives and talked to people, I became convinced that Robert never recovered from the events of the security hearing.

Shore: So he was a doubly defeated man in that sense, someone who was fighting battles at the Institute as well.

Kaysen: Yes.

Shore: In the minutes of the last faculty meeting before you came there is a comment from George Kennan saying that he had never before heard such contentious talk and the faculty should not engage in it.

Kaysen: Yes.

Shore: That it sounded like faculty up in arms against its director.

Kaysen: Well, the mathematicians were up in arms against him, and the mathematicians and historians were divided and there was every possible kind of contention. And the physics faculty was in total disarray and its stars had just left.

Shore: Let's go back a little bit and then jump ahead. Let's go back to the selection process.

Kaysen: Alright.

Shore: You had the initial interview with Henry.

Kaysen: We talked and I said in effect, that I thought a School of Social Science which essentially was a unified school of social science--I was focused on then what I called historical social science, studying history with the instruments of social science as a unified topic, not as economic sociology, or political science, for example. That was what I thought might be something the Institute

could do and that the format of the Institute would be stimulating for that, and it was difficult to do that in the university framework. Harvard had tried to do it to some degree by creating the department of social relations, but that was just fragmenting as an unsuccessful experiment.

Shore: Chicago tried something similar.

Kaysen: The Committee on Social Thought, which is where I recruited Geertz. That was what I said to Henry. That must have interested the Committee. I had at least one more interview with Henry and then I had an interview with the committee which consisted of Henry -- it was four people of whom only one is living, Dick Dilworth, J. Richardson Dilworth -- Edward Greenbaum and Harold Hochschild. Greenbaum and Hochschild were quite elderly gentlemen by this time. I remember meeting with them and wondering whether all four of them could get into my office. Hochschild was a man I'd met once before when I was in the White House, so we at least knew each other.

Shore: He was one of the founding Trustees, wasn't he, of the Institute?

Kaysen: No, he was not one of the founding Trustees. The only founding Trustee who remained on the Board when I was there was Sam Leidesdorf. I do not think Lewis Straus was a founding trustee but he was close to it, an early trustee. Harold came on somewhat later I believe. I'm

not a hundred percent sure of that but that's my recollection. He was then the retired chairman of the board of American Metals Climax. Immensely wealthy man. Eddie Greenbaum was a lawyer in the firm of Ernst, Wolf and Greenbaum. He was a very well known intellectual property copyright lawyer with authors and dramatists and songwriters as his clients, a very cultivated man. Harold was an extraordinarily cultivated man.

Shore: Did they all take active part in this conversation? Did Henry lead it?

Kaysen: Yes. Well, he led it. But they all asked me my views about different things. Then after two of these interviews, Henry asked if I would be interested. I thought, well, that's a very interesting idea, and I talked to some of my friends. I had a long conversation with Paul Samuelson who was an old friend, someone who I'd met when I was a kid in 1941, and whom I've enormously admired and respected and who is a very generous and warm-hearted person. Although looking back on it, I think Paul was hearing my interest in the job, and telling himself -- and I've never talked to him about this -- well, Carl wants the job, I don't know whether it makes sense, but if he wants to do it, why shouldn't I encourage him. We had a conversation in which he was not without skepticism about the possibility of doing this, but he said it would be interesting to try. Now

Samuelson is a man whose work is very, very abstract and technical and very formal, but whose learning is enormously broad, whose intuitions and whose interests are very wide. It's rare that you talk to Paul and mention a book that he hasn't read. I talked to Alex Gershenkroen, someone whom I respected and who represented in some sense what I was thinking of when I had this image (of a unified social science). I talked to my close friends, Jim Dusenbury who was a colleague of mine at Harvard, an economist, perhaps my closest friend in the department. I talked to Ed Mason, my mentor, and I concluded that it was an interesting thing and I'd try, and I was restless, and I had this enormous, massive senseless project which I'd started and which didn't seem to be flying, and this was a switch, I think. I'd written what I thought was some very good stuff and had finished a certain chapter of my intellectual history focused on the anti-trust laws, the economics of the anti-trust laws and regulations. I was starting this big, very complicated quantitative study -- I won't describe it -- which involved telling the census how to collect and organize data in a new way. Something I did as a consultant. And then trying to take the first result of that, the so-called enterprise census as opposed to the establishment census, and asking what does this tell us about American business. It was a big,

difficult, quantitative project, and I was in the middle of that. I never finished it although a student and colleague who worked on it with me rounded it up and wrote some papers on the basis of the material and the census has carried it on.

Shore: Do you think from the point of view of the search committee your experience in Washington was also decisive? Did they talk to you a little bit about that, about leading the Institute in a way that it hadn't been led before?

Kaysen: I'm sure it was. Well, they said something about that, but they took it that I had managerial experience. One process in the search was an interview with Lewis Straus, a private interview with Lewis Straus. Sam Leidesdorf was the chairman of the Board of Trustees -- as you probably are aware, the formal nature of the Institute Board is that it's what's called a membership corporation, that the members of the corporation are themselves the Trustees of the Institute. But the corporation elects itself as the trustees and there is a ceremonial office called the presidency of the corporation which was held by Lewis. The corporation meets once for 5 minutes a year and elects the trustees. So I had a private interview with Sam Leidesdorf and then I had a private interview with Lewis. Lewis' interview was intensely political. I didn't like it from the

beginning.

Shore: In what sense political?

Kaysen: He wanted to be sure that I wasn't too much of a radical.

Shore: Did this hearken back to the Oppenheimer years?

Kaysen: It hearkened back to the Oppenheimer case and hearkened back to the fact that I'd worked for a Democratic administration. Lewis had worked for a Republican administration. I can talk to you for probably a whole day about Lewis Straus, but I don't want to. He wanted to be sure that I wasn't coming with a liberal agenda to somehow make the Institute into that, and I wasn't.

Shore: And Leidesdorf, the interview with Leidesdorf?

Kaysen: Well, Leidesdorf wanted to see what kind of a fellow I was. Leidesdorf was eighty-two and died within a year of my assuming the directorship. He died in his sleep. I used to go up to New York after I became director which I didn't do a lot at first because we didn't move to Princeton until September. The first year I was there I'd go up to New York once and sometimes twice a month, and go up and talk to Sam about what was going on. I remember one conversation I had with him, and I did not open the subject although it was very much on my mind. He said, "I know some people think I should retire," -- I being one of them -- "but I'm not going to retire." And I didn't say anything. And that was the end of that. And he didn't retire, he went to bed one night and never woke

up.

Shore: Who was the person who succeeded Leidesdorf?

Kaysen: Harold Linder. And that was a very big occasion. I knew Harold pretty well. He had been on leave from the Board and had been head of the Export Import Bank in Washington when I was in Washington. When he stopped being head of the Export Import Bank he rejoined the Board. When Sam died I remember thinking that my study in the Olden Farm, Olden Manor, became like my office in the White House. In the next two days I made 50 or 75 telephone calls. I felt I was back in Washington where typically I made 30 or 40, 50 calls a day -- life on the telephone is what it's about. Lewis wanted desperately to be chairman of the board.

Shore: Wasn't he also very elderly at that time?

Kaysen: Well, no, he was in ripe middle age. I mean he was in his 60s I guess. He wanted desperately to be chairman of the board and several of the trustees, especially Harold Hochschild and Eddie Greenbaum and Lefty Lewis, the Yale Wilmarth Lewis, said they'd resign immediately if Lewis became chairman of the board. I learned about the Lewis Straus-Oppenheimer relationship on the board and just to be brief about that, the public history is that Straus, who led the investigation and brought in the decision, had drawn a fine line between Oppenheimer's unfitness to be chairman of the General Advisory Committee and to

advise the government on nuclear matters, to hold a security clearance on the one hand and his continued fitness to be director of the Institute. That's a total lie. Lewis immediately tried to get him fired and the Board resisted and Sam, who was a man who disliked quarrels, and was greatly respected and held in affection by his colleagues, smoothed this over and agreed that it would not be discussed again, and it all erupted on Sam Leidesdorf's death. I parenthetically say if you don't know it, that Sam played a very vital role in the creation of the Institute. You're aware of that.

Shore: Yes.

Kaysen: Ok. And Lewis resigned when he didn't become president. And I spent a good amount of effort trying to woo him back and trying to get money out of him, all of which was unsuccessful.

Shore: And so Linder was your candidate?

Kaysen: Linder was my candidate in the sense that he was a neutral person. I knew him, I felt I would get along with him, he was liked by the Board, and he was a man who had some world stature, I mean public stature, and I thought he would be a good chairman. He was an indifferent chairman. Nice fellow, very decent fellow, but an indifferent chairman.

Shore: Maybe we'll come back to the Board a little bit later on. When you first came to the Institute did you have a

meeting with Oppenheimer to talk to him about how things were and what his views were?

Kaysen: I did talk to him somewhat, a couple of times, yes.

Shore: And did anything come out of those meetings, or was he as you described before, a defeated man?

Kaysen: He was a defeated man. We did talk a little bit about physics, and the need to rebuild physics and what he thought should be done.

Shore: What was then the general situation when you came to the Institute? It seems from the record that no one before had ever raised funds, for example.

Kaysen: That's correct. But what I first did was talk to everybody I could talk to, and I discovered that I was faced with a deep division, deep hostilities.

Shore: Was part of it because of the fact that the Board had taken the appointment of the new director as their own function and did not include faculty?

Kaysen: Yes. That's right.

Shore: Did you hear that from faculty members?

Kaysen: Oh, yes. I was told that by Andre Weil. There was a reception for Annette and me at a place that was wonderful. It was a little club outside Princeton, I can't remember the name of it. It's on a little creek, it's a swell little club, and Dick and Bunny Dilworth were the hosts of the reception. Have you met Mrs. Dilworth?

Shore: Yes, I have.

Kaysen: Yes. Well, you know, they're a very grand couple and if you can imagine them in 1966, in the spring of '66, that's nearly 30 years ago. They were in their late 40s. Bunny was in her late 40s, Dick was probably not quite 50, just about 50. They were both very handsome, I mean they could have been on the cover of Town and Country. And she's a really beautiful woman, she still is.

Shore: She still is.

Kaysen: You know she's ravaged by her difficulties, and so on. And there was this swell, handsome, very elegant couple, there was the Institute faculty, quite a mixed bag, we were on a deck overlooking the little stream, having refreshments and so on, and Andre Weil came up to me and introduced himself and said, "You're not our choice, you're the trustees choice." That was my first introduction to him.

Shore: Welcome to the Institute for Advanced Study.

Kaysen: Yes. I had a fantasy later on, much later on, when I got to know Andre very well, that I would get a vanity license plate. You know, he pronounced his name "Vay", although his sister pronounced it "Weil", and I would get a vanity license plate which said "Oy, Vay".

Shore: You didn't do it though.

Kaysen: No. I had interviews, starting with the most senior members of the faculty, with Ben Merritt, who was the

most senior member of the faculty.

Shore: He was one of the original members of the faculty, I believe.

Kaysen: That's right. And Marston Morse who was close to being one of the original professors. Marston was a very decent gentleman, not like many of his colleagues, but I talked to every member of the faculty individually. You know, what's going on, what do you want, what do you need. I had a faculty meeting. I talked about my program and so on, and promised, and it's a promise I've fulfilled in my view, that the social science school would be funded out of new money.

Shore: In one of the articles that announced your appointment that was published in Business Week, there was a sentence that I found intriguing, that the Institute is "tired and it is no longer unique." Is that something that you found when you got there, is that something that the search committee talked to you about? Is this a fair characterization in 1965-66?

Kaysen: I don't remember that the search committee talked to me about it. Perhaps the Institute was tired, I did not discern that, that wasn't my first impression. Some of the faculty members said to me that it's no longer unique and I knew myself that there were some senses in which it no longer was unique.

Shore: Could you explain that?

Kaysen: Well, there were two features of the Institute structure and functioning which were originally unique in the American academic world and rare in the academic world in general, although not unique. One was that its professors were research professors and had no formal teaching obligations. They weren't required to lecture, to instruct in a classroom sense, although it was the tradition of the Institute that they were required, not required, that's the wrong word, they were expected to "help" the postdoctoral fellows especially, and the visitors in general, to stimulate them, to guide them, to interact with them intellectually. So that was unique, and the faculties of most American universities were teaching faculties, although by the time I got there, there were already many research professors. Harvard had University Professors, M.I.T. had Institute Professors, and the characteristic of the University Professor at Harvard and of an Institute Professor at M.I.T. was that he could teach what he wanted, but almost all Institute Professors at M.I.T. and University Professors at Harvard did teach. The other characteristic was the visiting member who came typically for a year, but sometimes longer, and sometimes for only a term, with nothing to do but to do his own research. This again was a unique idea. It was somewhat derived from All Souls College, from the German research seminar, and so on, and of

course you're familiar with Flexner's ideas, his lectures at Oxford. Again, institutes of research were widespread, post-doctoral fellowships were institutionalized in the sciences--M.I.T., for instance, had many post-docs in all of its scientific and even engineering departments. They were less institutionalized in history and in the humanities. They were fewer. The kind of theoretical physics center that was originally created in the Institute was novel when it was created, but the national labs had theory groups which had post-docs so that Brookhaven and Fermi Lab and SLAC all competed, so to speak, in the post-doc business in physics. The Institute was more nearly unique in mathematics and the French IAS had been founded, but it was a direct copy of the Institute, created by people who had been visiting members at the Institute and especially the francophone Institute professors, Weil and Borel, were frequent visitors at Burre sur Yvette.

Shore: But the uniqueness, then, if there was any, was in the combination of areas?

Kaysen: Perhaps, but what struck me, is that there was no combination. That each School went its separate ways. I will tell you a story of an event that occurred some years down my path, but it was certainly emblematic. One of the physics professors was Tullio Regge, Regge was very mathematical, a man of considerable mathematical

talent and skill and sophistication, as in fact were all of the physicists, but Regge the most skilled.

END OF CASSETTE NO. 1, SIDE 1

CASSETTE NO. 1, SIDE 2

Kaysen: I was standing at tea with Tullio, and Borel came by. And Tullio stopped him, and he had the virtue in Borel's and Weil's eyes, that he could speak reasonable French -- and did -- but he said to Borel in English that he wanted to ask him a question. And he asked him some question which was way beyond me. And Borel answered in the rudest possible way, he said "Regge, that's not a proper question. You don't know what you're talking about. Could you possibly mean..?" And I was struck by the enormous arrogance and rudeness and uncollegiality. The mathematicians had contempt for the physicists, that's the only word. There were some exceptions, and I can go down the list, if it's helpful. Even within the group of historians there were profound divisions. You probably know that the historians had opposed the appointment of George Kennan, especially the classicists, and some continued to be rude to him.

Shore: The notion of a community of scholars which is cited by the Institute in its publications seems to mean communities of scholars but certainly not one community of scholars.

Kaysen: Yes. That is correct.

Shore: Let's go back to when you came to the Institute. Could you tell us a little about it's organizational structure, it's financial situation, something that maybe doesn't appear in the archival record?

