

A HISTORY OF
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
1930-1950

Beatrice M. Stern

A HISTORY OF
THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY
1930-1950

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	iii
CHAPTER I	
THE PREHISTORY OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY	1
NOTES	40
CHAPTER II	
THE LOUIS BAMBERGER AND MRS. FELIX FULD FOUNDATION	44
NOTES	73
CHAPTER III	
PLANNING THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY	78
NOTES	118
CHAPTER IV	
THE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS	121
NOTES	188
CHAPTER V	
THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS	197
NOTES	255
CHAPTER VI	
THE SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES	260
NOTES	301
CHAPTER VII	
TOO MANY GENERALS	305
NOTES	360
CHAPTER VIII	
DR. FLEXNER RETIRES	366
NOTES	442
CHAPTER IX	
A PERIOD FOR CONSOLIDATION	452
NOTES	520
CHAPTER X	
THE STRUGGLE FOR POWER	528
NOTES	580

CHAPTER XI

THE SELECTION OF A SUCCESSOR DIRECTOR	589
NOTES	623

CHAPTER XII

DR. OPPENHEIMER'S FIRST YEARS AS DIRECTOR	629
NOTES	709
APPENDIX I	716
APPENDIX II	721
APPENDIX III	724
APPENDIX IV	726
APPENDIX V	729
APPENDIX VI	733
APPENDIX VII	757

INTRODUCTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

otherwise would have been lacking.

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

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

Princeton, New Jersey
May 31, 1964

Beatrice M. Stern

CHAPTER I

THE PREHISTORY OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

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

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

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

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

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

It was soon evident that Flexner disapproved of the proposed

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

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

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

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

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

Indeed, there seemed to be little difficulty in persuading

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

will of the testators?

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

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

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

- B. Granting only the Doctor's and Master's degrees, on the basis of proficiency and achievement rather than on years of residence or on literal fulfillment of arbitrary academic standards.
 - C. Creating both for Faculty and students an atmosphere and an environment more congenial to independent study and research.
2. Elimination of the first two years of the college, at the same time that its last two years are merged in the graduate department of the University.⁴

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

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

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

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

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

The draft said for the donors:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

discrimination was to be practiced.

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

I have just laid my hands on a memorandum prepared seven years ago and containing the comment of President [George E.] Vincent of the Rockefeller Foundation, who like other associates of the Rockefeller boards thoroughly approved of the idea. You will notice that on page 9 I spoke of needing \$50 million, but you will also note that I included the faculty of medicine. The sums we are now speaking of will therefore be ample without medicine.

I shall try to get together for you in the next few days a few things which, I believe, you will be interested in reading.⁷

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

Thank you for the charming card which you sent me, and for your good wishes...

I am working industriously in the hope of finishing my book on universities before the spring. Meanwhile, my wife and I and some friends whom we invited to share the box with us greatly enjoyed the concerts for which we are indebted to Mrs. Fuld.

Under separate cover I am mailing you and Mrs. Fuld a book dealing with higher education, in which you will find (pp. 198-209) a paper by Dean [Gordon J.] Laing of the University of Chicago, which makes almost the same proposal which you and Mrs. Fuld are considering at my suggestion.⁸

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board of Directors approved the purchase on the 3rd of July. On the 13th of August the Stock List Committee of the New York Stock Exchange approved the listing of 146,385 additional shares of Macy's common stock, ^{be} to capitalized at the book value of L. Bamberger and Company at time of sale. The sellers received 69,210 shares directly, and the cash proceeds from the balance of 77,175 shares which were sold to Macy stockholders through subscription rights at \$145 a share. The sale was consummated early in September, about six weeks before the stock market crash of the 29th of October. Macy shares reached a high for 1929 on the 3rd of September at \$255.50, and fell to \$110 on the 13th of November, but by June, 1932, near the nadir of price averages on the stock exchange for the depression, it sank to \$17.¹²

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

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

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

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

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

Samuel Leidesdorf is an intelligent, tolerant and generous

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The American college is wisely committed to a broad and flexible scheme of higher education through which each individual may hope to procure the training best calculated to realize maximum effectiveness. The scheme fails for lack of sufficient insight: in the first place, because the preparatory school routine devised by the college suppresses just what the college assumes it will develop: i.e., individual initiative; in the second place, because of the chaotic condition of the college curriculum; finally, because research has largely appropriated the resources of the college, substituting the methods and interests of highly specialized investigation for the larger objects of college teaching.

The way out lies, as I see it, through the vigorous re-assertion of the priority of the college such...The B.A. and not the Ph. D. is, and always has been, the college man. The college has been richly endowed...The graduate school is a late development: a proper beneficiary of the college surplus, if such there be, not the legitimate appropriator of the lion's share of its revenues.

I mean neither to depreciate nor to disparage graduate work; to the extent of advocating a more exclusive treatment of its privileges, a more thorough fitness for its opportunities, I am doing just the reverse. But I insist that rapidly won distinction as research centers is no compensation for college failure. The diversion of college resources to graduate uses is defensible on the theory that college work is antiquated or superfluous, but this plea can hardly be urged at a time when the graduate schools themselves suffer from... slighted college work.¹⁴

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

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

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

groups of subjects to warrant recognition.¹⁶

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Having suggested alternatives, he concluded:

Decision...is not important, or even desirable, at this stage. It is, however, important to realize the confused, not to say, chaotic condition of higher education in America. Curious as it may sound, this is an encouraging, not a discouraging, situation. We have, as a matter of fact, made great progress; that is why we can accomplish something that neither Pres. Gilman nor Pres. Harper thought feasible. Our problem is one...that arises out of progress; it is not ...due to stagnation or retrogression. It is...a hopeful phenomenon that secondary and collegiate education are so widely diffused, and eminent scholars and scientists so numerous that the country is ready for the next forward step -- a university which needs no feeding [undergraduate] school of its own, because the country abounds in colleges by which it will be fed.

If a university so conceived were established, it would... in all probability stimulate other institutions to reorganize. Some of them in time might drop the college; others might effect a complete differentiation between college and gradu-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ment," without explanation. Dr. Flexner at Oxford ascribed his retirement to a pending reorganization of the four Rockefeller foundations for education, saying that Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., had offered him a position equal in dignity and responsibility in the new establishment, but that he had declined, with the observation that those responsible for making the new organization function would do better if he were not there.³³

The press, especially the Times, suspected that Flexner had been disciplined for speaking his mind frankly. But again the Secretary spoke, attributing the retirement to the exhaustion of the special funds for medical education, and alluding to Flexner's age; at sixty-two he was within three years of compulsory retirement.³⁴ As the press took off on the new scent, the reorganization, the Times editorialized on Flexner's contributions with rare praise:

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

This report was, however, but the preface to a chapter of effort to put into effect the recommendations made on paper. Dr. Flexner has had the advantage of having at his hand the funds with which to realize some at least of his ideals or to test their validity.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and generalize." For, he said,

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER I - NOTES

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

1. Interview with Messrs. Leidesdorf and Maass. Leidesdorf to Hardin, 8/8/44. Hardin papers.
2. See E. M. Bluestone to Flexner, copy, 10/2/56. This put the time of his conference with Leidesdorf at December 19, 1929, a Sunday. The date fell instead on Thursday.
3. Statement made by Maass at luncheon commemorating the 25th anniversary of the Institute.
4. P. Stewart Macauley to author, 11/28/56, with copy of the Resolution of the Academic Council, February, 1927, and the recommendations of the Academic Council, April, 1930.
5. Ibid.
6. Interview with Arthur O. Lovejoy. Conversation with Alfred Hutzler.
7. Flexner to Maass, 1/21/30/
8. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/8/30. See Gordon J. Laing, Standards of Graduate Work, in Problems in Education, Western Reserve University Press, 1927, pp. 198-209. Laing, Dean of the Graduate School at University of Chicago, urged the removal of the first two years of the college to a junior college, and advocated separation of the last two undergraduate years from the graduate school. This would, he hoped, help to cancel from the University "the infection of lesson-learning." The American system of education placed an intolerable burden on the faculty of a university, whose members should be required to teach no more than one hour a day, if that. He feared lest research men leave the universities, where in his judgment they belonged, to become sequestered in research institutes. The Dean was very critical of graduate work in this country. Despite the efforts of the A.A.U., the master's degree was little more than "a gild-edged teacher's certificate," and though better results were observable with the doctorate, the scholarship of those who won that degree was very uneven. Laing had just attended the Semicentennial of the Hopkins. He commented on the Goodnow Plan, which he likened to the systems in Germany and France, where the graduates of the gymnasium and the lycée enter the university with preparation equivalent to that of the

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

9. Flexner to Aydelotte, 4/9/30. See Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German. The Oxford Press, 1930, p. vii.
10. Interview with Mrs. Barnett Warner.
11. Interview with Walter Farrier.
12. Moody's.
13. Abraham Flexner, An Autobiography, Simon and Schuster, 1960, pp. 3-62, passim.
14. Abraham Flexner, The American College, Century Co., 1908, pp. 215-217.
15. The Hopkins opened in 1876. The University of Chicago was founded in 1890, and Clark University and Catholic University in Worcester, Mass., and Washington, D.C., respectively, were founded in 1887. The last two were founded for graduate work exclusively, but both later added undergraduate departments. John D. Rockefeller, Sr., founder of Chicago, and Frederick Gates, who persuaded him to this first of his many educational philanthropies, wanted the University of Chicago to be a college. But according to Chicago's historian, Thos. W. Goodspeed, its first President, Wm. Rainey Harper, was primarily interested in promoting investigation, and secondarily in teaching. (Thos. W. Goodspeed, A History of the University of Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1916, pp. 144-145.)
16. The Presidents of the Universities of California, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard and Johns Hopkins formed the A.A.U., which, curiously enough, Dr. Flexner never mentions in any of his books, though in the absence of any federal standards in graduate or other education, it was the single semi-official agency considered as authoritative within its orbit both here and abroad.
An idea of the burgeoning of educational institutions with some pretensions, was given by Dr. Wallace Buttrick's finding on investigation in 1902 for the General Education Board that there were then over 700 institutions in the United States, exclusive of technical and theological schools, which called themselves colleges and universities. Ohio for instance, with a population of 5 million, had 40, twice as many as the German Empire with its 65 million people. (Abraham Flexner, Funds and Foundations, Harper & Bros., 1952, p. 47.)
17. An Autobiography, Chapters 6 to 13.

18. Simon Flexner and James Flower Flexner, William Henry Welch and the Heroic Age of American Medicine, Viking Press, 1941, pp. 309 ff. This account reveals that when Dr. Welch sought to persuade Mr. Gates to finance the capitalization of full-time services of clinicians for the Hopkins, Gates pleaded fatigue, and said he could not go forward with the plan, in which he was much interested. Abraham Flexner was then "borrowed" from the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching, and carried the negotiations to a successful conclusion in 1913. This account is more detailed than that given by Abraham Flexner in his Autobiography. (See pp. 109 ff.)
19. Raymond B. Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, pp. 93-103. Mr. Fosdick precedes his account of the intramural differences here with a description of Flexner as having "that keen, razorlike mind that characterized that remarkable family. The boldness of his thinking, and the tenacity of his opinions frequently created antagonism, but he had an intellectual energy and drive that were to have profound consequences on contemporary medicine." (pp. 93-94.) Then Fosdick quotes Dr. Alan Gregg, later Director of Medical Education at the Rockefeller Foundation, as praising that influence in contemporary and future medicine. (p. 103) An Autobiography, p. 115.
20. Funds and Foundations, p. 56.
21. Fosdick, op. cit., p. 193.
22. An Autobiography, pp. 223-224, quoting a letter to him from John D. Rockefeller, Jr., dated the 9th of April, 1928.
23. Abraham Flexner, A Proposal to Establish an American University. Memorandum, November, 1922. Flexner papers.
24. Ibid.
25. Ibid.
26. George E. Vincent to Flexner, 11/22/22. Aydelotte papers.
27. Abraham Flexner, The American University, in Atlantic Monthly for October, 1925, Vol. 136: 530-541.
28. Ibid.
29. General Education Board, Annual Report, 1924-1925, pp. 5-6.
30. Interview with Dr. Florence Bamberger. Macauley to author, 11/28/56.

31. John C. French, A History of the University Founded by Johns Hopkins, the Johns Hopkins Press, p. 195.
32. Abraham Flexner, Memorandum, Foundations -- Ours and Others, 1/3/24. Flexner papers.
33. New York Times, 5/26/28.
34. Ibid., 5/28/28/
35. Ibid.
36. See Simon and J. F. Flexner, op. cit., p. 432.
37. General Education Board, Annual Report, 1928-1929,
38. An Autobiography, pp. 230-231.
39. Universities, pp. 23-24.

CHAPTER II

THE LOUIS BAMBERGER AND MRS. FELIX FULD FOUNDATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have said that almost anything can be accomplished in America if intelligence, effort, and resources are combined; that is just what we so rarely bring about. We have intelligence alone -- and it is stalled; effort alone -- and we are jumpy, feverish, aimless; resources alone -- and we are wasteful. No sound or consistent philosophy, thesis, or principle lies beneath the American University today.