Kaysen: Well, I don't think I can tell you something that doesn't appear in the archival record. The organizational structure I found was that there were three schools, School of Mathematics, School of Natural Sciences, School of Historical Studies. Professors held appointments in their schools. The budget structure was exceedingly simple. About 75% of the budget came from the Institute's own funds. And that is very rough. And the other 25% came from two sources: one source was so to speak, a non-cash budget, of people who came with their own money, who didn't need stipends, and that was true substantially of senior historians who came when they had sabbatical, and didn't get a stipend. And that might have amounted to 5% of the total resources. Then the School of Mathematics and School of Natural Sciences both had grants. The School of Natural Sciences had grants from the NSF and NASA, the School of Mathematics from the Defense Department, the Air Force mainly, as a matter of fact. As I remember it, and this is not a clear memory and therefore could easily be wrong and is certainly recoverable in the archives, but the overhead,

the physical plant took maybe a quarter of the budget, the faculty salaries took almost half the budget -- the faculty salaries, their assistants, and their travel allowances and the retirement contributions and so on. And the fellows' stipends the balance.

Shore: Before we go more into detail about the Institute, I wanted to ask you a little bit about Princeton, if I may. You came from Cambridge, you had grown up in Philadelphia, you had spent a lot of time in Washington, you were now going to be in a small town in central New Jersey. Could you tell us how you reacted to that. It seems to be a major change in the way one lives.

Kaysen: It was. And let me say we had gone down, we had been shown over the house, it was an attractive house. We were going to live at a scale that was, in terms of my income in cash, aside from the perquisites, was going to be doubled essentially. My wife was not very happy about my going. If she had been asked, whether she wanted to do this and did not know what my choice was, she would have said no.

Shore: Did that color your years in Princeton? Did she change her mind?

Kaysen: No, she didn't change her mind. She was a very loving and devoted wife. It was her job to do a good job as the director's wife. She did a swell job as the director's wife. She worked very hard. She did not like it, she

liked it less and less, and of course once the trouble started in '73, well... but she never liked it. She was very good at managing a household and she was very good at producing a beautiful party. I saw Tom Watson the other day, whom I brought to the Institute board, the other day -- it's several years ago, he's dead, my god! But I had occasion to be with Tom and he started to remember the party that we traditionally had every spring at the trustees meeting with the same menu, because it was a wonderful menu, it was shad and shad roe and asparagus and it was just, you know shad and shad roe has a brief season, and Tom who has been every place in the world and seen everything sort of became a bit lyrical about how elegant and nice these dinners were. No, Annette did a terrific job. She never liked it.

Shore: That is almost a full time job, especially during those times.

Kaysen: It was almost a full time job. She had responsibility for running the nursery school, that seemed to be ex officio, the director's wife's job. There were many trustees, particularly the Linders, who felt that it was ok for them to call up and say they were coming and would we arrange for them to stay.

Shore: Donors would come as well to the house?

Kaysen: Sure. Yes. Not as much of that as there is at Harvard or Princeton. But there was enough of it. It was a

serious job and you know, Annette organized music at the Institute. She herself was a pianist of quite considerable talent. So she did take it as a serious job.

Shore: Were there also events for the spouses, of the people who were there, wives mostly?

Kaysen: Yes, they were all wives. Although there was one member who joined the board toward the end, a woman whose spouse came with her. That was Jack Whitehead and Betsy Whitehead. Yes, there were events -- there was a lot of work and there were faculty dinners which was something that I instituted, and before the new building was finished they were held at our house once a month. They were bachelor dinners but Annette took the responsibility and you know it's a big responsibility.

Shore: Were these dinners for the entire faculty each time or did you split them into groups?

Kaysen: No, they were for the entire faculty which were about 25. We could handle about 40 people and people could invite guests. I invited some guests and there was a list and you could invite a guest up to the time capacity was reached.

Shore: What about relationships with the University?

Kaysen: They were very good. Goheen was very welcoming, he was a very attractive, nice fellow, and very decent fellow. We had a statutory relationship with the library and you

know all about that, and I renewed that and I talked to Goheen. Bill Bowen, who became the provost, he wasn't when I first came there, was somebody I knew. We had tried to hire him as a faculty member at Harvard. Marver Bernstein, who was dean of the Woodrow Wilson School, was also someone I knew. I knew the economists of course. I taught for a bit at Princeton. I knew Murph Goldberger and in fact Murph had been a tenant, rented my house the year I was in England many years ago.

Shore: So there was a lot of exchange.

Kaysen: There was a lot of exchange, and there was institutionalized exchange in art history, in classics, and in physics and mathematics, there was a lot of interplay and collegueship and it was all carried on in a very easy and agreeable way. And throughout my stay my relations with the University were excellent.

Shore: What about the town itself? This is the mid 1960s, the whole country is changing rapidly, or at least it seems to be changing rapidly.

Kaysen: But Princeton wasn't.

Shore: In what way wasn't it, weren't there class and race and gender divisions in town that were clear?

Kaysen: I'll tell you two stories. One, Ted Sorenson was a friend of mine from Washington. He was then not married, he'd been divorced and he was living in New York alone, and was kind of lonely. And I said to him, you know Ted

we have a big house, very pleasant, swimming pool, just pick up the phone and come and spend the weekend when the spirit moves you. It didn't very often. But once he did come and we were invited -- this was early in our stay -- to a dinner party at the home of someone, whose name I cannot remember, but they were Princeton people, he was chairman of the Mercer County Republican Committee, she was a kind of garden club, very nice woman, and we were important new people. And so I called our hostess and said we had a guest and asked if he could come, and when I introduced him she said are you "the" Ted Sorenson? She said, "You're the first Democrat I've met socially in my life." And that was Princeton.

Shore: I see. We talked about this before, but the Institute itself seemed to be the one, was the one, academic institution in Princeton which had a larger Jewish complement to it.

Kaysen: Yes, but the physics and mathematics department were like all physics and mathematics departments. They had plenty of Jews, although the Princeton mathematics department was probably a little less Jewish than most. But still Solomon Lefschutz, for example, and ...

Shore: There were no overt hostilities there?

Kaysen: No.

Shore: Well, there were no overt hostilities at all in Princeton, it seems to me, at some level.

Kaysen: No, that's right. But it was a very different community. The other thing I wanted to say is that Dick Dilworth went to New York every day on the 6:45 or so train, in which there was a pullman car that was rented by a group including Dick and the other bankers and Wall Street-type lawyers who went every morning. All this was a very new world for us and because we were important people we had some contact with that world and disliked it pretty much.

Shore: Could you explain your dislikes?

Kaysen: I mean, I was conscious of the waspishness of these people, of their Republicanism. A lot of these guys, and they were very polished, very smooth, a lot of them reminded me of Doug Dillon. I got to know Doug Dillon very well when I was in Washington. We were very friendly, pleasant, agreeable, when I see him now, we act like old buddies. We were fighting about everything, we were on opposite sides of every important issue. And Doug was a kind of covert snob and a covert anti-semiter. There was nothing, no failure in politeness, but a kind of you know -- I'm Doug Dillon.

Shore: And you're not.

Kaysen: And you're not. That's right. And of course Doug, this was underlined for Doug Dillon because he had a Jewish grandfather. His grandfather was not such a snob -- only his father became a snob and an anti-semiter after he'd made his twentieth million or fiftieth million or

whatever.

Shore: One of the things that strikes me, having come from Philadelphia, is the black community in Princeton and also the black employees at the Institute for Advanced Study, at least still in this time, seem to be segregated in one or two occupations, and female members of the staff seem to segregate in one or two occupations.

Kaysen: Yes. That's certainly true. Although something that is interesting is that we did have a mixture of blacks and Italians working as grounds crew which seemed to work. The maids who took care of the housing were mostly black. The cook was black, he was a wonderful man, his name was Phelan.

Shore: This is at the time when the cafeteria was on the top floor of Fuld Hall?

Kaysen: On the top floor, yes. And we used the cook as a cook and he was a good cook. When we had big parties he came with some of his staff to serve and we'd get maids from the housing project and train them, Annette trained them, to be housemaids, to serve a dinner, and do it properly.

Shore: This is at the time when the "bachelor" apartments are still "bachelor" apartments, there were maids as well?

Kaysen: Yes, there were maids who cleaned up. And Ruth Barnette, the senior housekeeper who was kind of a drunk. Well, she was a drunk, she and Kitty Oppenheimer were drunks, they often used to get drunk together. That's something

I inherited. It took me a couple of years to retire her. The business manager was a very nice, decent guy, Mike Morgan. A very decent guy, really a very sweet guy, not forceful enough.

Shore: Was there any attempt, any conscious attempt to change the racial or gender situation by putting people in certain positions?

Kaysen: No. No. None. Zero.

Shore: Let's go back to the Schools. Could you talk individually, briefly, about the three Schools, how you found them when you came, and relationships with individual faculty members?

Kaysen: Let me first say that what I found and what remained the case during the whole of my tenure is that each School was allocated a budget which had so to speak two elements in it, a money budget and an office space budget. They were free to spend them as they wished, while I preserved the symbolic power of appointment in that I signed every letter and only a letter signed by me generated checks. The School of Mathematics several times approached me and asked why they couldn't sign their own letters. I said it's a nice idea but I'll sign the letters. The understood organization was that each School ran its own affairs as far as inviting visiting members. I inherited something called the Director's Fund which allowed me to invite a couple of people without reference to the

Schools and I did so. I'll talk to you at some length about faculty appointments which was a matter of contention immediately.

Shore: Do you recall any of the first Director's Visitors that you brought?

Kaysen: No, I don't. I'd have to look at my books.

Shore: So the three Schools at the time that you came were almost completely independent.

Kaysen: They were completely independent.

Shore: And they had a fixed percentage of the budget?

Kaysen: No, they had a traditional amount of the budget and when the stipend level seemed appropriate to raise, we would discuss what it should be. The post-doc stipends were kept the same. The History School had almost no post-docs, eventhough Harold Hochschild had given some money anonymously under the title of the Herodotus Fund to invite younger historians, year after year it was not fully spent. They were reluctant to invite post-docs.

Shore: The Committee of the Future talked about a number of these problems. Maybe we should go through some of them now. It might be a useful way to focus the discussion.

Kaysen: Sure.

Shore: One of the most important points that you focused on at the end of your tenure at the Institute when you wrote your report of the director, was that the fields of intellectual endeavor had narrowed from Flexner's time.

Was this apparent in the way the three schools were organized?

Kaysen: It was apparent in the way the three schools were organized. Let me say at the beginning that for most of my tenure, although toward the end this wasn't true, I had nothing much to say about the internal organization of the School of Mathematics, in the sense that I didn't try to influence it. I didn't try to influence it at all. But if I had been asked what I thought, I would have said, they're doing pretty fine with one conspicuous exception, which was their vile treatment of Gödel, the greatest man among them.

Shore: Could you give some more details about that?

Kaysen: Well, they essentially tried to keep Gödel from being a member of the School of Mathematics. They said logic isn't really mathematics and so on, and they partitioned him off, he was modest in his claims, and Hassler Whitney and Gödel constituted a subcommittee on logic and he would invite one or two people and that was it.

Shore: Is that one of the reasons that Gödel was also physically separated in the library?

Kaysen: Well, he didn't want to be. Gödel was a strange, a very strange man. To put it mildly, eccentric in the extreme.

Shore: Had he already started with his interest in religious, philosophical thought?

Kaysen: Yes. Yes.

Shore: Had this also led to his estrangement by his colleagues?

Kaysen: No. No, I do not think so but I had no information on that. I knew about that, not from Gödel, although we had had a few conversations now and then, but I knew about it from Morgenstern at the University who was a friend, a Viennese contemporary, of Gödel's and who was perhaps one of the few people who had some ordinary social intercourse with Gödel.

Shore: Did Gödel feel this, did he sense it, did he bristle at it or did he just accept it?

Kaysen: He accepted it but he didn't like it at all. But he was a very timid man.

Shore: We were talking about the narrowing of the field of intellectual endeavor. You've spoken about the School of Mathematics. The School of Natural Sciences?

Kaysen: Well, let me say, for the School of Mathematics, I became later conscious of their narrow-bore Bourbakism. But first of all there were exceptions to it and second of all, I didn't feel that I could do anything about it and actually it has begun to cure itself. The one member of the School of Mathematics I still have a relation with, and a very good relation, is Enrico Bombieri, a man of enormous talent, enormous breadth of intellectual interests both within and outside mathematics. And a man who has really changed very many things about the School of Mathematics.

Shore: Could you give an example or two?

Kaysen: Well, the basic example is that he has continued the rapprochement with Physics which Milnor actually started before Bombieri became a professor. Milnor has always been interested in relativity and so Milnor began to talk to physicists -- this was at the end of my tenure really -- but he had begun to talk to physicists, and Bombieri reintroduced computers to the mathematicians. Another characteristic episode. You know I caused a new office building and a new cafeteria to be built. I also added to the apartments, which was necessary, and by adding to the apartments created a new street which I had to name. I thought about what great man had been at the Institute and I named it von Neumann Drive. I met Andre shortly after the name had been announced and the sign had been put up, and Andre in his characteristic way when he wasn't screaming at me -- which happened from time to time -- he would bait me, tease me, and I enjoyed that as a matter of fact. He said to me, pointing to the name -- we met on the street, he said, "you think you've done us a favor. You haven't done us a favor." Atle Selberg, who was never as crude or as rude as Borel and Weil but was even more hostile, although I was personally friendly with him and Annette and Hedi Selberg were quite good friends, and I liked Hedi. She's a very attractive woman, I don't know if you know her. Hedi you know was

von Neumann's assistant for a long time.

Shore: No, I didn't know that.

Kaysen: Atle once said to me, von Neumann wasted his talent. And the reason he wasted his talent was fooling with computers.

Shore: A topic I think we've already touched on and we'll come back to is what one could call an incredible arrogance that one encounters in these kinds of comments. Do you have any explanation for it, you were obviously subject to it probably more than anyone.

Kaysen: Yes.

Shore: Do you know where it comes from? Is it the institution? Is it the group of people that's gathered, is it the combination?

Kaysen: I've thought about that a lot. I have almost a well rehearsed answer, if not in precise words. I think there are three elements in it. One element has got to do with the nature of mathematics and with the nature of certain disciplines which are very like mathematics -- theoretical physics, abstract economics -- in which the power of very profound analytic thought is drawn on and it's a combination that's very rare, it's hardly understood by most people. I've studied enough mathematical economics to have some feeling for it. I don't possess it to any great measure. It's this unusual combination of enormous imagination with the power to

sustain very long and complicated chains of reasoning. The imagination is the primary thing. You have to be able to intuit new structures and then see how they fit in and why they fit in, what the logical connection is and so on. And people who have this gift are you know the Paul Samuelsons and Armand Borels and Andre Weils and Freeman Dysons and Murray Gell-Manns of this world. Well, they're three, four sigma away from the mean, and they know it. Now some of them are modest. Freeman is basically a modest man. But I know Murray very well, I know Walter Gilbert pretty well. Walter's wife is a good friend of Ruth's, my wife, I knew Wally a little bit then but I know him better now. He's a molecular biologist at Harvard, a Nobel Prize winner. I know Jim Watson quite well. I know twenty or thirty of these people quite well, some of them my Institute colleagues, some of them not, and they're all arrogant, they're all remarkably arrogant. It's this consciousness of intellectual superiority. They're not all remarkably arrogant. Freeman is not arrogant. Michael Atiyah who was a member of the Institute faculty, have you ever met him?

Shore: No, I haven't.

Kaysen: It's almost worth your while, if he's ever in the United States, if you're in England, to introduce yourself and talk to him, I don't know how much you'd feel free to talk to him. Michael was unusually modest. Hassler

Whitney was modest. But Michael and Hassler were arrogant in a different way, that is, they were sure they were right. When they knew something, they were sure they were right. Harish-Chandra never displayed the kind of rude arrogance that many of his colleagues displayed. But Harish knew when he was right.