What with the pressure of numbers, the craving for knowledge, real or diluted, the lack of any general respect for intellectual standards, the intrusion of politics here and of religion somewhere else, the absurd notion that ideals are 'aristocratic,' while a free-for-all scramble which distresses the able and intelligent is 'democratic,' there is no possibility of a summary solution of the problem of higher education in America -- or, for the matter of

that, of education at any level; we lack teachers, facilities, standards, comprehension and the willingness to accept differences. In the hurly-burly which exists, excellent work will go on...scholars and scientists...have never been defeated -- not by war or poverty or persecution, and they will not be defeated...

It has, however, become a question whether the term 'university' can be saved or is even worth saving. Why should it not continue to be used in order to indicate the formless and incongruous activities -- good, bad, and indifferent -- which I have described in this chapter?...

It is, in any case, clear that no uniform, country-wide and thoroughgoing revolution is feasible.²

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He wrote:

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

The enclosure read as follows:

First: The name or title by which this corporation is to be known in law is the Institute of Higher Learning or the Institute for Advanced Studies to be situated at or near the City of Newark. The Institute shall have a faculty or staff headed by a Director, whose functions will be defined by the By-Laws to be hereafter adopted.

Second: The purpose for which this corporation is formed is the promotion of knowledge in all fields and the training of advanced workers for and beyond the Ph. D. degree and similar professional degrees of equal standing. The conditions under which such degrees will be awarded will be at least equal to those demanded by the most exacting educational institutions in the United States.

Fourth: The corporation shall be managed by a Board of not to exceed fifteen Trustees who shall be divided into five equal classes serving respectively for one, two, three, four, and five years, and vacancies due to the expiration of term, resignation, death, or other cause shall be filled by the remaining Trustees in accordance with the By-Laws which will be adopted.⁶

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

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

Just these few lines to express the deep appreciation of Mrs. Fuld and myself for the invaluable counsel and assistance you have rendered us in formulating plans for the establishment of an 'institution for higher learning' in fulfillment of our ambitions to devote our respective fortunes to some worthy philanthropic purpose.

You have been so helpful and the thoughts to which we are about to give concrete expression are so largely your own that we are exceedingly anxious to enlist the continuance of your services in directing the Institute and placing it in a position where it can successfully function in accordance with our ideas. Such being the case, I am writing to inquire whether you will accept the appointment as Director as soon as the 'institute' is established and thereafter devote your time exclusively to its management, to the end that it may become the outstanding success which we are all so desirous of achieving. We recognize that the position will be one of great responsibility which may entail considerable travel on your part to make the desired contacts, and, if agreeable to you, I would be glad to have you indicate your acceptance of the appointment herewith tendered upon the following basis, to wit...

Please be assured that your acceptance of the appointment will, in the opinion of Mrs. Fuld and myself, launch our enterprise with the preconceived assurance of its success...

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

I am profoundly touched and gratified by your kind letter of May 5. I need not assure you that I am deeply sensible of the honor and confidence which you and Mrs. Fuld repose in me, and in accepting your suggestion that I be the initial Director of the Institute for Advanced Study I wish to express my personal gratitude and my profound appreciation of the great responsibility which I am undertaking.

You and Mrs. Fuld are making possible a new step upward in American education -- a step that ought in history to count with the founding of the Johns Hopkins University and Medical School and the establishment of the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research. I can only promise you that I shall spare no effort to make the institution

worthy of your beneficent idealism.

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

With all good wishes and very high regard...⁸

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

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

in these negotiations to date.⁹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The faculty would

consist exclusively of men and women of the highest standing in their respective fields of learning, attracted to this institution through its appeal as an opportunity for the serious pursuit of advanced study and because of the detachment it is hoped to secure from outside distractions.....

While the institution will devote itself to the teaching of qualified advanced students, it is our desire that those who are assembled in the faculty...may enjoy the most favorable opportunities for continuing research or investigations in their particular field or specialty, and that the utmost liberty of action shall be afforded the...faculty...to that end.

Students and workers might be financially assisted:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

committed as trustees give promise....

Whether this institution shall rise, physically, in this city or in its environs, it cannot fail to bring to the area over which Newark's influence extends an intellectual stimulation, the effect of which will be incalculable...

This institution at its inception receives something far more useful to the scholar than money. This is the untrammelled opportunity to follow intuition and experiment into the unknown, where lie fields of knowledge useful to man, but still locked against him.

In endowing their foundation with that opportunity Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld have given it more than their millions. Under the direction of men like Flexner, Carrel and Weed, and women like Dr. Florence Sabin, it is bound to be well used. This gift...puts this community more and more under obligation to the generosity and vision of the Bamberger-Fuld families.¹⁴

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

the first faculty appointments were made.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Vice-Chairman was provided for.

The Board at its first meeting elected the following officers:

- Mr. Louis Bamberger, President
- Mrs. Felix Fuld, Vice-President
- Mr. Aydelotte, Secretary
- Mr. Leidesdorf, Treasurer
- Mr. Alanson B. Houghton, Chairman
- Mrs. Esther Bailey, Assistant Secretary
- Mr. Abraham Flexner, Director²⁵

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

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

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

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

October 9, 1931	
Cash	\$ 500,000.00
January 7, 1932	
Bonds	<u>2,199,449.39</u>
Total	\$5,324,866.45 ²⁷

CHAPTER II - NOTES

1. Goodspeed, op. cit., pp. 10, 291.
2. Universities, pp. 213-214.
3. Ibid., pp. 217-218.
4. Simon Flexner and J. T. Flexner, op. cit., p. 299.
5. Charles R. Hardin to Flexner, 4/30/30. Flexner to Charles Hardin, 5/1/30; 5/2/30.
6. Ibid.
7. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 5/5/30. The salary was \$20,000.
8. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 5/9/30.
9. Dr. Flexner's list of names: (Hardin papers)
 - Edwin Alderman, President, University of Virginia
 - Frank Aydelotte, President, Swarthmore College
 - Florence Sabin, Member, Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research
 - Joseph R. Swan, President, The Guaranty Company
 - George Vincent, former President, The Rockefeller Foundation
 - Edward M. Earle, Professor of History, Columbia University
 - Edward Capps, Professor of Classics, Princeton University;
Adviser to Rockefeller Foundation
 - James Truslow Adams, author, essayist, publicist
 - A. B. Houghton, former American Ambassador to Germany and to
England
 - Dwight W. Morrow, American Ambassador to Mexico
 - John Livingston Lowes, Professor of English, Harvard University
 - Lewis H. Weed, Dean, School of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University
 - Felix M. Warburg
 - Herbert H. Lehman
10. See copies, Hardin papers.
11. J. R. Hardin to Maass, 5/7/30. Hardin to Flexner, 4/5/33. Hardin papers.
12. Ivy Lee to L. Bamberger, 6/3/30, Hardin papers.
13. J. R. Hardin to Lee, 6/4/30, Hardin papers.
14. Newark News, 6/7/30.