Shore: I thought one of the marks of true intellectual genius is humility before what you don't know. This kind of genius that you are describing in one field turns into an ability to see everything in a clear way.

Kaysen: Well, but you see, that's only one part of it. The other part in the mathematician and in some kinds of theoretical physicists but not others, is -- how shall I put it? -- a consequence of a semi-articulate or a semi-inarticulate Platonism, the belief that their gift is an insight into the true structure of the world, and it's an insight which carries into everything, because they're Platonists.

Shore: The notion of the Institute itself might also play a role, because now you've gathered together groups of geniuses, and would that make it different from a solitary genius working at a university.

Kaysen: Well, there are two institutional elements that contribute to this. One is the fact that Institute professors are told they are geniuses at a relatively early age, and then free from all responsibility except

to themselves. And depending on one's character, this is good for you or bad for you. My contrast was Arne Beurling, is that a name you know, professor of mathematics?

Shore: I knew of him, yes.

Kaysen: And Homer [Thompson]. Now Arne Beurling was a very distinguished mathematician. Homer is a very distinguished archaeologist. I think that it's a different level of attainment and calls on different intellectual qualities. Homer was a wonderful teacher, a devoted teacher, always felt responsive to his visitors, always active, just a very genial man, you felt the Institute enabled him to do better what he did. The Institute ruined Arne Beurling.

Shore: In what way?

Kaysen: Well, he stopped publishing. He didn't stop writing, but he couldn't be bothered. He'd solve a problem, write it up and put it in his desk drawer. He didn't talk to anybody. I saw Arne Beurling more frequently at the barber shop than I saw him at the Institute.

Shore: And this is a function of the institution's prestige? The fear of publishing something that isn't perfect?

Kaysen: No, it's the function of lack of demand. If you felt arrogant enough, now I hardly knew Arne, I talked to him a couple of times a year, but if you felt arrogant enough, and you felt also that you didn't have to tell

anybody, it was enough that you knew you knew the answer, you were relieved of all of the pressures. You see, the salary policy, which I inherited and did not see fit to change although I did not think it was a good policy...

Shore: This is the policy of everyone receiving the same salary.

Kaysen: The same salary. There was no incentive, there was nothing. Either you liked public fame and you went for it, or you liked to show other people how smart you were, or you had an inner sense of conscience. I mean, contrast Andre and Armand: Andre was a more successful mathematician. Now Armand has never got over the fact that he never got a Fields Medal. It was the big disappointment in his life. You have to scratch Gaby Borel only twice to have her tell it to you, how he was cheated, unfairly treated, whatever. But Armand, who was the rudest man, almost the rudest man I've ever met in my whole life in any context, including my drill sergeant when I was a private in the Army, was devoted to his students. The post-docs who came to work with Armand, he was available to them any time they wanted, he had lunch with them every day, they were deep in discussion. Andre, though, could barely bring himself to talk to anybody else and then mainly in a hostile way. I'll tell you some other time about an interchange I once had with Lars Hormander. So the Institute reinforced the bad parts of a man's character in a sense by making no

external demands on him. And you know, Andre was a bad character. He was mean, he was envious, he was mean-spirited. He once started to badger me -- while I was giving him a ride -- about how much Mike Morgan got paid. And I said to him, you know Andre, it's none of your business how much Mike Morgan gets paid.

Shore: Was this interest in how much Mike Morgan got paid something that is more or less unique to the Institute? It seems like one of the few places in American academic life where the faculty had so much more informal and formal power.

Kaysen: Let me not answer that question now. I would say that they had more formal power. I don't think they had more informal power, they had more formal power, there were less constraints. And certainly my own experience, which we'll talk about, indicates their informal power.

Shore: Let's go on to talk about the appointment of faculty members. I noted that when doing research for this interview that you had appointed more members of the faculty than any other director except Oppenheimer, and you're very close actually, in total numbers. Geertz, Hirschman, Setton, White, Adler, Bahcall, Dashen, Elliott, Habicht, Langlands, Lavin, Milnor, Rosenbluth, Atiyah. I might even have missed one or two. How did this process work under your tenure and how did the social science situation affect other appointments?

Kaysen: Well, they are very different. My first task, and this is in the Director's ten year report, my first task when I came to the Institute was to deal with the physics faculty which was in decay.

Shore: Because people had left?

Kaysen: Pais, Abram Pais, Yang and Lee had left within three years. I think either Yang or Lee was still technically there when I was there but he left that year, and Pais had already left, and Yang and Lee had quarreled with each other for reasons that no one understands since it was in Chinese, and Pais had got sort of fed up and went to Rockefeller. So the physics faculty was in disarray. Robert had made two appointments which the mathematicians resisted enormously, fiercely, and thought were wrong: two young men, Adler and Dashen. I had known Adler, he was junior fellow at Harvard -- which I had been much earlier -- but I had known him as a fellow. On first meeting Adler and Dashen in the course of my tour around the faculty -- they both had five-year appointments -- I said how glad I was to meet Dashen, how nice to see Steve again, but I also said to them that they must understand that they weren't going to be promoted. The Institute doesn't work that way. I had heard a lot about all of this. Of course they both were promoted, which is an interesting tale. Robert's last fight with this faculty, which led to his being not on speaking terms with the

School of Mathematics, and even Harish. Well he was probably still on speaking terms with Hassler Whitney who was a very odd bird. He's still around, isn't he?

Shore: Yes, he is still around.

Kaysen: He's a very strange man. An old yankee. An old, old yankee. A connection of Eli Whitney.

Shore: I didn't know that.

Kaysen: Gödel, Harish and Hassler and Marston Morse were the four members of the mathematics faculty who behaved decently with me even when they didn't agree with me. Gödel of course was sui generis, i.e. cuckoo, but Hassler was always agreeable in his way and Harish was very, very agreeable, a very nice man. But even Harish who was a restrained and generous and quiet person, was sour on Oppenheimer. And this was about the Milnor affair.

Shore: In the last meeting of the faculty there was an attempt to add three people, I believe, to the School of Natural Sciences. Marvin Goldberger and Steve Adler and a couple of others were talked about for long-term appointments, and the faculty, especially the mathematicians, were up in arms against that. So you saw as your first role then to try to ...

Kaysen: Well, I was told by Regge, by Dyson and by Stromgren that physics was in decay and I had to do something.

Shore: They had names in mind, the three physicists, or did the mathematicians also have a role to play?

Kaysen: No, they didn't. I was told that. And then the historians pressed me with an appointment. Setton. That was the first appointment I made actually. The mathematicians were at that time content, that is, they didn't have an imminent retirement, weren't pressing to appoint somebody. I went and discussed appointments with them and the faculty records must show this, but they're probably very thin and spare. What we agreed was that as far as the existing faculties go, the procedure would be as follows: that the faculty would nominate, that I would circulate a dossier to the faculty, that I would receive comments from the rest of the faculty and that I would then either submit or not submit the nomination to the Board. If I submitted it to the Board it would be approved. And the faculty understood that I had a veto power and they didn't fight the proposition that I had a veto power although the big fight with Oppenheimer had been about Milnor, and that fight was because they believed, and of course this was before I came and I do not know the rights and wrongs of that, that Oppenheimer had deceived them. And that may be true.

Shore: In what way did they feel deceived?

Kaysen: The mathematicians had talked about getting Milnor, that Oppenheimer had made no objection to it, they voted to get Milnor and then Oppenheimer said he had a no raiding agreement with Princeton and they couldn't appoint

Milnor. And they believed that this was absolutely not true, that Oppenheimer for whatever reason, had decided he didn't want Milnor. And Milnor was, of course, the first -- was Milnor the first appointment? Milnor or Atiyah?

Shore: I think it was Milnor actually.

Kaysen: Yes, I think Milnor was the first appointment to mathematics.

Shore: Rosenbluth in physics and then Atiyah.

Kaysen: Yes. I'd have to cudgel my brains and possibly unsuccessfully. All right, so there was general agreement on that proposition. The first appointment was set and it went perfectly smoothly, there was no issue except in my mind. This was the first appointment. It was urged by Cherniss and Clagett and they said that Setton was a wonderful scholar and this was my first appointment. I took it enormously seriously, I sat down and read everything that Setton had published by then. Not very much, by the way. And I thought this man's a bore. Do you know anything about his work?

Shore: I do know his work.

Kaysen: His most important work up to that point was the Catalan Dominion of Athens, about the Catalan company that had taken over Attica and the Morea from the Fourth Crusaders on their way home and had run it for a hundred years. This a book of enormous dullness and stupidity. It is a

totally uninteresting book. Of course, it was a great technical achievement. He found these letters, which nobody had seen, mostly letters of complaint from the commander of the Catalan company to the King of Aragon: "Why haven't you given us our pay?" The Catalans were totally uninterested in the Greeks. There is almost nothing in these letters about Greek life or about anything. And the big feat was the paleographical and linguistic feat of actually deciphering and translating, decoding and deciphering and translating the letters. At that point, that seemed absurd to me.

END OF CASSETTE NO. 1, SIDE NO. 2

CASSETTE NO. 2, SIDE NO. 1:

Shore: You were commenting on the work of Kenneth Setton.

Kaysen: And I understand as you raised a question that it [selecting historians with expert skills] was in the tradition of the Institute. I may say parenthetically to record another scandalous thing, Ben Meritt is one of the dumbest people I ever met. A very nice man but rather stupid. He was far below the sort of lower tail of the distribution of teaching fellows that I used to run when I was the head tutor of the economics department at Harvard. You know he was a great man because he'd made

this wonderful observation, that stones are rectangular. You know about it?

Shore: No, I don't know about it.

Kaysen: The deciphering of the Athenian tribute lists which were engraved on slabs rested very heavily on the fact that Ben was the first guy to make the observation that they're shaped roughly like your tape recorder and therefore if you had fragments you could fit them into a notional rectangle and count the missing parts. A moderately ingenious observation but not the work of genius. And Ben was really a dull man. Now there were some very interesting paleographers at the Institute. I met old E.A. Lowe who was a wonderful man. I thought Alföldi, who was one of the worst sons of bitches and bastards who I've ever met in my life -- mean, cruel, arrogant, a sneaky person -- a very great scholar. You know, you could see that he did things with his paleography and his techniques of reading coins. He had an imagination.

Shore: But Kenneth Setton?

Kaysen: He was a pedestrian fellow. He was very good at languages. He could speak Latin. He had talent and he was a diligent scholar, but he had almost no imagination. No imagination of any sort.

Shore: So why do you think the historians wanted him as a member of their faculty?

Kaysen: Because Cherniss who was the leading person who pushed on this liked it, felt a medieval latinist who would be good, and Clagett and he were graduate school buddies, something I wasn't shrewd enough to discover beforehand.

Shore: Did you try to stop the appointment?

Kaysen: In my own mind, I asked myself, couldn't they do better? So the first thing I did, when they told me why a Byzantinist was a good thing to have, was to suggest somebody like Stephen Runciman, a couple of books I had read. Well, he's a popularizer, not a serious scholar. That's what I was told. Well, I thought, I have to learn about this after all, I have not competence at all in these matters. I can read what Setton writes and I can evaluate it, and I trusted my judgement. I'm not a modest man either. But I thought I have to understand what the professional thinks. So I took the opportunity when I was in Cambridge to talk with Franklin Ford. Franklin and I are friends, we're contemporaries as Harvard faculty members, he like I was in O.S.S. during the war, and I knew him -- not well -- from that time. We were both friends of Felix Gilbert's. And I want to say a little more about Felix. And I talked to Franklin. And I said, Setton is dull. Yes, he said, kind of dull. I said, "Isn't Runciman a more interesting guy?" He said Setton's a better scholar. And that set me back on my heels. I tried to elicit from Felix an adverse comment

but I couldn't get it. Felix was the one person in the School of Historical Studies I had met before I had come to Princeton.

Shore: And this was in the O.S.S.?

Kaysen: In the O.S.S. But briefly. I had not met George. I knew about him. Oh no, I had met George when he was ambassador to Yugoslavia, and, of course I corresponded with George when he was ambassador to Yugoslavia, sub nomina J.F.K., that is, I remember drafting telegrams to Kennan.

Shore: But in a way Kennan and Gilbert were outsiders in the School of Historical Studies, weren't they?

Kaysen: That's right. Kennan and Gilbert were outsiders. Gilbert of course was not an outsider in the sense that he was respected by his colleagues, was a very well trained historian in the traditional sense, enormous command of linguistic tools and traditional historical school tools, had as a graduate student worked on the monumenta historica, is it Momumenta Germaniae Historica, yes, which is a traditional training ground for historians, and had all the credentials, but he was somewhat outside. But Gilbert was a very timid man, would not set himself up against the classicists. And the classicists were a curious crew. As I said Meritt was just kind of dumb and narrow-minded; Gilliam had the broadest intellectual interests but was very traditional;

Alföldi, who was emeritus, was very powerful, and intimidating; Thompson was a genial man and a very good scholar, but not a strong-minded man. And Meiss, who was probably intellectually the most distinguished member of that faculty when I came there -- I think that would probably be between Meiss and Gilbert in terms of reputed distinction -- and Gilbert had written less than his talents would probably have led you to expect. He was very important as a teacher and was very important as a teacher at the Institute. But all of the modern historians who came into contact with him, by modern I mean in the traditional sense, Renaissance, post-medieval, appreciated him and admired him but there was something, some drive lacking in Felix. Personally he was a very timid man. And Millard, who was a man of great intellectual distinction, great personal force and skill, was a totally selfish man. He had a treaty with his colleagues which said in effect, you leave art history to me, you let me pick the five or six members that are all I want to be bothered with, and I won't bother you. This was implicit.

Shore: Was that not also an informal agreement throughout the School of Historical Studies?

Kaysen: No, it wasn't. The classicists tended to decide together and Felix and George respected each other. George, who was a gentleman and a very serious man -- Alföldi had

complained to Oppenheimer that he was not a real scholar and that it was a disgrace to employ him. Those were the words. George has proved to be quite a remarkable scholar in many ways and a very decent man, with a public spirit, and an institutional spirit. One of the few friends Oppenheimer had at the end of his life. George respected Felix and consulted him. Marshall respected Felix, Marshall Clagett, but he stuck with the classicists and that group.

Shore: Marshall was almost a new professor at that point.

Kaysen: He was relatively new. He was two years old and Gilliam was maybe three or four years old.

Shore: The argument I've heard made was that the School of Historical Studies develops in the way it does because it feels that there are history departments all over the universities, as you said before -- important chairs had been developed since World War II in many universities -- and they felt they were preserving certain kinds of fields that otherwise were being neglected. Was that the argument for Setton, then?

Kaysen: There is something to that -- well, the argument for Setton was we want a Byzantinist, we want a medievalist, and that was the argument that was made, that was what we need.

Shore: So you allowed the appointment to go through?

Kaysen: To put it mildly, I felt defeated and I felt that it

would be unwise for me to veto an appointment in a field in which I had no claim. For modern history I could say I've studied some modern economic history, I have some sense of modern history, but, you know, until I read Setton's book I didn't know that there was a Catalan dominion of Athens! I felt it would have been a politically foolish move for me to veto an appointment for which there was no contrary view. I tried to elicit from Felix a negative vote but I couldn't do it, Felix was too timid.

Shore: And the mathematicians did not get involved?

Kaysen: The mathematicians like to hold the historians in contempt, they like the historians to be classicists, the European tradition meant that they admired the classics. That's what you should do. Andre, who had some Latin and I even think some Greek -- Andre was a fantastically gifted linguist -- felt like a patron. Alföldi and Andre found each other, you know they were sons of bitches together, had the same deep mean, envious, hateful streak, depth called to depth, and they were pals.

Shore: There was one other aspect ...

Kaysen: Andre's wisecrack, which shouldn't be unrecorded, the Institute was a nursery of mathematicians and a nursing home for historians.

Shore: I had actually heard that wisecrack as something that Andre and Andrew Alföldi spoke together.

Kaysen: No, no.

Shore: No? One last point on the School of Historical Studies. I had heard from Armand Borel several years ago that one of his complaints was that Oppenheimer had tried to stock the School of Historical Studies with people of the same kind of status interests -- I don't know if I'm quoting him exactly -- but people who were well spoken and conservative and had a certain notion of history as a kind of elegant march through time. Borel felt that his relationship, his bad relationship with the School of Historical Studies was related to that kind of snobbery -- I think that was the word he used.

Kaysen: Kennan can be the only example of that that he can point to.

Shore: I see.

Kaysen: I mean the appointments that were made during Oppenheimer's tenure that I can think of were Meiss, Meiss was a little like that, he came from a kind of Cincinnati Jewish family of the upper crust German Jews, but still, Armand wouldn't know that.

Shore: And Thompson, I believe?

Kaysen: But Homer's not, Homer's a plain Canadian. A very plain man. I believe from the prairies, not from Ontario, but I'm not sure of that. Frank is an Iowa boy, Marshall Claggett's a midwesterner. You know, it just isn't so. Felix actually does come from a tony family, he a scion

of the Mendelssohn family. Did you ever look at the letters he collected? Bankiers, Künstler, Gelehrte? It's a wonderful collection of letters. So it's just a foolish observation, I think.

Shore: Ok. And that's what we're here to find out, what you think. So the process essentially worked in the way you described it for each of the appointments in each of the Schools.

Kaysen: Yes. Now the next appointment was Rosenbluth. Rosenbluth was my next appointment. And one of the things about Rosenbluth was it was an appointment to broaden the intellectual scope of the school of physics. He was a plasma physicist. Plasma physics had to do with astrophysics. It was different from particle physics. It had a connection with things that somebody like Dyson was interested in but the particle physicists were in statistical mechanics. Stromgren who was the let's say most publicly distinguished of the remaining physicists was very strong for Rosenbluth and Freeman was very strong for Rosenbluth. And I had all these physicist friends and I talked to them, I talked to Murph whom I knew well, I talked to Vicky Weisskopf and to -- I probably didn't talk to Herman Feshbach at the time, but I talked to quite a few people and I talked to Harry Smythe, and there was no question that Rosenbluth was a first class appointment.

Shore: You were also praised by the physicists as someone who could read their materials and make some good sense out of it. Is that something you learned at the time or did you have a prior interest in physics?

Kaysen: Well, I had an interest in physics and part of my White House responsibility was things military. I'd been interested in nuclear weapons, my World War II career was about bombing, I was interested in the military uses of nuclear energy, so I learned enough physics to make a little sense of what I read, and I had these physicist friends and I know a little bit of the lingo. I could not read a physics paper and I cannot read a physics paper and say it's wrong. I can read a physics paper and say, oh, that's what it's about.

Shore: I understand. As an aside, if you don't mind, Freeman Dyson had a similar job during World War II?

Kaysen: It was a bit different. We once had a long conversation. We were going up to a conference, a kind of military consulting conference on the Cape, and I drove him up and we got so entranced in the conversation of exchanging World War II reminiscences that we ran out of gas and we had the spectacle of the Director of the Institute for Advanced Study and one of its most distinguished professors pushing my little Volkswagen convertible to the next gas station!

Shore: That's marvelous. Shall we get back to faculty

appointments?

Kaysen: Yes. And they all went very smoothly in this way. And on the mathematics appointments, you know, there was nothing for me to do, it was ministerial. These fellows were a wonderful group. They were abominable people, most of them, many of them, but they were very good, and when Andre came and said to me the School of Mathematics is better than the other Schools, I would go to Freeman and say, is that correct? He'd say yes, it's correct. Or to somebody like John Tukey at Princeton -- whom I knew because he was a vulgar man who went into applied mathematics and game theory and statistics -- it was clear and it has been clear during the whole history of the Institute, that the mathematics school has had a level of achievement which the other schools have not had.

Shore: So the physicists, for example, who I imagine could have commented on the mathematicians, did not.

Kaysen: They didn't. And on the whole because of the Bourbakism there was a real disjunction. There's less of a disjunction now partly because the physicists have got people like Wilczek who's even more mathematical and Ed Witten, the string theory man. So they're even closer. In mathematics, the new appointments mean that Bourbaki's sun has set. When I was there it was not at the zenith of Bourbaki but still the dominance of Bourbakism could be

felt. The two or three mathematicians at the Institute who were not Bourbakists, such as Atle Selberg, who was a number theorist, and was not really sympathetic to the traditional classical connection of mathematics to physics. Of the other two, one was Beurling who was relatively withdrawn and retired within two or three years of my coming to the Institute, and the other was Hormander who left, who went back to Sweden.

Shore: You said you wanted to comment on Lars Hormander. Would you like to do that now.

Kaysen: Yes. I had an exit interview with Lars and asked him why he was going back. This was perhaps in my third year, I think that's about right, third or fourth, and I missed him because he and Harish were the most friendly, Marston was friendly but Marston was a man in his 70s already, he was retired.

Shore: He was also working on secondary school education at that time, wasn't he.

Kaysen: No, that was Hassler. No. Marston was of course very strong in his sympathies for physics but he was retired and he was you know an old man. And Harish and Lars, Harish was younger than I, Lars was about my contemporary, maybe a little younger, he was Freeman's age, and I felt a rapport with him -- Armand, who was younger than I was so hostile that I could hardly talk to him. So I liked Lars and I enjoyed him, his wife was

nice, Viveca, isn't that right?

Shore: I don't know.

Kaysen: Lily was a lovely person. She's still around, isn't she, Lily Harish-Chandra.

Shore: Yes she is.

Kaysen: Lovely person. One had normal social relations with them and I had some kind of normal intellectual relations with Lars. So I had an exit interview with him and he said well, the atmosphere is so harsh, it's so hostile. He was a specialist in partial differential equations and he was a great man. He had done some famous things. But he said, "I once wanted to do a paper and I gave a paper in the math seminar about something, and Andre's comment was, 'Lars why don't you talk about something you know?'" Can you imagine saying this to a colleague? Can you imagine taking a comparable example, such as Van Woodward saying to Ed Morgan if Ed Morgan said, "I'll write a paper about Woodrow Wilson in the First World War because I read this and that and it occurred to me..." Can you imagine Van Woodward saying to him, "Ed, why don't you stick to what you know?" Van would say to him -- and these are people I know -- Van would say to him, "Well, welcome to the club!" Or, if he'd written something about the Civil War, "Welcome to the club, I'm glad to see you're getting into the really interesting material, that's a nice paper, you missed this point, or you made

that point, I never thought of that, or whatever." That would have been the attitude.

Shore: No one ever stood Andre Weil down then? Was that because of his standing?

Kaysen: No one ever stood Andre Weil down. Because of his arrogance and his harshness and partly because of his standing, partly because of his supreme self-confidence. The one person who stood him down once was Gershenkron. I invited Gershenkron to be a visiting member twice and Andre was teaching himself to read Russian poetry -- he knew how to read mathematical Russian, he was teaching himself to read Russian poetry -- and he wanted to come and to read to Gershenkron so Gershenkron would correct his language, phonology, and Gershenkron said that he was too busy.

Shore: Wonderful. One appointment that I'd like to ask you about is ...

Kaysen: But let me finish with Hormander. So he told this story and he said, "Weil used to refer to me as a differential engineer as if somehow differential equations was not high-class mathematics like algebraic topology and number theory (which were algebraic number theory and algebraic topology which is what Weil and Borel practiced -- Borel practiced other things too). And he just said, it's too harsh, it's too hostile. A few years later when Michael went back, and under different circumstances, that was a

real blow to me because we were real friends.

Shore: Michael Atiyah?

Kaysen: Yes. And in the great vote, the great split faculty vote, Michael actually abstained. He did not vote with his colleagues. Michael was a man with whom I had a very nice relationship, is a wonderful person. Michael went back to this very attractive offer of being a Royal Society Professor and one could hardly criticize him in any way or be surprised. (His wife actually liked being in England better than she liked being in America.) We talked when Michael left and he said something very telling. He said I don't feel I've lost a friend. Now I spent 16 years in the Harvard economics department and when I left I felt I left lots of friends, real friends -- it was terrible. I twice went to a mathematics faculty meeting, this was my statutory right, and I stopped going because it wasn't that they were unpleasant to me, they were so unpleasant to each other. They shouted at each other.

Shore: It's my understanding, if we could stay on this theme a little bit longer, that Andre Weil's reputation preceded him to the Institute, that the mathematicians knew what they were getting, but that they made the conscious decision to take him anyway, that in effect the personality of the person should be immaterial, that the work of the person was supreme and therefore they invited

Andre Weil.

Kaysen: Yes. Even Robert said someplace in a document, and it may be in the Stern history, do you have the Stern history?

Shore: Yes.

Kaysen: That he knew Andre and he knew his reputation but he thought he was sufficiently distinguished. Andre himself once made an observation, a wise crack, he was very good at wise cracks, very quick on his feet -- this was in the early days when we were still on polite terms with each other. I was at a mathematicians party -- they invited me to their parties, especially if it was a party for a visitor -- and it was for a man named Zygmund, who was a distinguished mathematician at Chicago. Andre said to me, in his way, "let me introduce you to my former colleague and, now that I'm no longer there I can say, my friend, Professor Zygmund."

Shore: So he knew what it was about.

Kaysen: Oh, it was all very self-conscious.

Shore: Back to the appointments. John Elliott seemed to be an appointment that was not in the mold that you were describing before. Could you talk a little bit about that?

Kaysen: Yes. I wanted to appoint Lawrence Stone.

Shore: To the School of Historical Studies?

Kaysen: To the School of Historical Studies. And Lawrence wanted

to be appointed. I did not know Lawrence before I came to Princeton, although I had read that big book of his.

Shore: On the family?

Kaysen: Well, on the aristocracy, you know, The Crisis of the Aristocracy, and one of the things I did, the first year I started to have some social science visitors, was to have a combined history and social science seminar with Princeton people and Felix. Frank Gilliam actually came to it from time to time, and George came too and Joe Strayer, and Lawrence and others. I was tremendously impressed with Lawrence Stone, and Dick Neustadt, who's professor of political science at the Kennedy School and was a friend of mine, a colleague and a friend, had recommended Lawrence to me as someone I should look up when I went to Princeton. And I thought Lawrence was exactly what the School of Historical Studies needed, very brilliant, very wide-ranging social historian with an interest in everything and stimulating to students. And I wanted to appoint Lawrence. Felix was interested in it but he said it would never fly, that Lawrence had already annoyed some of the old guys. And then Felix I guess suggested John Elliott and Lawrence knew John Elliott, they were friends, and so Lawrence and Felix helped me recruit John Elliott. Hanna Gray, whom I had invited to the Board of the Institute was influential in helping me do that and I was very pleased. Although John

was a little bit of a disappointment to me -- not personally -- but in the sense that he proved to be, at least the first couple of years at the Institute, not as broad as I thought he might be. But he is a very broad person, and the mathematicians respected him -- they respected anybody with a wide linguistic command for some reason -- and he was a breath of fresh air.

Shore: You said that you recruited him with Felix, as a replacement for Felix?

Kaysen: No, but as a modern historian, I guess, we agreed that we had to build up the history faculty, there hadn't been appointments for a while.

Shore: And the rest of the history faculty went along with this appointment?

Kaysen: Yes. Well, again, because in a traditional sense he was a very distinguished historian. Now the appointment I want to say something about is White and that's the biggest mistake I made at the Institute, was allowing Morty White to con me. The Setton appointment was not a mistake in the sense that I didn't think it was a good appointment but I've explained to you my calculation and my lack of self-confidence in my own judgement. I knew White, I knew him well, I thought he was a second-rate person. I did not then know what a son of a bitch he was and one of the mistakes I made was not finding out from my Harvard colleagues why he was so eager to come to the

Institute. He had come as a visiting member at the invitation of Clagett and Cherniss, although he was a little out of the way but I didn't interfere with them, and he was somebody I knew and with whom I was friendly. My wife Annette had actually worked with him for a while in some enterprise called ESI which was the business of revising the social science curriculum in the high school after the model of the revision of the physics curriculum. It was Jerry Bruner, Elting Morison and Morty White who were involved in this and my wife was a kind of administrator for them, a job she was working on just before we went to the Institute. So I knew Morty and we had a pleasant friendly, casual and unserious relation. I thought he was an agreeable enough person, and when they wanted him... -- oh, when he came as a visitor we saw something of him and Lucia his wife, a pleasant woman, and you know we had them to tea and Morton asked me what my ideas for the Institute were and I told him. I'm perhaps less so now than I was twenty-seven or twenty-eight years ago, but I am rather open and perhaps even a little bit gullible. I'm certainly not a suspicious or protective person, I don't think. My first reaction to somebody, especially to somebody I know is not: "What is he after?" By now my first reaction is, what is he after, but at forty-eight or whenever I was when Morty was a visiting member, two years after I came,

if it was two years, that wasn't my first reaction to somebody I know. I didn't think about whether I should be telling him all this. So I was very open with him and when it turned out that Marshall and Harold, whom he had cultivated -- he'd been at the Institute before and he'd cultivated Harold very strongly -- were eager to promote him, I thought to myself, well, he's not very good but he's no worse than some of the rest of them. He's as good as Setton if not better, and he's at least a modern minded man who'll be helpful to me. What a piece of self-delusion. He was the most vigorous, the most persistent and the most damaging of my adversaries. He was the one who leaked things to the press. He broke his own word, leaked things to the press, cultivated that fellow at the Times who wrote all the stories. I'll think of his name.

Shore: We'll talk about that later I hope. You mentioned the circumstances under which he left Harvard and came to the Institute -- care to elaborate on that?

Kaysen: Yes. During the great crisis at Harvard which took place in '67, the strike in '68, Morty, who was chairman of the Philosophy department, allowed some of the student strike leaders to use the Philosophy department xerox machine and facilities for their organizing activities. And it was typical of Morty that he would do this. He did not, like my former mechitin Larry Wiley, who's son was the

husband of this daughter you've just met for some years -- openly espouse the cause of the strikers. Larry is a wonderful, sweet and somewhat naive man. Morton would never do that, he was too calculating, but he did do this. And Franklin Ford who was then the Dean -- do you know Franklin at all?

Shore: I don't know him personally, I know of him.

Kaysen: Yes. He's a very fine man, first of all a very fine scholar and second of all a very fine exemplification of the canons of academic honor and decency and fairness. Perhaps a little more straitlaced about these things than I myself would be, but really an admirable person. Franklin was Dean of the Faculty and at one point, in a faculty meeting, I'm told -- of course I was not there -- they were very contentious, and full of aggressive remarks and snide remarks, Franklin made a passing reference to this, very indirect, and Morton stood up and advanced, have you every been in University Five?

Shore: No, I haven't.