15. New York Times, 6/8/30.
16. Flexner to J. R. Hardin, 9/17/30, Hardin papers.
17. J. R. Hardin to Flexner, 9/29/30. Flexner to Hardin, 10/3/30, Hardin papers.
18. J. R. Hardin to Aydelotte, 10/7/30, Aydelotte papers.
19. Maass to J. R. Hardin, 5/9/30, Hardin papers. Mr. Maass raised several questions of merit. One concerned the requirement that all checks on Institute depositaries must be drawn by the Treasurer and countersigned by the President, the Vice-President, or a member of the Finance Committee. Maass suggested that the By-Laws might better provide that such signatures should be prescribed by the Board from time to time. Mr. Hardin's marginal note said: "Always easy to change." Another point concerned the powers given the Director: "Do you not think a great many of the powers you have conferred on the Director should be subject to approval either of the Board or of the several committees? Such, for instance as the organization of the faculty...?" And finally: "Do you deem it advisable to add an article covering the meeting of the faculty and the action to be taken at such meetings?"
There seems to be little doubt that Dr. Flexner, dismayed by both the unwanted powers given him, and the lack of Trustees qualified in academic matters, such as he had had access to at the General Education Board, must have consulted Mr. Maass before returning Mr. Hardin's draft for duplication and mailing to each Trustee. Probably Mr. Maass felt it was necessary to send his letter raising questions to Mr. Hardin as a normal courtesy before bringing the questions before the Board.
20. Dr. Flexner supplied Mr. Hardin with a copy of the amended By-Laws of both the General Education Board and the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, during the drafting stage. The General Education Board had amended its laws on the 23rd of May, 1929 to provide that no trustee should be elected or re-elected who had attained the age of sixty-five years.
21. Abraham Flexner, President Daniel Coit Gilman, Simon & Schuster, 1946, pp. 52-53.
22. Bulletin No. 1, pp. 7-14, passim.
23. The following is Dr. Flexner's proposed Article VI, providing for the office of Director:
The Director shall be responsible for the final formulation of policies to be presented to Trustees and Faculty and the current educational conduct of the Institute.

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


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

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

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

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

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



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

24. Article X put some kind of a premium on the importance of meetings of the Members of the Corporation, by providing that a majority of all Members present could amend the By-Laws, while saying that a majority of the whole number of Trustees was needed to do the same thing. Earlier the article had provided for a two-thirds vote of either.
25. Since officers were to be elected at the annual meetings, Dr. Flexner at first considered himself an officer. At the annual meeting of 1932 (the first held) the Director's re-appointment was effected.
26. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 10/21/30.
27. Treasurer's Reports.

CHAPTER III

PLANNING THE INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The situation is a more complex one than at any previous time in the world's history. When...Mr. Gilman organized the Johns Hopkins University he could appoint a professor of history, a professor of mathematics, a professor of economics, or a professor of physiology. But any one of these subjects and indeed all subjects have so developed that it would require a small faculty to represent any of them adequately in all its aspects.

Progress is likely to be made by selecting a crucial or strategic point, and then by procuring a scholar or a scientist who will push his investigations from that point forward ...We must ascertain the subjects which, though of fundamental importance, are not at present productively cultivated in this country at a high level, and we must undertake to discover the persons who may be relied on to forge ahead, but in order to come to decisions on such points and to make choices of this character one must possess a sound knowledge of the status and outlook of each of the major branches of learning. Towards this end I have been working.⁴

Outlining this truly stupendous undertaking had the virtue of explaining

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

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

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

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

Flexner's reply was revealing in its obliquity:

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

But with Mr. Maass he was quite candid:

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

Maass replied:

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

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

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

I have finished the second draft of a report which I shall send around to the members of the Board in advance of the autumn meeting, and I find my ideas are even more sharply crystallized than I have permitted myself to say, but the truth is that I do not wish to put anything on paper which will make it difficult for me or for the Board to change, if in the course of the next months we get further light...

I am trying in my mind to devise ways of starting which will commit us as little as possible financially and otherwise so that over a period of years we can regard the Institute experimentally, profiting by our experience and changing without getting too deeply involved to do so.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The topics respecting which most discussion took place were the subjects which the Institute should first attack, the persons best qualified to lead, the conditions under which they would work most effectively, the location and ultimate character of the buildings...On one or two of them my mind has become clear, as will be made plain in the course of this report; as to the others, further conference and reflection are still requisite. (Emphasis his)¹²

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

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

Universities, being primarily intellectual in character, ought to be small and plastic; they should be havens where scholars and scientists may regard the world and its phenomena as their laboratory, without being carried off by the maelstrom; they should be simple, comfortable, quiet without being monastic or remote; they should be afraid of no issue; yet they should be under no pressure from any side which might tend to force their scholars to be prejudiced either for or against any particular solution of the problems under study; and they should provide the facilities, the tranquillity, and the time requisite to fundamental inquiry.

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

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

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

If the Institute were to differ from universities in these respects, how was it to be distinguished from a research institute?
it would
"By reason of its constitution and conception/be a research institute;

if the members of its staff are not contributors to the progress of knowledge and the solution of problems, there is no sufficient reason for setting it up." But they should also be teachers, choosing "a few competent and earnest disciples engaged in mastery of a subject," although the students might be researchers also. In the typical research institute, teaching was also carried on, but the emphasis was different for such institutes were primarily engaged with the effort to settle problems, and the younger men were considered to be "novices" or assistants, rather than students. Continuing his distinctions, Flexner wrote:

The Institute will be neither a current university, struggling with diverse tasks and many students, nor a research institute, devoted solely to the solution of problems. It may be pictured as a wedge inserted between the two -- a small university, in which a limited amount of teaching and a liberal amount of research are both to be found....The level of the teaching and its form mark it off sharply from college teaching, from most university teaching, from technological or professional teaching. This granted, the professor himself benefits, if for an hour or two weekly, in addition to his own research and the supervision of a few investigations, he discusses with a small thoroughly competent body a larger theme. He is thus assisted in preserving his own perspective, and he has a motive for wider reading and broader contacts...

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

I should think of a circle, called the Institute for Advanced Study. Within this, I should, one by one, as men and funds are available -- and only then -- create a series of schools or groups -- a school of mathematics, a school of economics, a school of history, a school of philosophy, etc. The 'schools' may change from time to time; in any event, the designations are so broad that they may readily cover one group of activities today, quite another group, as time goes on. Thus, from the outset the school of mathematics may well contain the history or philosophy of

science; the school of economics, a chair of law or political theory.