Kaysen: It's a big beautiful room that occupies the whole width and most of the length of the second floor of University Hall with windows on both sides, and the faculty meetings are in the afternoon with the slanting light coming in. It's a beautiful room, one of the most beautiful rooms in the United States, and there's a kind of round table on a little dais at one side of it at which the President

and Dean sit and the secretary, and Morton advanced up to that table and said, "if you're referring to me Franklin, that's a lie." Franklin had a stroke that afternoon, a very mild stroke, from which he fully recovered, and I didn't know any of that. I was too naive as I say to ask myself the question: "Morty's a professor of Harvard, why does he want to come to the Institute?" There are no philosophers here. He isn't much of an historian of philosophy, although somewhat of one -- that was the basis on which he was appointed, as an historian of American thought. I didn't ask myself that question, I didn't pick up the phone, nor did anybody pick up the phone and warn me which somebody should have done.

Shore: And the mathematicians and physicists went along with this appointment?

Kaysen: They didn't care. They simply didn't care.

Shore: Can we talk about a couple of more appointments and then maybe we can take a break. Irving Lavin, if we can stick to Historical Studies for a while?

Kaysen: Well, that was very simple. Millard came to me, said "I'm about to retire and I want Irving Lavin to be my successor." This is how Millard was appointed. Panofsky was about to retire. He went to Robert and said, "I want you to appoint Millard Meiss." I said, "What do your colleagues think of that?" He said, "They're all in favor of it." I said, "Are there any other people we

should consider?" He said, "No." Now, I did not have much acquaintanceship among art historians. I didn't have a network like I had a network of physicists. I asked Jim Ackerman who I knew because one of his children -- Do you know Jim Ackerman at Harvard, he's an art historian?

Shore: No, I don't.

Kaysen: One of his children and Susanna were schoolmates. I asked the few people I knew and all said Irving Lavin is a very able and interesting and lively guy. I interviewed Irving three times and was impressed with him and among other things I was impressed with the breadth of his interests. I talked to Felix about him and Felix was positive about him which I took as an important sign. I found it interesting that Irving could talk about nineteenth century English art as well as about Bernini and as well about Tunisian mosaics. You know, he did some wonderful work on Roman mosaics in the desert. And he appealed to me personally and Millard is a man I admired and disliked in equal parts but I had great intellectual respect for him, and I felt that he was too good not to want somebody good to succeed him and that he was too good to want merely a toady, a clone. That was the basis upon which Irving was appointed. I don't try to follow this but certainly the period in which Irving was a member of the faculty while I was Director he was

a good appointment. He was a very energetic participant in the history and social science joint seminar. Cliff and he found each other stimulating and talked to each other a lot. Irving and John and only Irving and John fulfilled -- I mean George did to some extent and Felix did, I shouldn't say that -- fulfilled the notion of real intellectual interaction across the faculty boundary and welcomed the notion, that was my notion about what the School of Social Science should be about.

Shore: One last appointment in the School of Historical Studies is Christian Habicht.

Kaysen: Yes. Well, Merrit had retired, Homer was getting on, the classicists felt they had to have somebody. Gilliam was the last classicist appointment, he was already there a while, and it was the consensus of the faculty, so I couldn't say no. I mean, one has to respect the tradition. And again, he seemed to be an outstanding scholar. I read what I could of his work. It's laborious for me to read German, I don't do it regularly, but I can, and I saw that his interests were broad, that he was not a pedant. We'd had an Israeli classicist as a visiting member once and he and I had a conversation. He was saying about the Institute tradition, that it is Zitationsgeschichte, and Habicht didn't seem to be in that mode, he seemed to have interests in social history and the history of religious ideas, and in institutions

as well -- to have a broad gauge. I was disappointed in his behavior with respect to the Bellah appointment but in other respects Habicht behaved like a decent person during the remainder of our joint tenures.

Shore: Why don't we take a break here and talk about the Social Science School next.

Kaysen: Sure.

END OF CASSETTE NO. 2, SIDE NO. 1

CASSETTE NO. 2, SIDE NO. 2:

Shore: You told us about the Board of Trustees' interest, from the beginning, in the School of Social Science and your notion of why you wanted to work on a School of Social Science. Could you tell us some technical things about getting funding for it, how this mandate worked out in general.

Kaysen: Well, there was a kind of byplay that started just as I got appointed which never came to anything and I guess it started between Dilworth and a New York lawyer named Oscar Ruebhausen. Ruebhausen was chairman of the trustees of the Russell Sage Foundation which was a foundation with about, at that time, maybe 40 or 50 million dollars of assets -- the Institute probably had about an 80 million dollar portfolio when I got there -- and it was a foundation for social science research. The thought was perhaps the Russell Sage Foundation could

somehow merge with the Institute. And I talked with Oscar and with Bert Brim, who was then the president of the Foundation off and on for a while but nothing came of it.

Shore: Did the Ford Foundation come into it?

Kaysen: That came in a little later. Now, my pal Mac Bundy was President of the Ford Foundation and I went to Mac. I went to Mac and said ok, I'm doing it and now I want to get some money out of you and we talked about how much I'd need and what I wanted and so on, and I said I wanted to fund a couple of professorships as a way of starting and I think my initial goal was four million dollars and -- I'm unclear about this, my memory is not sharp on this, the documents are all there. And so what I tell you is subject to the correction of the archival record. But I think that, if I remember it, Mac first of all was too shrewd to do this himself, so that he turned me over to a fellow named Champ Ward who was the head of the sort of humanities and social science division of the Foundation, or something like that. And Champ and I had a lot of discussion and negotiation and the long and short of it was we got -- now what I don't remember was it \$2 million to be matched two to one? -- yes that's what it was.

Shore: I think that's what it was.

Kaysen: And I thought that was a pretty heavy burden to bear but

I grimaced and started to work.

Shore: Was it hard to raise funds for an institution that had such an elite reputation, a rich reputation also?

Kaysen: Yes, it was, it was. And I got some funds from the Board although the Board was on the whole very stingy and did very little compared with the Boards of Princeton or Harvard or Yale where you know that if you're on the Board you're expected to give them money or find them money.

Shore: One finds in the record that you had an enormous circle of acquaintances from the number of letters I've seen to people you were writing to on a first name basis. Did this come out of the government period, out of your teaching period?

Kaysen: It came out of Harvard which is a great institution, it came out of my government experience, it came out of other things.

Shore: How about the 1907 foundation?

Kaysen: All right, I'll tell you about that in a minute. But that isn't in the record in detail at all and since that was the second biggest source of money other than the Ford Foundation it bears talking about, but I worked at it. I did not like it, I was not really good at it. You've formed some impression, I'm sure, of my personality and so on, you can see that I'm enthusiastic but it's not easy for me to say the same thing over and

over again. And I'm not a natural ass-kisser, I mean I remember that I heard from one of Harold Linder's friends, who was someone I knew, that Harold's very old ancient mother in her 90s felt that the thank you letters I wrote to Harold when he gave me the odd \$100,000 were not fulsome enough and that made me furious but what could I do? I tried to make them more fulsome. And you know it's nothing against Harold who is a decent man indeed and who left some money. I had an early fund raising success which was a kind of phony success, but it was good for my reputation. Tom Watson had been giving annual money or money every couple of years to support a professorship for some time because he felt indebted to von Neumann, and rightfully so, and never paid off the debt but nobody ever pays off these debts. And he gave me a million dollars to fund the professorship so that Harish-Chandra became the first von Neumann professor. And that was a gracious gesture. Incidentally and sort of by the by, shortly after I came to Princeton, maybe some time in the spring or early winter of the following year, I got a call from Watson whom I'd never met who said he knew I was the new director and he was interested in the Institute and he would like to meet me. So of course I dashed up to New York and we had a nice lunch. And in the course of time he accepted an invitation to be a member of the Board and we got to be friendly and he

was modestly generous, he gave us a million dollars, he gave us \$250,000 for the School of Social Science, but he was never a big donor. He gave some more money for an interesting conference I held, the proceedings of which never got published which was a shame and is my own fault in a way, on the computer as a scientific instrument. A very interesting conference, and if the papers are around you ought to read them because they're extraordinarily interesting papers. Michael Atiyah gave a brilliant paper on the concept of proof, and what is a proof, and the point was that it was not a logical concept, it was a psychological concept and for a mathematician he was an extraordinary man.

Shore: I saw a reference to this conference but never have seen the papers.

Kaysen: I might have the papers someplace. If I do I would be glad to give them to you. I'll look for them. Well, so, Tom got on the Board. The story that I'm reminded of -- I like stories -- was that after the lunch -- and I like Tom, he was an attractive guy and I got to know him pretty well and I found him really an attractive and interesting man, and an admirable man. But after the lunch -- we sat in some private dining room and got served -- and we exchanged some conversation, and he stood up and I stood up, and then he went to the closet and got my coat. He started to help me on with it and I

sort of made a kind of, you know, I'll do it gesture, and he said "Father," -- when Tom said father it always came out so to speak in all capitals -- he said, "Father always said to me, 'A man who won't let you help him on with his coat either is or has been a butler.'" So I went at it. Shortly after I'd come to Princeton -- this is not a digression as you will see -- a man I did not know but whose name I knew, Bernard Segal, a Philadelphia lawyer, still extant but not in command of himself anymore -- he's in his mid-eighties, in fact, in his late eighties now -- called me up and said he'd like to meet me. I had heard of him, he had been President of the American Bar Association, had been. First Jew to be President of the American Bar Association. He had been appointed by Bobby Kennedy to be on the Lawyer's Committee on Civil Rights, he was active in that, he was an establishment Republican in an establishment law firm in Philadelphia and I knew his name for all these reasons. And I remember saying that I would be pleased to meet you and I come to Philadelphia quite frequently, my mother was then still living, and I'd be glad to call on you. He said, no, I want to call on you. And he called on me. The long and short of it is he wanted to invite me to join the board of Penn which he did and I did. He was then I think chair of the nominating committee. They were looking for an academic. There

were then no academics on the board and I was an alumnus and had suddenly become a respectable and famous academic through no particular merit of my own. So I joined the Penn board and shortly after that, Bernie said to me, there's a board committee to oversee a grant from the 1907 foundation which I'd like you to join. And I said, spare me, Bernie, I have enough occasions to come to Philadelphia already, and I don't need another. He said, trust me, it will be good for you, do it. And we had got to be friends, I'd talked to him about what I was there for, what I was trying to do. He's a very interesting man, an admirable, remarkable man in every way. So I did what he said and he introduced me to the people at the 1907 Foundation -- 1907 was the founding year of the United Parcel Service company. This is now called the UPS Foundation. But it was then the corporate foundation of the United Parcel Service company. The UPS Foundation is now an independent foundation with a billion dollars of assets, but that's another story. And he introduced me to those people and I talked to them and explained what I was doing and made a variety of statements which, if you were a Calvinist you would have said were not true and if you weren't, even the most liberal interpretation was stretching the truth, about how the social science research at the Institute would help promote the understanding of human behavior and social behavior and

every good business would be able to benefit.

Shore: You didn't feel any kind of conflict of interest from being on the Penn board and raising funds from them?

Kaysen: No, no. Bernie made it clear to me that he had tapped them for Penn and that it was my turn and so on. And I won't go through all of the evolutions. It was all about as strange as it could be and Bernie once said to me, when he was telling me about this, that these guys are the smartest bunch of truck drivers that you ever met. And the long and short of it is they gave me \$2 million so that, with the other bits and pieces, I matched the Ford money.

Shore: Also the Carnegie Foundation?

Kaysen: Yes, but they gave me a term grant and the term grant was for the other half of the School of Social Science and let me go back to that in a minute.

Shore: Alright.

Kaysen: But that was the major piece with the Ford grant and this and lots of things -- I can't now remember everything I got and everything I didn't get -- and all the lunches I ate and all the trips to New York I made. I remember trying very hard and failing to get a million dollars out of Norton Simon, whom I had also brought on the Board, a fascinating man. In general I didn't do well with my trustees.

Shore: Was it hard to convince foundation people of doing this

kind of social science that didn't have immediate applications? That seems to me to be most difficult.

Kaysen: No, because Ford had already funded Stanford and what I had to say to Champ Ward was why is this different and my pitch was on the virtues of a permanent faculty -- You should live so long!

Shore: But if you're talking about a foundation like the UPS Foundation, one would assume that there's an interest in application. You made that kind of an argument to some.

Kaysen: Yes, I did. And the man with whom I dealt was a man who was then the executive vice president of the corporation who was in charge of all this activity. His name was Charles Foreman. He fortunately was a fool. I mean he was a clever man, he was fluent and articulate, much more articulate and fluent than most of his colleagues on the board, but there was a foolish element in him. He had some training as a psychologist in something like motivation and that kind of thing which I think of semi-fraudulent or allowing itself to be drawn into fraudulence. I think Chuck had a little bit of that in him and I was able to sense it and exploit it. When I confess to St. Peter I expect to get quite a few demerits for this because I knew goddamn well that there was never going to be an application in anybody's lifetime now present, but I thought that I was within the poetic license of the head of an academic institution when he's

asking for money. And I had made the promise -- which I assume I made voluntarily, it wasn't pressed out of me, but I saw that it was a necessary promise to make to the faculty, formally at a faculty meeting and it must be in the minutes -- that no new appointments would be made in social science that weren't funded, that the School of Social Science wouldn't take money away from other schools. Now of course this isn't true and Andre and others didn't hesitate to point it out to me and Andre was very vehement, he's a good calculator. You know, he made the point that I was taking apartments and I was building offices and so on, but you know I raised a hell of a lot of money for the offices, I got an NSF construction grant. Looking back on it, I was amazed at how well I did. I raised about \$8 million. It's not a lot of money. You have to multiply it by about three to get it into today's prices -- four actually. But even so, no heroic feat, but given the situation, the fact that it had never been done and the kind of uphill struggle of this wealthy institution and your trustees not giving much, it was a big struggle. Another man might have done better and I had no Jim Wolfensohn. Harold was only moderately energetic.

Shore: Would this lead to the reason why the endowment for the School of Social Science is separate from the endowment of the other three Schools? Did that happen at the time

you were raising the money?

Kaysen: Well, I made it separate just to sort of demonstrate to people that I wasn't taking their money away.

Shore: So much for the financial side of the question. The other side, the more important side, the intellectual side.

Kaysen: Well, I talked to a lot of people. I talked to Bob Merton whom I knew, I talked to Ed Shils whom I knew, those are the people I talked a lot to. I talked to a lot of other people, I talked to the historians at Princeton, I talked to Lawrence, I talked to quite a variety of people, and to Bob and to Ed I talked to very specifically because I thought from their intellectual histories and their writings, they were exactly sympathetic to what I wanted to do, and they were. They thought this was exactly right, to put it in its most high-flown form, that there was only one social science, it was the study of society, that human history was the recorded evidence of the studies of society, and you should study everything in the historical way. I talked to Alex Gershenkron, I talked to a lot of people, and there was support for this idea. The two people I talked to most specifically about recruitment were Shils and Merton. Merton of course was and probably still is, although he's almost ninety now, the most distinguished figure in American sociology and in American social

science in general. He's pretty amazing, he's still pretty sharp.

Shore: Did you talk to Talcott Parsons as well?

Kaysen: Yes I did. I knew Talcott. Frank Sutton with whom I'd written a book was a student of Talcott's and one of his favorite students, it was a measure of Talcott's enormous incompetence as an academic politician, that Frank never got tenure at Harvard and people not his intellectual equal did. So I talked to Frank a lot, I talked to Talcott, I talked to Jim Dusenbury -- he's technically a rather narrow economist but he's an interesting person. You know I must have talked to fifty people I've forgotten. I decided from the first that while I might have economic historians, I wouldn't have economists, that I said to myself that economics is done so well at Harvard, and I said it to people like Bob Solow, (whom I asked to join the Board -- we were contemporaries as graduate students, so we remained close friends,) that economics is done so well at Harvard and M.I.T., at Stanford, nothing would be added. M.I.T. has five post-docs and five visiting assistant professors, or three, or did then, it's a little shrunken now. With the National Bureau, I would add nothing. But what I wanted was historians with a social science bent, political scientists, sociologists, anthropologists.