Each school should conduct its affairs in its own way. for neither the subjects or the scholars will all fit into one mould. An annually changing chairman would perhaps be the only officer requisite. There should be complete academic freedom, as there is in England, France and Germany...

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

These men know their own minds, they have their own ways; the men who have, throughout human history, meant more to themselves and to human progress have usually followed their own inner light; no organizer, no administrator, no institution can do more than furnish conditions favorable to the restless prowling of an enlightened and informed human spirit...

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

had left to him alone. Then he continued:

Delicate questions arise in connection with the relations which should exist between the director, staff and trustees. Incidentally I have touched on them in saying that, as a matter of course, the staff will be made up of mature scholars, presumably conscious of the weight that should attach to their utterances and actively participating in the government of the Institute. But the subject is a difficult one, and I am not yet prepared to submit further positive recommendations, though it has received my continuous attention. I am clear that the relationship between the executive officers and the faculty is not usually in America cordial or satisfactory. On the contrary, for one reason or another, the American professoriate is unhappy -- and it will not enlist the country's best brains in sufficient number until the atmosphere is radically changed.

I have already suggested changes of a fundamental character, among them the inclusion in the board of trustees of outside scholars as well as members of its own staff. Whether this is all that need be done to give learning its proper weight in the Institute, I am not at this moment prepared to say. I do say, however, that the Institute exists for the sake of learning and that policies and measures that are inimical to the happy and enthusiastic pursuit of learning are necessarily wrong.

It has been urged that trustees should limit their activities to business matters and that faculties should govern all else. In support of this contention Germany, France, Oxford and Cambridge are cited. But none of these instances is convincing. In Germany a powerful ministry is in constant cooperation, as it is in occasional conflict, with the universities; practically the same is true in France, where, however, the bureaucratic habit is stronger. Oxford and Cambridge do indeed govern themselves, but on three occasions in the last half century Parliament has intervened through Royal Commissions in order to cure some of the defects due to government by exclusively academic bodies....

Both lay trustees, alone, and teachers, alone, are liable to be one-sided. When the president is the sole link or channel of communication between the staff and trustees, he tends to become autocratic and is unlikely to be widely informed. Our American experience shows the consequences. On the other hand, faculty government would distract scholars and might lead to internal and factional difficulties. We have, as I have said, tried to correct these weaknesses by constituting the Board of Trustees out of laymen, academic personages not

members of the Institute, and persons chosen from the Institute staff. Thus every relevant point of view should get a hearing.

At present, this arrangement will, I believe, suffice. Further steps can be taken, if problems arise, for the solution of which this simple organization is inadequate. I fear, however, that mere organization and rules will not alone achieve our purpose -- that of creating a genuine seat of learning. Sympathy, helpfulness, and mutual respect, involving director, trustees, and faculty are all requisite to create an atmosphere free of tension, attractive to men of high attainments and to students of unusual ability....

Tentatively, each school may work out its own budget, and the several budgets can perhaps be harmonized in conferences between the Director and the several schools, in preparation for consideration, first by a budget committee of the Board of Trustees, consisting, perhaps, as at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, of three scholars and two laymen, and finally, by the Board as a whole. (Emphasis his)

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

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

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

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

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

applied science, and progress in philosophy had in recent years been "bound up with new types and methods of sheer mathematical thinking." In its indifference to practical results, mathematics seemed to Flexner to epitomize the function of the Institute, for, he said, "Nothing is more likely to defeat itself, nothing is on the whole less productive in the long run than immediacy in the realm of research, reflection and contemplation." But/cited with approval Pasteur, Koch, Lister and other physicists and chemists who "had their feet in both worlds -- the world of practice and the world of theory." What he wanted was "minds that are fundamental in their searching, whatever the spring that moves them..."

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

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

There is no more important subject than the evolution of the social organism, and the social organism is developing now as never before under the pressure of economic forces. Before our very eyes, mankind is conducting portentous social-economic experiments. Science and philosophy are creating new means and new goals; the economist must have something to say as to their value and feasibility....

But where does the economist enjoy the independence and the leisure which have for a century been enjoyed by the philosopher and the physicist? Where is the economist who is by turns a student of practice and a thinker -- in touch with realities, yet never their slave?...Economics, hard pressed by the tasks of the day, has not usually enlisted minds willing to work in leisurely and philosophic fashion...Nowhere does a group of economists enjoy the conditions which Pasteur enjoyed, when he was working out the foundations of preventive medicine...

Physical plagues had been largely eradicated by medical science. But economic plagues, like the one which then was paralyzing the world, continued their periodic ravages for reasons not understood. "The Institute for Advanced Study has here a pressing opportunity; and assuredly at no time in the world's history have phenomena more important to study presented themselves. For the plague is upon us, and one cannot well study plagues after they have run their course..." He spoke of economics, he said, in the broad sense, "inclusive of political theory, ethics and other subjects that are involved therein." His vision:

Thus I conceive a group of economists and their associates, financially independent, unhurried and disinterested, in closest possible contact with the phenomena of business and government and at this high level endeavoring to understand the novel phenomena taking place before our eyes. The mathematician is in a sense secure from immediacy; the economist must be made so. He has at times to mingle with the stream of life; we must make it safe for him to do so. He must be enabled to take the same attitude towards social phenomena that the medical scientist has now been enabled to take toward disease...

Beyond these two subjects, Flexner suggested that in the future

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

analogous to that of the Collège de France, viz., to take advantage of surprises by creating from time to time a chair for a new subject or an unexpected person. By the same token, since the Institute is not concerned with subjects or degrees in the ordinary sense, chairs that have served their purpose can be discontinued. In these respects the stimulating influence of the Collège de France has proved of incalculable value. It has pioneered in every direction....

Under such circumstances, growth will be slow and unsymmetrical, as it should be;...we shall learn much from experience -- much that will be helpful in reshaping such schools as we start, much that will be useful in shaping others...If the Institute is unsymmetrical, it can the more readily remain elastic and highly vitalized.

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

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

On this basis alone can a university or an institute be in the world and of the world, as far as any individual may desire, and yet preserve its absolute independence and freedom of thought and speech.

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

I have said nothing definite thus far as to buildings and site, and that because despite their crucial importance these things come second. Nevertheless, they cannot be ignored. A group of scholars should not be isolated; they need access to libraries, museums, collections, and other scholars -- the more so, because a slow development is contemplated. If the life of the academic body is to be normal and wholesome, the accessories of civilization must be obtainable with such means as they possess -- I mean schools, physicians, friends, and domestic aid....

It is not, in the first instance, a question of erecting buildings; for the subjects with which I propose that we begin, any kind of buildings may be made to answer. In time, certain conditions affecting the site will require consideration. It should be large enough to be forever protected against the noise and bustle of urban or commercial life.

But I have come to no conclusion on these points; I have merely been analyzing the problems in order to separate the various factors. I shall suggest the appointment of a small committee which may make a preliminary study of this question with a view to general discussion by the Board later.¹³

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

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

He noted particularly that he was saying nothing about the duties of the Director; they were described in the By-Laws, and "nothing needs, at this moment, to be added." Further on matters not discussed, he wrote: "I have proposed nothing definite as to fees or the terms on which degrees will be conferred: both subjects ought to be discussed by the Committee on Education, which cannot be formed until the first staff appointments are made." Routine administrative affairs should continue to be handled by the Board's Assistant Secretary Mrs. Esther S. Bailey, and the Treasurer's office.

The Institute's success would be measured "in the slow process of time by the development of its staff, the students that it trains, and the additions that it makes to the world's fund of knowledge and experience." He closed on/prophetic note:

Let me say that I am not unaware of the fact that I have sketched an educational Utopia. I have deliberately hitched the Institute to a star; it would be wrong to begin with any other ambition or aspiration. On the other hand, I have been careful to keep within the realm of the practical. But I do not deceive myself; it will not be easy to begin on any such basis; it will be harder, as the years pass, to keep this standard. We shall find ourselves dealing with men and

women, not with angels or supermen. Difficulties will arise; disappointments will occur. But we shall be helped, not harmed, by the high level at which we have pledged ourselves to act. In any case, unless we attempted something much higher than is now attained, there would be little reason to attempt anything at all.

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

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

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

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

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

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

inevitably sink both in personnel and in spirit to the level of the graduate school of the larger institution which would really absorb it.

We want and need neighbors, but we want absolutely to preserve our identity, and this is not only my view but the view of both President Hibben and Dr. Trowbridge, Dean of the Princeton Graduate School, with whom I have had a confidential talk...¹⁶

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

He said:

Mathematics can be taught 'safely' in Moscow, Berlin, Rome and Washington. In urging that mathematics stimulates philosophy, poetry, music, and the other humanities, you strain your hand. Bertrand Russell gave up mathematics on account of its intellectual futility with respect to everything else, save applications...

Beard

Chuck mathematics and take economics. Then you begin with the hardest subject. It is as mathematical and statistical as anyone wants to make it, but it is more. It is a far more 'severe' discipline than mathematics, because it deals with the inexact. In teaching it you come smack up against the whole business of academic freedom and propriety. We have no good schools of higher economics in this land of business schools, and you could make a ten-strike for learning by establishing one. There are good men to get or borrow....³⁰

#

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

and laborious in a university.³⁵

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

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

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

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

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

The Professor suggested that Princeton would be an ideal location.

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

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

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

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

Faculty government is very conservative. Each suggested change runs into interminable discussions, delay, whittling down, and compromise. But in the meantime most of the faculty go on with their work without the fear that some outsider will upset everything for them overnight. Conservatism in a university is, I think, desirable in and of itself....

A good deal of the trouble is due, I think, to our form of organization, which puts the legal power in the hands of trustees and the actual power in those of a President and his administrative staff, and the professional alumni.⁴⁰

Flexner quickly replied that his intention was to place the

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Frankfurter wrote in his lengthy comments:

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

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

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

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

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

It seems to me to be the part of wisdom to be as tentative as possible at this stage about the government of the Institute. You might point out...the most serious objection to faculty government, which is that it inevitably becomes legalistic. Oxford is a good (or rather bad) example. The 'inadequacy of uniform procedure' is the point to be insisted upon...

You might, I think, stress a little more (or at least not forget) the importance of the Director in (1) the selection of the faculty, and (2) the making of the budget. He will want all the advice he can get from inside and outside the Institute, but subject to the approval of the Trustees the final decisions on these matters should, I think, rest with him.⁴⁷

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

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

The result was that a few conscientious, hard-working souls were swamped and their important work suffered, and the rest did nothing. The result was dissatisfaction and inefficiency all around...

Ed believes that any considerable measure of academic administrative responsibility has a demoralizing effect on real scholarship...He believes that what departmental business has to be done should be simplified...and should be conducted at informal luncheon discussions, provided the Institute maintains its primary ideas of limited numbers and simplicity of purpose.

'Faculty government' would seem to us futile and ineffective...Scholars should be let alone as much as possible...the ablest of them do not want to be bothered with self government... They would much prefer to be relieved of all administrative duties, provided the head remains always a cultivated, understanding person who will assume the burdens of government.⁴⁸

Flexner replied:

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

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

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

I am firmly convinced that the absurdities connected with our universities would for the most part never have taken place if a few outstanding scholars had been members of the boards of trustees and in position to express their views to the trustees, as they have expressed them to me. Within the last few days two Harvard professors have talked to me on the School of Business, as it is, and they have both said that, had the faculty been consulted, the School could never have been organized in its present form. The Harvard Corporation never gave these men, who know what education is, a chance to be heard.

Precisely the same has been said to me by Columbia professors with respect to the abuses...there. Last Monday night I dined with one of the most distinguished members of the Columbia Trustees. He said that my book was a revelation to him. Had a few distinguished members of the faculty been sitting on that Board, they could not have helped raising questions which ought to have been raised and which were not raised by President Butler...The autocratic power of the American college president ought to be curtailed. It cannot be curtailed by a lay Board. It can only be curtailed if:

- (1) The faculty has a voice in the management of the institution, and
- (2) Outside scholars can also criticise the director or anybody or anything else. I don't want to be a Mussolini, but one could almost be if one were dealing with merely a lay board.⁵⁰

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

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

He replied:

Theoretically I agree with you absolutely about degrees, but there are practical difficulties....I believe that the best of our men can save two or three years. As a practical measure, therefore, for the present, it seems to me better to throw...the best of students completely into the hands of the several scholars without any requirements as to previous degrees and then safeguard a young fellow's career by giving him a degree if he deserves it. It ought to be a very rare degree....as rare or rarer than the Degree of Doctor Juris at Berlin, which is very carefully safeguarded...