Shore: So there are two things at work, there's an attempt to

fill a niche that doesn't exist in American academic ranks, and then there's this notion that one can do a kind of an overarching social science that doesn't have immediate application. Is that right?

Kaysen: That's right. Fundamental social science. And it's the social scientific study of history, or historically oriented social science. I tried one time to get money out of the Volkswagen Foundation for a Max Weber Professorship. Max Weber was whom I wanted to appoint. And of course Talcott and Merton were in the Max Weber spirit. And that was the image. And then the other thing, and I will boast for the record as I did to you on the phone, the other thought I had was that there was something happening in the field of psychology, linguistics, computer science. It was represented to me by Herb Simon whom I knew as a colleague in the broad sense and that this would be the complement, that the School of Social Science would have two parts, one of which was the study of society in a historical mode and the other was the study of the individual, his mental capacities, development, and I thought in the best tradition of Aristotle, man is a social animal, that people don't exist in isolation, and that in some sense even though you couldn't see how, there would ultimately be a bridge between the micro and the macro. George Miller was somebody I had known as a colleague at Harvard

and admired, and Duncan Luce was somebody whose work I knew, so they were the first two people and what I got from Carnegie and I think from Sloan, as I remember it, was some money for five years. We had a good five years. We had some very interesting people there, Dave Rummelhart, what's the name of that leading Englishman who's written enormously interesting books on linguistics, enormously influential. He was a kind of student of George's. Fishburn?

Shore: Noam Chomsky?

Kaysen: No, Noam was not there. Although I might have thought of Noam. I made a little exploration, this is by the by, before I did this, about whether it was possible to have biology at the Institute. I invited Jim Watson and Paul Doty, both friends of mine from Harvard, down for a couple of days, we had a long set of conversations and what they said in effect, is biology can't operate in a paper and pencil environment. It has to be in a wet lab and you don't want to spend the money on a wet lab and it's not what you should do. And they were right I think. So I had this vision. And I started with the permanent money and the name that rose to the top of my list when I saw it was Geertz, I mean when I started talking to lots of people. So I went and saw Geertz and I invited him to the Institute, then he came and spent a year, and we spent a lot of time talking about what this

should be and how we could conceive it.

Shore: Why does Geertz come to the top of the list?

Kaysen: Well, everybody said this man is brilliant, he's got a very wide horizon, he's very original, he's very stimulating, they told me all that. I read his book, a couple of his books, Peddlers and Princes, and what's it called, Agricultural Involution or something in Java, not the one he wrote about religion, but the one he wrote about economic development. And it was a very interesting book, and I thought he handled the economic side of it, the change from self-sustaining agriculture to plantation agriculture and its effect on society, brilliantly, so I was tremendously impressed. I admired Merton, respected Merton, although how shall I say, we had very good relations with Merton, he's a wonderful guy, but I never had an ease with Merton. I had an ease with Ed Shils, although I knew him less well and Ed's got old and crabby and he's become very conservative. He was always rather conservative. A kind of libertarian in the best sense, but he's become much more conservative. But I just love Ed, and I thought he had very good taste, he certainly hadn't the academic achievement of Merton. And he didn't have a taste for systemization. But I thought in terms of taste in people he was more perceptive than Bob. Ed and Bob Merton are both people I admire. I don't want to sound that I'm diminishing them in any way.

They just played a different role.

Shore: Were either of them candidates?

Kaysen: No. They were both in their 60s. And they were both well placed and Ed divided his time between Kings College (Cambridge) and Chicago, no. I mean I don't know whether I asked ever, I don't think I did. I can remember Ed saying something. But I thought that Herb Simon would be such an ornament that I should get him but he was not interested. We had this exchange of correspondence you saw.

Shore: Was it hard to get Cliff to come to the Institute?

Kaysen: Yes. It was somewhat hard and I had to work at getting Hildred a job which I did but I was helped by the Princeton people. But she's very good. She deserved the job. There's no question about that. But you know it's always hard when the suggestion comes from the outside, not the inside. But it took a little persuasion and so on, but he did, it was a big gamble for him. I don't think he's regretted it, and while he's a good teacher I sensed in him that the Institute would be an environment which he enjoyed, and I think it has been.

Shore: Let's talk about a couple of the other key intellectuals in the early years of the School. Bill Sewell was there.

Kaysen: Well, Bill Sewell was a kid. He had written some stuff which looked very interesting and Cliff liked it and I liked it, we interviewed him. I knew his old man

slightly, admired him as a grand figure. That didn't play any role. And Bill was just an awfully enthusiastic guy, we got him there, we liked him, we said let's give him a five year appointment. And he was very helpful and he was indeed exactly the kind of person I was looking for, that is he was a historical sociologist, or a sociological historian, and he was a good historian who had the respect of the historians.

Shore: Quentin Skinner?

Kaysen: Yes. Well, Quentin was very attractive to us. Now Quentin came after the Bellah affair, didn't he?

Shore: I'm not sure about that actually.

Kaysen: No? Well, I'm not sure about that either. But I think I asked Quentin to come as a faculty member after the Bellah affair.

Shore: He came as a long term member earlier on, I believe.

Kaysen: Yes. But he didn't want to expatriate himself. And everybody we had as a long-term member was somebody we thought maybe we might get as a faculty member.

Shore: Tom Kuhn is another person?

Kaysen: Well, Tom was somebody I wanted to appoint as a professor.

Shore: In which School?

Kaysen: In the School of Historical Studies but he wouldn't have come in the School of Social Science, I don't think. He then thought of himself as an historian of science, he

now thinks of himself more as a philosopher. But I don't think he would have come in the School of Social Science. I would have offered him a joint appointment, but I don't think the historians would have taken him, and Marshall didn't want to take him. And Marshall, when I advanced the idea of Tom Kuhn, Marshall advanced the idea of Martin Klein. Now I admire Martin Klein and respect him, he's an historian of nineteenth century and early twentieth century physics, he was at Yale. I respect Martin Klein's achievements and think he's a very good historian of science, but he's much more of a traditional historian of science, he wouldn't do for me what I wanted and Tom, had he wanted it and had we been able to appoint him, would have done that. I think it might have been good for Tom to do it. But that's another question. One can't predict these things.

Shore: How about your own involvement in the intellectual life of the new program?

Kaysen: Well, I was very involved in the intellectual life in the sense that I attended every seminar every time I was in town. I was out of town a fair amount, but not so much. But I thought my business was primarily to be an entrepreneur, and I found the demands of being an entrepreneur and the administrative and public demands with my trustees and with Princeton, sufficiently demanding, that I think I wrote four papers in the ten

years that I was at the Institute, and only one of them was any good. And it was thoughtful, sort of original actually. But I was a very ardent participant in the discussion, and in the recruitment. And of course for a while the faculty was Cliff and me.

Shore: Was there any connection between the original School of Economics and Politics?

Kaysen: No. I thought all the people in the original school were pretty poor. One of them is somebody who actually was in a very formal way my superior in the Second World War, the very strange O.S.S. unit to which I was attached, although when I was attached to it I was technically a member of the air corps and was in detached service to this unit, was housed in the economic warfare section of the American embassy in London and the minister for economic warfare was Winfield Riefler who had been a professor of economics. He was a very amiable gent who had been a moderately good central banker, but a man of no intellectual depth or seriousness. Mitrany I met several times. Walter Stewart, the image of Walter Stewart as an Institute Professor, who I never knew, was of a man stretched out on a long leather couch, asleep.

Shore: And Edward Mead Earle?

Kaysen: Edward Mead Earle maybe was already dead. I think he had died. Felix after all had first contact with the Institute as Ed Earle's assistant.

Shore: The selection of Clifford Geertz, did it sail through the faculty? Was there any problem with it?

Kaysen: It didn't quite sail through the faculty. The faculty proposed that there be an ad hoc committee. I agreed that there be an ad hoc committee. I now forget who the members were. Bob Merton was one and nobody could complain about that, you know Bob is a member of the National Academy. There was a Dutch anthropologist. There was an art historian from Yale who was a pre-Columbian art historian and therefore presumably knowledgeable on anthropology. He was Millard Meiss's suggestion. And maybe Ed was on the committee -- no, there was a historian of religion, a Japanese historian of religion from Chicago. No, that was the Bellah committee. There was somebody else and I can't remember who it was. Somebody raised a question of how well Cliff knew Arabic. Oh I think I may have had Bernard Lewis on that committee.

Shore: I think you did.

Kaysen: Yes. And Bernard said that he was not a classical Arabic scholar but there's no question he commanded it well enough to read what he had to read, and he did know Dutch and he did know Javanese. There was nobody to say yea or nay if he knew Javanese or not. And in the faculty discussion I remember somebody, possibly Harold, but possibly not, saying in a hostile way, that he didn't

think his language capacities were first class in every language. And Marshall Rosenbluth, who was newly a faculty member said, "it seems to me he's learned everything he needs to know to do his work and it's clear to me if he has to learn more, he'll learn more." And it was said in such a flat way that nobody took it up, you know, it was interesting. But in general it sailed through. And the formula under which it sailed through is that I was going to present to the whole faculty the report of the ad hoc committee of the faculty, and listen to their views. I didn't say that they were going to vote and that I would be bound by the vote or anything of the sort. I just said I would present the report of the ad hoc committee and I would listen to their views and I would report them to the Trustees. But in general I was able to say the faculty was content or something like that.

Shore: You mentioned to me on the phone something that one doesn't see any evidence of in the archives and that's the attempt to appoint W. A. Wrigley.

Kaysen: Tony Wrigley. W. Anthony Wrigley. Yes. There's no evidence of it. There was no attempt to appoint him. There was an invitation to him which he turned down. I had no doubt that Wrigley would have sailed through the faculty. He was quantitative. He was archival. He was very original. He was the leading English student of the

famous French demographer Louis Henri, and I don't think you can underestimate Andre's parochialism and the influence of the parochialism on Andre. That is if somebody had a French reputation then he was ok, if somebody was a member, as I believe Louis Henri was, of the French Academy of Sciences, there could be no higher recommendation. Now Wrigley was one of the first Englishmen, Peter Laslett was the first, but Peter Laslett was not technically competent as a demographer and a statistician. Peter is a very smart and interesting fellow. Do you know him?

Shore: Yes, I know his work well.

Kaysen: And Peter Laslett started this and was an academic entrepreneur, but he started this institute of demography, and Wrigley was one of the first people there, another one was Richard Schofield, and there were several others, and Wrigley did the first set of reconstructions in England of family histories in the Henri manner. His first village I remember was called Colyton in Devonshire. But he also wrote an absolutely brilliant article, one of the best thirty-five pages of economic history I have ever read, on why the industrial revolution took place in England and not in France, on a comparison of England and France in 1750 when everything would have led you to believe it would be France. It was a real tour de force. Now it happened that immediately

after he spent a very happy year at the Institute, Tony turned inward to some of the more technical aspects of his work. Really almost paleographic questions of how you sorted out people with the same or similar names, very technical points about how you made use of the parish registers. But he's gone back and forth. But the long and short of it is that I had liked his work, I'd invited him, I liked him, I found him enormously attractive, Cliff liked him, although he was very...

Shore: I can't see their work together...

Kaysen: Well, their work was very different. Tony was ecumenical in his interests if not in his work, Cliff, I don't think Cliff would have initiated the appointment but Cliff agreed with me that since he was in some sense on the cultural history extreme, it was good to have some balance in the School. That demography was in some sense the basic social science, fundamental --Bill McNeil of course believes this very strongly and his work reflects that -- but Cliff as I say was not enthusiastic but was persuaded on two grounds, and of course you can ask Cliff himself. But what my memory of my understanding was that Cliff liked Tony personally, I don't mean as a dinner companion, but personally in an intellectual sense. He found him lively and stimulating. He agreed with my argument and he felt that he and Tony could get along intellectually and I felt that Tony first of all was a

first-class guy. I thought that bringing a different perspective was good, and that they would complement each other in a real way and I thought that this would stimulate Tony to do more of the broader economic history and perhaps less technical demography.

END OF CASSETTE NO. 2, SIDE NO. 2:

CASSETTE NO. 3, SIDE NO. 1:

Kaysen: Well, he said he would think about it. He was flattered, He was an awfully nice man. And then he went back to Peterhouse and I went and visited him to propagandize him some more, but he decided not to do it and he said basically that he liked Peterhouse, that his wife, who was Dutch, felt that she hadn't removed herself from her family and home when she was in England but she would have done so in America. It would be a bigger distance. So he said no, and you know I regretted it but we moved on.

Shore: One thing that looks very abrupt in the archives but I'm sure has a much longer history is the attempted appointment of George Miller: a memo on November 1st calling a meeting of the faculty to discuss the appointment, then on November 8th calling off that meeting and calling off the entire episode. Could you lay that out for us?

Kaysen: I did not then have money to appoint George. He wanted

to come. He shared my vision. Cliff liked him. He liked Cliff. I thought it would be a very good idea. I felt that if I appointed George I would have no difficulty in finding the money for him because he was a very well known figure. And at some critical moment he had an offer at Rockefeller. I think that was it although I don't remember that, whether I have the chronology right. So I went to the faculty with the thought that maybe they would give me leave, they'd give me a year's credit so to speak to...

Shore: Finance the appointment.

Kaysen: Yes. Of course they had to trust me because if I appointed him, I appointed him, and they absolutely refused. And I didn't want to break my promise and I didn't want to have a fight which centered around breaking my promise. I saw the way Oppenheimer lost some of his friends on the grounds that he'd deceived the faculty and so on. So that I just said well, I can't do it. And I withdrew. That was the time incidentally and off the record, not off the record, I tried to get a million dollars out of Norton who had it but was not interested in doing it. I mean he had many.

Shore: A slight aside: was there any connection between the psychology program of Piaget in the late 50s and this idea to pursue psychologists as faculty appointments?

Kaysen: Well, I was aware that it existed. No, there was no

connection in that sense. No, it was my sense of what was intellectually right. Again, looking back on it I was right. I may even have been five years in advance.

Shore: The importance of critical theory is now something that one cannot avoid and finding it in the archives so early on was quite impressive. Was there any resistance to the School of Social Science among the trustees? It sounded like in our earlier discussion that there wasn't.

Kaysen: No. One of the things that I agreed to with the faculty was to appoint three trustees and then four when we got a fourth School who would be academics, who would be from the disciplines covered by the Schools and that I would accept suggestions from the faculty. And god, I can't think of his name, he was a pretty decent guy, a mathematician, who was from the University of Illinois, and wrote on random processes [Leonard Doob]. I used a book of his once. It may come to me. Then Sid Drell, Stanford physicist, was a trustee, although he was the second physics trustee. I'm trying to think of who the first was. I cannot remember. And Hanna was the history trustee. My suggestion, which Felix had seconded. She had been a student of his. He'd taught at Bryn Mawr. And then I appointed Bob a trustee. That is, I didn't appoint him, I invited him, nominated him to join the Board. The mathematician, gosh I can see his face. He was a little bit the mouthpiece of the School of

Mathematics. But he was a much more decent guy than many of them. So he was always a little skeptical but he wasn't hostile. And I think the first professorship had been created by this time, but I'm not sure of that. Doob. Leonard Doob.