I want the Institute to be different in pretty nearly every important respect from any American institution I know anything about, and I have tried to keep even these experimental features to the minimum required to set up something and to get the consent of the New Jersey Board of Education....⁵³

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

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

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

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

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

Universities. Thus he said at one point:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CHAPTER III - NOTES

1. Universities, p. 32.
2. Ibid., p. 31.
3. Ibid., p. 34.
4. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/16/32, pp. 5-6.
5. Flexner to Maass, 2/3/31; to L. Bamberger, 2/11/31.
6. Aydelotte to Flexner, 6/1/31. Aydelotte papers.
7. Flexner to Aydelotte, 6/2/31.
8. Flexner to Maass, 6/8/31.
9. Maass to Flexner, 6/9/31.
10. Flexner to Maass, 6/10/31. Maass to Flexner, 6/15/31.
11. Flexner to Leidesdorf, 7/24/31.
12. Flexner, Confidential Memorandum to Trustees, 9/26/31. Hereafter this will be referred to as the Confidential Memorandum, considered and discussed at the Trustees' meeting of 10/13/31. The minutes were silent on the nature of the discussion. Though Dr. Flexner wrote Mr. Bamberger that during his travels he had kept careful notes of all conversations, and of his own reflections and ideas, none of these is available in the files of the Institute. Presumably he took them to his summer home in the Canadian woods, where he prepared the Memorandum, and left them there.
13. The Board approved the suggestion for the special committee and authorized the President to appoint to it four members. Minutes, 10/13/31, p. 2.
14. Minutes, meeting of the Committee on Site, 12/7/31.
15. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/1/32.
16. Straus to Flexner, 4/7/32. Flexner to Straus, 4/9/32.
17. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/11/32, pp. 3-6. Shortly before this meeting, Flexner had called on Mr. Edward Harkness to ask him to finance site and buildings for the Institute. Miss Grace Moore, Harkness' secretary, who expressed great interest in the Institute, suggested deferring the interview for prudential reasons. It may be assumed that Flexner followed the matter, but there is no further record. See Memo for files, 1/15/32.

18. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/11/32, p. 2.
19. Ibid., p. 5. See Maass to J. R. Hardin, 12/17/31, and Agenda 12/28/31. Hardin papers.
20. Minutes, meeting, Members of the Corporation, 4/24/33, p. 2.
21. Arnold Toynbee to Flexner, 2/6/31.
22. Aydelotte to Flexner, 12/16/30.
23. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31.
24. Oswald Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31. Veblen papers.
25. Weed to Flexner, 12/23/30. Charles R. Morey to Flexner, 12/23/31.
26. Flexner to Aydelotte, Miss Sabin and Weed, 12/11/30.
27. Weed to Flexner, 12/23/30.
28. Miss Sabin to Flexner, 1/12/31.
29. Charles A. Beard to Flexner, 6/28/31; 7/22/31. Flexner to Beard, 6/29/31.
30. Flexner to Beard, 8/11/31. Beard to Flexner, 8/15/31.
31. Raymond B. Fosdick to Flexner, 9/24/31.
32. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31.
33. Paul Hanus to Flexner, 1/22/32.
34. Felix Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31.
35. Alan Gregg to Flexner, 12/14/31.
36. Hans Zinsser to Flexner, 2/2/32.
37. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.
38. Solomon Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/18/31.
39. George D. Birkhoff to Flexner, 11/5/31.
40. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.
41. Flexner to Veblen, 6/25/31. Veblen to Flexner, 7/11/31.
42. Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/18/31.

43. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31. Flexner to Vincent, 12/11/31.
44. Otis Caldwell to Flexner, 2/26/31.
45. Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31.
46. Alfred E. Cohn to Flexner, 12/14/31; 12/28/31. Flexner to Cohn, 1/7/32. Frankfurter papers.
47. Aydelotte to Flexner, 8/30/31.
48. Mrs. Edward M. Earle to Flexner, 8/11/31.
49. Flexner to Mrs. Earle, 9/15/31.
50. Flexner to P. S. Straus, 10/22/31.
51. Vincent to Flexner, 12/9/31. Flexner to Vincent, 12/11/31.
52. Frederick Keppel to Flexner, 1/12/32.
53. Frankfurter to Flexner, 9/21/31. Flexner to Frankfurter, 9/25/31.
54. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 13.
55. Universities, p. 64.
56. Ibid., p. 152 (note).
57. Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, Princeton 1746-1896, Princeton University Press, 1946, p. 390.
58. Princeton University, Official Register for October, 1929, the President's Report, pp. 9-11, Vol. XXI, No. 1.

CHAPTER IV

THE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS

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

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

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

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

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

In the first place, I would secure permanently one or two mathematicians of great and undisputed genius. These men should be chosen with respect to the importance of the researches which they have under way and only secondarily with reference to their ability to work with other men. However, it would be unfortunate if such a man was not able to work in conjunction with younger men and to have some interest in them. These leaders are to be taken wherever they are to be found.

In the second place, the remainder of the staff would consist mainly of younger men giving promise of unusual talent, to be taken only for a period of years. Such men should be selected absolutely without regard for what is ordinarily called personality, and the salary should be sufficiently high and the duties so congenial that they could be obtained for a period of years without difficulty. It would, however, be a normal expectation that they would go into the academic field after that period...In exceptional cases where the man developed a first-class power he might be retained.

No importance whatever should be attached to keeping a balanced department of mathematics: that is, one in which the various

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

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

With all its abstractness and indifference, both pure and applied scientific and philosophic progress of recent years has been closely bound up with new types and methods of sheer mathematical thinking.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You indicate that you would not go ahead in a particular field if you were not able to get 'the right man.' My belief is that in most fields, there are sufficiently many good men so that you can surely get a man of the right sort. For example, if you cannot secure the man whom you have picked out and who I agree is the best first choice, there are a number of others who are surely as good and who may, in fact, be better....

Your program is experimental only in its details. The general idea is perfectly conservative and is regarded as sound by every competent judge...¹¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

they would meet at Oxford University in the spring.¹⁵

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

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

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

I saw Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass and told them the substance of what I told you and Mrs. Fuld regarding my conference at Pasadena. They were both thrilled at the possibilities, but, of course, we cannot count any 'unhatched chickens.'

I shall in a cautious way open negotiations with Birkhoff and Hermann Weyl, and shall endeavor to keep in touch with Professor Einstein, but I shall keep within the financial limits which we mentioned in our conference....

I do hope it may be feasible to perfect an arrangement which will enable us to give Einstein the opportunity which in my opinion he cannot now enjoy either in Germany or in Pasadena.¹⁷

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Board to approve would be sent.

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

As to you, my mind is clear. If Miss Gwethalyn Jones and Professor Luther P. Eisenhart interpose no obstacles which hinder you, I shall on hearing affirmatively recommend your appointment on the following terms:....

Your service to begin next fall, though the Institute itself cannot expect to operate until the fall of 1933...All other details to be left in abeyance, until I return to America and see what the financial situation is, Yesterday's Frankfurter Zeitung contained a speech by Senator Reed that was very dark...