Shore: Could I ask you to cast your mind back to the point when resistance began. You mentioned earlier in our interview that Andre Weil immediately came up to you and said you weren't the choice of the faculty, or you weren't his choice.

Kaysen: No, he said I wasn't the choice of the faculty.

Shore: There is evidence in the archives that Dean Montgomery wrote you letter upon letter from the beginning complaining about one thing or another. Was there any time when resistance to the School built. Is it just at the Bellah appointment or before that?

Kaysen: If the Bellah appointment had never happened. If Bellah didn't exist. If Wrigley had accepted the appointment and then we were coming up to the third appointment. My guess is that some form of resistance might have crystallized at the third appointment. My treaty with the faculty was that until the School had three professors there would be an ad hoc committee which would report to the faculty. So the third appointment would have been critical.

Shore: Did you have three appointments in mind early on or you

were going at it one at a time?

Kaysen: No, I was going at it one at a time. And, after all, with each appointment I felt that Cliff had to be agreeable and that I was very conscious that I was trying to create an institution, not only hire three faculty members and so I had that very much in mind. You know Robert died in fall, no he died in February 1967. And I sent out the usual kind of black-rimmed card, and I remember vividly Deane storming into my office -- most faculty members called, but my instruction to my secretary was that any time a faculty member shows up, if I was free, I would see him. Never to keep them waiting. And Dean came into my office and he said, approximately, I don't know if these were his words but this was the substance: I got your card, you won't see me at the memorial service, I'm glad he's dead. Walked out.

Shore: One other question before we move on to the actual Bellah affair. The West Building itself, the selection of its architect, its funding. It also seemed to be something that became an object of controversy.

Kaysen: Well, when I talked to people about what's needed, what they felt, very many people said the place is crowded, we're limited by office space, if you're going to have social scientists, we need more offices. And you know that was both a sound observation and an argument against having social sciences. I mean the subtext was, you're

not going to take our offices away for social scientists. Freeman I think was one of the first people to say to me, but others did, that the cafeteria is so crowded that you can't have a leisurely lunch. You always feel that somebody's waiting for your table. But it's important to have a place where it's pleasant to eat. It's no longer pleasant to eat up there. And I thought this was a forceful observation. So I concluded that it was necessary to do something about that and then there was an announcement I think, an N.S.F. announcement about the possibility of construction grants, and I went down and explored and lobbied, and I got a grant. I do not remember the thing, the project cost \$4 million as I remember it.

Shore: There was also funding from the State of New Jersey, I believe. About \$3 million?

Kaysen: Yes, yes there was.

Shore: Which was the main funding, a bond, I believe. A low-interest bond, about three million dollars.

Kaysen: Well, maybe it was more. I don't remember the details. But I got the NSF grant and I got the bond money and we of course had a very, very sound balance sheet and all that. So I built it. I shopped around for an architect and this is a kind of amusing story. Millard Meiss you may or may not know was trained as an architect. Before he became an art historian. I was fortunate in knowing

that. And I figured even if I had not known that, that I would consult Millard as an art historian to say, you know, did he have any thoughts about who might be an architect. And he warmly recommended Louis Kahn and so I called up Louis Kahn whose buildings I knew or at least one of whose buildings I knew, and I knew it with prejudice, that's the Richards building at the Penn medical school. What I knew about it was it's a very handsome building, it's a molecular biology lab, biomedical lab, but it's a couple of adjacent cylinders, with a lot of sun exposure and half the windows are covered with aluminum foil because laboratory scientists don't want a fluctuating amount of heat coming in. So I always thought there's an architect who builds monuments, not useful buildings. But I called him and explained who I was and asked him whether he could pay me a call in Princeton. He did and we walked around. And he said, I won't try to give you a blow by blow, but he said two things, he said, well, if I were you, the first thing I'd do with this place is burn down the existing buildings, and the second thing, he was going to add about 20-25% to the floor space but if I let him do it, it would be beautiful. The whole thing would be beautiful. So I thought the hell with that, and moved on. And after some more shopping I hired Kevin Roche who had done the Ford Foundation building and whom I got to know through that

connection, although the building had been built before, or commissioned before Mac became head of the Foundation. But Kevin came down, he's a very attractive and charming guy, and he made a plan, it was a very interesting plan. But it was going to be on the lawn right in front of the facade of Fuld Hall.

Shore: Where the circle of trees is?

Kaysen: Yes. And it was going to be a kind of greenhouse, the cafeteria was going to be a greenhouse in the middle and there were going to be two wings. And I liked it and I thought it was very attractive. The faculty were unanimously, almost unanimously against it. Regge, who was one of my closest friends, called me aside afterward and said not to do it, let's build underground. And something very interesting happened. Kevin Roche made a presentation at a faculty meeting. They were sort of polite but they were perfectly plain. And he called me afterward and he said don't go ahead. I've had a lot of experience in these things, he said. Faculties never forget. There's no objective standard in architecture. People will hate you for this building forever after. I advise you not to do it. And I know you feel painful and you know that I'm going to cut my bill in half so that you'll be in a better position with respect to your trustees. I mean he really was a prince. And I took his advice. I mean when Regge said to me can't we build it

underground, I knew that I shouldn't go ahead. And apparently there was a widely shared sense that this was some sacred space you see, and that I was invading. So after some more thought, and consulting with various people, I hired Bob Geddes. Bob Geddes was then Dean of the School of Architecture at Princeton. He lived up the street literally. I knew him already. I liked him. I had seen pictures of several things he'd done. And I figured that somehow there was a plus in having him there. And he did this very wise thing of building it in a way that didn't obtrude on the existing structures. And it is a building which has won a lot of prizes. And what's more important is that everybody who's been in it has found it satisfactory. So with some troubles and the usual business of construction, with my naivete, it got built. Bob was excellent and it worked out I think very well.

Shore: If I may ask an almost personal question as a librarian, I've heard this as part of the Institute lore, that Bob Geddes hated the library building and therefore had the trees planted in front of the building. Can you give credence to that story?

Kaysen: I cannot. Bob Geddes is still alive and well. You should ask him. Bob thought the library building was unsuitable and that Wally Harrison had made no effort at all to make the library building accord in any way with

the Institute as it was. But of course the original Institute was, well, Fuld Hall wasn't too bad, but the little brick shit houses on the outskirts were absurd.

Shore: Did you see the new building as saying something? Fuld Hall says, it seems to me, something about American democracy, or at least it hearkens back to Independence Hall, or to a Quaker meetinghouse.

Kaysen: Fuld Hall always seemed to me to look like... I thought two things about Fuld Hall. One, that it was a state mental hospital because that's what it looks like. Two, that this had been proposed for Dartmouth and rejected and that the Institute -- Sam -- had bought the plans cheap.

Shore: Well, there goes my argument. Except that the buildings at such an institution should say something. And it seems then, I don't know what Fuld Hall says. The library seems to say, I'm a modern building. Take a look at me. What did you think the Geddes building was saying?

Kaysen: It said this is a contemporary functional building which is built to fit in as best it can. And I think it did that. I would have not have countenanced a neo-Georgian building. It would have been absurd. And I think given the constraints Bob did as good a job as anybody could have done.

Shore: Let's turn to the troubles.

Kaysen: Bellah. The cause célèbre.

Shore: I don't know how to go about this, except maybe to ask you, why Bellah?

Kaysen: Well, the short and simple answer is that Cliff wanted him passionately. I knew him slightly but Cliff said he wanted him, I said let's invite him as a visiting member and we'll talk about it. And he came. He was interested. He and Cliff were somewhat overlapping as graduate students at Harvard. I read his book as soon as Cliff talked about him, his book on Tokugawa religion, which I thought was a very interesting book. A little wooden in its Parsonianism, but a very interesting book. When Cliff mentioned him, I went around and talked to people I knew. Eddie Reischauer, whom I knew quite well, first as a colleague at Harvard and as Kennedy's ambassador in Japan where I actually had some interaction with him officially. I was the initiator of the liberation of Okinawa from its American military dictatorship, to put it in high terms.

Shore: Was this when you were vice president for the rest of the ...?

Kaysen: No. This was in the course of events. Actually it was in the late summer of '61. And I talked to Eddie in Tokyo about these things. But we were really pretty friendly. And so I talked to Eddie who was very high on Bob Bellah. I talked to Marius Jansen who was the

professor of Japanese history at Princeton who'd been a Harvard Ph.D., a Fairbanks/Reischauer student, and who was somebody who came to our seminars and so on, and Marius was high on him. I talked to an economic historian of Japan named Bob Lockwood at Princeton, Bill Lockwood, I'm sorry, who was high on him. You know I tried to inform myself and Cliff was passionate about him. I was a little anxious about him, mainly on grounds of maybe he's too much like Cliff, that another cultural historian, although he's a sociologist, very Parsonian, maybe that's not the next appointment we should make. But I also felt and this has not been said to anybody, I never said this to Cliff, although Cliff understood it perfectly well: he had been accepting of Tony who wouldn't have been his first choice, I should be accepting of Bob. And I also felt that if I turned down Bellah, Cliff would leave. Cliff never said to me I want Bellah or I'll go, or behaved that way at all. But I felt that he might simply feel I've been here two years, I don't have a colleague, what the hell's going on here, it'll be another year, and so on.

Shore: How did it turn into such an affair? Maybe you can start by talking about the individuals involved or do you want to talk about the process?

Kaysen: Well, the process. We agreed that there should be an ad hoc committee and then Morton White suggested an

innovation. I should have rejected it but I didn't.

Shore: What was that innovation?

Kaysen: That there should be a committee of the faculty which interviewed the ad hoc committee and after some wrangling I agreed, but I agreed that I would sit there while it was happening. They wanted a review committee without my sitting there. I wouldn't sit still for that. And the ad hoc committee was Reischauer, this Japanese historian, Kitagawa, at Chicago, Shils. I think maybe that was it. Is that right?

Shore: I know Cliff also came in and made a statement.

Kaysen: Well, various people made statements.

Shore: And was Gershenkron also a member of that committee?

Kaysen: No he was not. I do not believe he was.

Shore: There is a transcript of this that I've seen.

Kaysen: Yes. During the meeting with the faculty committee, both White and Cherniss behaved in a way that was intolerable. Eddie said to me afterward, "I've never experienced such rudeness and such impossible behavior."

Shore: Bob Merton was on that Committee.

Kaysen: Yes. Yes. Yes that's right. And the Committee said this is a very well qualified guy and Kitagawa made some remarks to show that he had an independent opinion. I wasn't particularly impressed with Kitagawa.

Shore: It seemed there was one person who was not in favor. Kavel?

Kaysen: Yes. Stanley Kavel. Yes.

Shore: Or lukewarm at least.

Kaysen: Yes. He was lukewarm. Yes, Stanley was lukewarm. That's right. And I don't know how he got on the committee except that I knew him and I was willing to have him on the committee. But he wasn't negative, he was lukewarm. He said as I remember it, he said sort of, this is what you want, not what I would take, but this is what you want. And nobody said he's not a competent scholar, this isn't good work, this isn't serious work. Nobody said that. Well, and then the dogs were organized and I think Morty organized them. Freeman wrote a letter to the Packet or the other paper.

Shore: Town Topics, I think.

Kaysen: Town Topics. Saying that the Institute faculty treats religion as if it were a childhood disease. And basically the physicists were for it and some of them even liked him. Freeman liked him because he was interested that somebody would talk about the history of religion. The modern historians were for it, and the classicists were against it, and the mathematicians were not quite unanimously against it. As I remember Hassler and Michael Atiyah abstained. Gödel was against it because he knew that Bellah was a communist, and the notion ... Bellah had been a leftist, and Gödel paid a long private visit to me -- it was laughable -- and he

said everybody knows that the Japanese revolution was caused by Admiral Perry, the notion that Tokugawa religion at this moment had anything to do with it! I mean absurd.

Shore: Was there any way to argue with what I still heard from Dean Montgomery when he was still alive and still at the Institute: that they were right about something that they weren't necessarily right about? Let me put that another way, that they were convinced that they knew what was going on in an area which wasn't their own? Could you get in there? Was there any wedge or way to make an argument?

Kaysen: No. No. No. And I made it a point of insistence with the Board that the bargain was that the faculty should have its comment, that I should report my recommendations to them, and basically that if they didn't appoint Bellah they should find a new director.

Shore: Did Cliff support that? Did he suggest that you should not go that far?

Kaysen: No. No. Cliff was very strong on it. We were in a state of war, Cliff and Hilly would come over three nights a week and we'd talk.

Shore: Was Bellah involved at all?

Kaysen: He was somewhat involved and Andre of course wrote him a letter and said if you come you will never be treated as a colleague by any of us. I mean Andre at his most

charming, the best.

Shore: Did you realize what was going to happen if you proceeded, that it would become an all-out war.

Kaysen: At some point, sure.

Shore: But you made the decision based on the principle of...

Kaysen: Based on the principle that I had come to do this, that I had had an objective process, a review, that this was a competent appointment, and there was no reason not to make it.

Shore: When I first read these things, when I first came to the Institute I knew nothing about this, about 10 years ago, and being a child of the '60s I think, as they're known, I had the feeling that this was the 1960s happening at the Institute for Advanced Study, the clash between a new way of thinking about the world and a traditional way of thinking about the world, at a different plane, of course. Did you feel that it had anything to do with what was going on in society?

Kaysen: No, I didn't. I don't think the Institute had anything to do with society.

Shore: Why did it reach this level of anger?

Kaysen: Because there was a sense in which, there was something about Bellah that they didn't like, he symbolized everything they didn't like about social science, softness and so on and so on. There was the feeling that this was an occasion on which I could be driven out and

they were taking the occasion, there was the underlying proposition, very strong in the School of Mathematics and only less strong in the School of Historical Studies because they were less forceful and self-confident and coherent people except in the classicist section, that we didn't want this stuff at the Institute, that it was going to take money away from us one way or the other, and that was no good. I mean Montgomery had more than once expressed the view, and others believed it but they didn't come and tell me it, that the only worthwhile thing at the Institute was mathematics, everything else was a waste of money, and this was then the occasion.

Shore: But this is what I mean about the 60s, the notion, that standards are falling everywhere, that society is going to the dogs, and now even here at the Institute for Advanced Study: a creeping social disease is coming here, we're now dealing with a lesser kind of advanced study.

Kaysen: No, I don't think so. Now I can't speak to the inner minds of the people. I knew at the time, let me correct that, I remember thinking at the time, that Andre Weil, for all that he's a son of a bitch, is not a fool. He must know if he's exchanged ten words with him, that Bellah is an intellect superior to that of Morton White and Kenneth Setton. He had nothing to say about Morton White and Kenneth Setton. This is purely political, this is purely a question of this is the tactical moment to

fight the School of Social Science, and in a sense I regretted the fight was on Bellah, I felt he was an easier target than Wrigley.

Shore: But it was going to come to a fight, either with this appointment or the next one.

Kaysen: Some appointment. And that's what I felt and that's why I decided that I couldn't withdraw.

Shore: Draw the line in the sand at this point. Do you think your background in government or your personal style, a notion of "I've come here to get some things done and I'm not allowed to do this," might have added to the intransigence on both sides?

Kaysen: Perhaps. I didn't articulate that to myself, but I did say I came here to do that. I said to the faculty, it's the trustees who decided to invite me with this mission, which I explained, and I'm going on. We even agreed on procedure. I fulfilled the procedural requirements and I'm going ahead.

Shore: How about the role of the press in this controversy?

Kaysen: Well, Israel Shenker played a big role. I was at a meeting of the Carnegie Commission in Phoenix, Arizona when Clark Kerr, who had plenty of experience of this sort, handed me a copy of the Times and said, congratulations Carl, you're on the front page. That was the first.

Shore: Do you have any notion of how this material got to him?

- Kaysen: Yes. Morally certain but had no evidence. There was Morty White. First of all, Morty might well have known Shenker. Second of all, Morty had had the experiences the others hadn't, of the Harvard wars, and third of all, it struck me as being the kind of thing Morty would do. None of that is evidence. It doesn't affect my belief.
- Shore: Day to day life at the Institute at that time has been described as people in warring camps not talking to one another, not going to the cafeteria.
- Kaysen: Yes. A lot of that. Very unpleasant.
- Shore: Was it hard to run the place at that time?
- Kaysen: No. The place runs itself. The members who represent two-thirds of the activity were a little bemused by what they heard, but they were there to work and mostly they tended to their work.
- Shore: Did you try a public relations blitz of your own?
- Kaysen: No, I didn't and I should have, but I wasn't very good at it. I refused to talk to Shenker, after I saw a couple of Shenker stories I decided I could lose by talking to Shenker. I talked to some people. I don't have a clear memory of that.
- Shore: Albert Hirschman's appointment seems to come at the same time as this, in a way.
- Kaysen: No. It came the next year.
- Shore: It came the next year, but was the controversy still simmering at that time?

Kaysen: No, Bellah had refused the appointment. You know his daughter was killed in an auto accident in which she possibly committed suicide. That was a horrible blow. What's her name, Melanie, Mrs. Bellah, was sick of the whole thing and that was the final blow.

Shore: Is there anything you would have done differently, thinking back on this? Was there any way to do it differently?

Kaysen: If I were a person of a different temperament, I would have said I'll outwait the sons of bitches.

Shore: Andre Weil was going to retire in a couple of years, I believe?

Kaysen: No, no. He had quite a few years to go. This was '73. I'll outwait the sons of bitches, I'll bide my time, but I didn't think that way. I was fearful, as I said, that Cliff would go, and if Cliff went... It's not my temperament, I'm not a patient man, I wouldn't have stayed myself. I don't know what I would have done.

Shore: Was one of the ideas at the time a change in the retirement age? Does this come at the same time as the Bellah affair? I am not recalling it completely now from looking at the archives.

Kaysen: No, the retirement age was already 70.

Shore: It was 70, but there was an attempt, or there was talk about moving it back to 68 and then to 65.

Kaysen: I think that was after my time. I do not remember such

discussions. I'd have gladly moved it to 40.

Shore: After the Bellah affair, he was appointed and withdrew as you said, Albert Hirschman is the next person you appoint. How did you and Cliff choose him?

Kaysen: Alex Gershenkron may have suggested him to me. I'm pretty sure it was Alex who suggested him to me. I knew him of course as a colleague and I had known him before he came to Harvard. I liked him. Again, I thought the fact that he was European, his learning, would appeal and it did. There was absolutely no fuss about Albert, it simply went perfectly smoothly. Cliff and he get on very well. Their temperaments are somewhat similar, although Albert is much quieter, but I mean they're somewhat loners, Albert more than Cliff. Alex was the one who suggested to me that Albert would be a perfect Institute professor. He said he teaches but he doesn't enjoy it, he's a very reflective man which he certainly is. He reads widely and it was a good appointment. We had for instance a Latin American year which was very good. We had perhaps a future president of Brazil.

Shore: Jose Sera?

Kaysen: No, Fernando Henriques Cardoso.

Shore: Oh, that's correct.

Kaysen: That was a very interesting year, Juan Linz and Sidney Mintz, from Hopkins, but we had a lot of interesting times. And Albert, well he was a delightful colleague.

Shore: Could you enjoy those times?

Kaysen: Yes. What triggered my resignation was two things. Harold retired as chairman of the board, and we elected Howard Peterson. Howard wanted it, Harold wanted him. I knew Howard a little. I thought this was ok. But Martin Segal, a very energetic and activist guy who had been brought on the board by Don Straus, said we had to have a serious fundraising campaign and he said he would take it on and Howard agreed provided Martin would take it on. Harold was never very energetic in that respect. Martin is an energetic man. He was a successful fundraiser for Lincoln Center and so on. And I guess I thought a fundraising campaign..., so we're now in '75, two years after the event, things had settled back to normal, the breach between me and the mathematicians was pretty complete. Michael's leaving at the end of this affair had nothing to do with it, it was the offer of the Royal Society professorship, which took away the last person. Milnor was a very silent person so I didn't have anything against him.

Shore: Langlands?

Kaysen: Langlands was also a very shy and reserved person, very sweet, very attractive, but very shy and reserved. Langlands didn't vote on the Bellah issue, he came next year. Well, when I thought, can I go through with the fundraising campaign? I thought the hell with it. I

can't do it. I'm just not up for it.

End of Cassette No. 3, Side No. 1:

Cassette No.3, Side No. 2:

Shore: We were speaking about your decision to leave the Institute for Advanced Study.

Kaysen: Well, I felt that at the start of a fundraising campaign the Institute deserved a director who would come to it with enthusiasm and freshness. I had certainly lost some part of my enthusiasm and a good deal of my freshness. And I might say my wife was worn out by this experience which was even harder on her than it was on me in many ways.

Shore: Was there a breakdown in social relations?

Kaysen: To some degree, although not completely, and the wives of the mathematicians were less mean than their husbands. Both Lily Harish-Chandra and...

Shore: Hedi Selberg?

Kaysen: Hedi Selberg, there was no break in their friendliness. And Mary Whitney, who was a somewhat foolish woman, a much younger woman, was perfectly friendly. And the physicists went out of their way to be supportive and helpful. Dyson and...

Shore: Adler?

Kaysen: Well, I wouldn't say that of Steve. And he was having his domestic difficulties, although they may not have

started quite then. Mary, certainly Dashen, but especially Neta Bahcall; Marshall's wife was a very odd body indeed. But, he left you know. So now the Stromgrens had left; she was very nice, but he had left very early on to become what Murry Gell-Mann calls the "Great Dane," the Bohr Professor, with this wonderful house on the grounds of the Carlsberg Brewery. Have you ever seen it?

Shore: No, I've never seen it. Sounds great.

Kaysen: It's worth seeing. Well, but basically I felt that I was not up to it. So I decided that I would resign as director, thought about whether I wanted to stay at Princeton and Bob Solow, I think, promoted a professorship for me at M.I.T. Wiesner, the President, is an old and close friend of mine, I worked with him, he was Kennedy's science advisor. We worked together very closely on the nuclear weapons treaty, on various other things. Jerry called me up and offered me a professorship. So I said I'd come as a visiting professor and decide whether I wanted to stay. Once we came back here, we decided we would rather stay. And at that very moment I was offered by Art Singer, of the Sloan Foundation, the job to run a commission on government and higher education. He said, you could do it from Princeton. Of course, I had a professorship, and I could have stayed as a professor. But, I thought about that

and decided that I didn't want to stay. And after we got up here, I think Annette was happier to be here.

Shore: You want to say a few words about your successor, Harry Woolf.

Kaysen: Well, a committee was formed in the usual way and there was a faculty advisory committee and Steve was on it, and Steve had gone down to Hopkins to interview Harry.

Shore: Steve Adler we're talking about now?

Kaysen: Yes. And Steve's a naive fellow, a very nice, very earnest, hard working, serious-minded guy, but I don't think of him as shrewd in human insight or sophisticated. He came back from Hopkins and reported to me -- we were very friendly -- that he thought Harry would be very good. I was very concerned about who my successor would be. I wondered whether Bob Goheen would be interested, we talked a little bit about that. He wasn't. I then wanted to get Lyman Spitzer and that would have been a very good move. Have you made his acquaintance?

Shore: No, I haven't.

Kaysen: You know, he's now a very old man. But he's a great man. A terrific scientist and a wonderful organizer and a man who could possibly if anybody could have somehow put some life into it, Lyman might have. But Lyman thought about it and we talked a lot, and he just wasn't interested.

Shore: There was some talk of rotation among the faculty?

Kaysen: Well, there was some talk about that. George Kennan

offered himself as an acting director which I thought was not the most helpful thing George could have done, but he did. There was talk of rotation among the faculty. Of course the mathematicians never thought there should be a director, but that was no news. One person I thought would have been a good director and again Hanna Gray squelched this just like that, and it's a puzzlement to me, it's part of the same puzzlement that we talked about earlier at lunch, why she was so keen on promoting Harry Woolf. That was Bob Adams, the provost at the University of Chicago, afterwards the secretary of the Smithsonian and now just retired from that job. Bob Adams was a very distinguished archaeologist, a Near Eastern archaeologist, wrote a book about the first cities, a very important book about Iraq, about the excavations in what is now Iraq, had been head of the division of social science and then provost at Chicago. No, he'd been head of the division of social science. He wasn't yet provost. He was a member of the National Academy, he was head of the social science assembly at the National Research Council. I knew him a little. He was a very attractive and vigorous guy. He came from a very rich family. His name is Robert McCormick Adams. He had been connected to the Chicago rich folks, and Chicago is a very successful fundraising institution, with a very devoted following among the rich of central midwest. And

I thought in every way he'd be an admirable candidate. And Hanna who knew him well just brushed him aside. When she became president she made him provost, and that was a puzzle to me. I literally don't understand this.

Shore: So you were involved in the selection?

Kaysen: Not directly. I was involved in discussions with the Trustees and with suggestions to members of the faculty search committee.

Shore: This time there were faculty on the search committee.

Kaysen: Yes. There was a faculty committee that met with the trustee committee. And Mike Forrestal was on the trustee committee. In fact he may have been chairman of it. And I talked to Mike a lot. I knew little about Harry. I'd heard about him from some of my colleagues at Johns Hopkins, people I knew. One person I knew well who'd been a colleague at Harvard -- who'd been there a long time -- was a friend. One person who'd been a member of the Institute and you see I'm being discreet but these are their views, not mine, and both of them said they didn't like him and they didn't trust him. I had the experience of meeting him when he came up to talk to me. When I met him I asked him after we talked, why he wanted the job and he said something which struck me as totally false and totally implausible, either that he should believe it or that he should think I would believe it, and therefore very offensive. Namely it would give him

more time for his own work. Then his conduct in the course of the immediate business of the search, and his conversation with me, and his conversation with the trustees, to the extent I heard them, were...

Shore: Confirming in your opinion?

Kaysen: They deepened this negative impression. And then I, at the last meeting of the board as the record shows unless it's been expunged, I said I felt it my duty to say to the trustees, although it was obviously their choice, that they were making a mistake in appointing Harry Woolf. That he had not either the stature or the, I don't know what I said, the integrity or force or something, to be a good director and I thought they were doing the Institute damage. I know this was not according to the convention and perhaps an unacceptable thing to say, but I felt obliged to say it. And those were my last words as director of the Institute.

Shore: How about some last words for this interview? I wanted to ask you about the idea of an institute for advanced study, where you were for 10 years. Is it a nineteenth century notion put into practice in 1930 and has its time passed, does it need to change? How would you organize an institute for advanced study now if you were going to do that? Could you let us know what your views are on this question?

Kaysen: Well, let me give you my views, and let me give them to

you in the form of answering two questions. One, is an institute for advanced study necessary? If I were surveying the American or world academic scene, and I were like Flexner, a man accustomed to institutional innovation, would I say the American academic scene or the world academic scene needs an institute for advanced study? And I might say yes, certainly not as strongly as Flexner thought it needed it in the 30s, and the reasons had some persuasive power. I can see why it was sensible to believe it. I don't think that's true now. Research professors exist, post-docs exist, research institutes exist, lots of them. On the other hand, suppose I had a lot of money and it was not my money and I couldn't buy pictures or a 200 foot yacht or the Presidency or other toys and objects, but had to expend it for the benefit of the academic world, and somebody said to me, why don't you create the Institute for Advanced Study as it ought to be. And I said, well, that's an interesting idea. What should it be? And I'd say the following things, one, it should be affiliated with a university; what its organizational arrangement is, there are various possibilities. Two, unlike the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, it should have a faculty. People with long-term appointments. The faculty should have long-term but not permanent appointments, it should rotate. One way to achieve this would be to spend a lot

of money and after the faculty served 15 years, give them a great lump sum settlement and say, go your way, do what you want. Another way, which might be easier, is to make it organically connected to a university and where the appointment procedure is that the person holds a professorship at the university, he's appointed as a professor at its institute for advanced study for a term of years. One could do this a lot of ways, fifteen years, ten renewable for ten, one could argue about that, and then he becomes a faculty member in the ordinary way at a university. The faculty members should be small in relation to the number of visiting members, and the visiting members should be as they are at the Institute, a mixture of senior scholars and post-docs. I think the mixture is in a better proportion in physics and mathematics than it is in history, and social science had tried to make it, I had tried to make it, more younger people. Now it's not the case in social science, you can not do it immediately after the Ph.D. with lots of people as you can in mathematics and physics because you're fairly sure of their talent. Staying power is important in historical study, but maybe the idea, and it's an argument of how well it would work in terms of the market, of getting the bright assistant professor and saying, come to the Institute for three years after the second year of your assistant professorship, not only

have you published your dissertation, you can now write a really great book and you'll get tenure someplace, but you'll be young, you'll be full of juice and so on. Well, one would have to survey this scene, with a contracting academic market place, this might not look like as attractive as it looked to me when I first had this idea in the 70s before the marketplace started contracting. But that's the way I would design it. And I would probably make it have a bigger range than the present Institute if I had enough money.

Shore: So you still believe in the idea of a community of scholars?

Kaysen: Yes. I would try to make it more frankly interdisciplinary. Mathematics has had a real change of heart so that it seems to me, looking from the outside, that there's more scope for interaction between mathematics and other natural sciences, or the natural sciences, mathematics and linguistics and the whole idea of information and brain, information processing, language, on the one hand, and some aspects of social science on the other. All that. And whether, for instance, it would make sense to include laboratory subjects remains open to me. Maybe not. Maybe yes. Ernst Mayer came to the Institute and wrote a book and had a wonderful time. Do you know Ernst Mayer at ninety?

Shore: No, I don't.

Kaysen: Oh, he's a great evolutionist. He was head of the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard. He's 90 and he's going to put 2 books to press this year. Wonderful.

Shore: Would you include artists in this, musicians, novelists?

Kaysen: I might. I might. I think there might be something to that. They'd have to be few. You may be aware I was a member of the Society of Fellows, a junior fellow at Harvard. That was a very important intellectual experience, for three years I was in a group which included at any one moment 24 people covering the whole range of disciplines, 24 young people essentially, all but dissertation or immediate post-doc people. And it was a very lively and stimulating group and I believe in that. Now I do believe that some disciplines benefit from it more than others, but I think that history and the social sciences still could have these kind of benefits. I think there's something in it.

Shore: Well, it's nice to know that you're still hopeful for an institute for advanced study.

Kaysen: Now, you know, economists always talk about the test of the marketplace. There are now lots of institutes for advanced study. If I had wanted to, I could have stayed on as director and spent five years or even ten, just touring all of the institutes for advanced study that have been created in the world.

Shore: Thank you very much.

Kaysen: You're welcome.

END OF CASSETTE NO. 3, SIDE NO. 2, End of the Interview.