I look forward confidently to co-operation in the development of a mathematical institute. I want no needless delay, but on the other hand we must heed the general conditions and pledge ourselves to do nothing we cannot easily live up to.³¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

honored him.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Students will be selected on the basis of their aptitude for the work rather than on the possession of formal college degrees. It is expected, of course, that most of the students will enter with Ph. D. degrees or their equivalent....

It is understood that ten students is the largest number that any one has suggested for any one professor to work with; and if a professor feels that he can work better with as few as five or six, or even with only two or three, it will be left to his judgment to work that way. Each professor will decide for himself whether to work with seminars or groups, or to work with each student individually.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There has been some questioning of the value to Princeton on the grounds that Dr. Flexner, with his challenging theory of research and his practical means of putting it into effect, will draw men away from the University. This line of reasoning is not quite sound: the question is not whether we should prefer to have Professor Einstein on our faculty or on Dr. Flexner's, but whether we should prefer to have him in Princeton or Berlin. Similarly, everyone will regret that Professor Veblen, one of Princeton's ablest mathematicians, has left the University faculty, but assuming that Dr. Flexner could attract him anyway, the question is whether we should rather have him living in Princeton or some place else. Dr. Flexner was bound to build up a strong faculty; we are pleased that it will be near us.

Opportunity for scholarly development is one of the prime factors considered by teachers in changing from one university to another. Included under this head are a good library, well-equipped laboratories, a reasonable teaching schedule, and the chance for associations with leaders in scholarly work. If Dr. Flexner's group helps to make Princeton more famous as a center of research, we will have a better chance of competing on even terms with sister institutions which are as anxious as we are to strengthen their facilities.⁵¹

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

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

written:

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

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

More and more a few points stand out fairly clearly not because of any possible difference of opinion between you and Veblen and me, but because we are setting precedents and establishing relations which we hope will prove sound after all three of us are dead and gone. I am giving you these impressions for what they are worth, and I want you to understand first of all, that I have not the slightest desire to be consulted with reference to your concerns. Our chances for perfect harmony, understanding, and cooperation are best if each of us goes his own way, talking things over as freely as possible as long as we are on the job but leaving our successors precisely the same kind of freedom that we now enjoy.

With this general view in mind, let me say that I would not for the world do anything to mar the great work in mathematics that is going on at Princeton....You were generous in letting us have Veblen, and I assume that in so doing you felt sure that you could fill the post without lowering the prestige of the Department, but quite obviously this cannot often happen at this stage of the game of our academic development...Merely moving men from one place on the checkerboard to another does not modify the general situation in respect to scholarship in this country. I would not therefore if I could injure seriously

any university department and though this involves a sacrifice on the part of individuals, it is a sacrifice that at this stage of our intellectual and scholarly development we must make...

While I am clear in my mind as to this I am equally clear that as long as you and Veblen and I are in command, we can talk about things with the utmost vigor and candor, because I believe we all have at heart the same interests...So please do not let this caution on my part interfere with the frank exchange of views in the future.⁵³

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

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

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

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

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

I agree with you that the relationship of the Institute and our Department of Mathematics must be thought of as a matter of policy extending over the years. Accordingly I am of the opinion that any of its members should be considered for appointment to the Institute on his merits alone and not with reference to whether for the time being his possible withdrawal from the Department would give the impression that such withdrawal would weaken the Department. For if this were not the policy, we should be at a disadvantage in recruiting our personnel from time to time. If our trustees and alumni were disturbed by such a withdrawal, as you suggest, they should meet it by giving us at least as full opportunity to make replacements intended to maintain our distinction. The only disadvantage to us of such withdrawal would arise if we were hampered in any way in continuing the policy which has brought us to the position we now occupy. This policy has been to watch the field carefully and try out men of promise at every possible opportunity. If it is to be the policy of the Institute to have young men here on temporary appointment, this would enable us to be in a much better position to watch the field.

In my opinion the ideas here set forth are so important for the future of our Department that it is my intention to present them to the Curriculum Committee of our Board of Trustees at its meeting next month, after I have had an opportunity to discuss them further with you next week.⁵⁶

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

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

In the long run, cooperation will, I believe, be most effective if each institution pursues this policy, leaving the members of the staff after their appointment to work out such cooperation as may seem to them agreeable and helpful. We must...avoid even the appearance of influencing each other's policy and appointments.

While I am clear that as a matter of principle the above statement of policy is correct, I am not unmindful of the fact that we shall have at the outset to demonstrate to the two institutions and the mathematical world the fact that Princeton has been strengthened, not weakened, by the location of the Institute in immediate proximity to Princeton University. The mere transfer of individuals from one...to the other would add little to the combined resources of both. The calling of Profes-

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

over the "transfer" of the three men.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Professor Veblen's inclination is to work with individuals or with a small group, but the proximity of Princeton makes it possible to pursue a different method and to assemble⁸⁰ all those....who are engaged in advanced mathematical work.

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

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

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

Inasmuch as only those students will be admitted who have already obtained the Ph. D. degree or whose training is equivalent to that represented by $\overline{it_2}$...and who are in addition sufficiently advanced to carry on and to cooperate in independent research, the number of students will be small. A few workers, who have been admitted for the year 1933-1934, already hold assured positions in university departments of mathematics and have given evidence of capacity for original and independent research. Mature persons of this kind will naturally receive preference in the matter of admission.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have been thinking how astonished you will be when you read what is happening to me in Europe. You will, however, see that I have made no commitment which will interfere with my undertaking at Princeton. In these times of dire threats to Jews and liberals, one is morally obligated to undertake what in normal times one would avoid.

When it became known that the Germans, and particularly the Prussian Academy, took hostile action against my position and my civil rights, people in France and Spain felt it necessary to rally to my support in the noblest way. To accept the obligations was to me not only the demand of enlightenment; it was also an opportunity to aid the interests of oppressed Jews and liberals.

First of all came the Spanish Embassy and offered me a professorship, without exacting from me any commitment as to when and for how long I would be in Spain....I accepted the offer in principle and promised to come next April for four to six weeks. I could make this promise the more easily since I appear to be foreclosed from returning to Germany in the foreseeable future. That this commitment conflicts in the slightest way with our arrangements seems to me to be out of the question, since we had firmly in mind that we were to have our half-year in Berlin, which was a more binding undertaking than I am making to Spain.

Then came the French Consul to offer me on behalf of the Ministry of Education a professorship in the Collège de France. Since I did not have any more time to dispose of I declined this with thanks. He came the next day to say that I need not not commit myself to come to Paris; he would just like to have my word that I would accept membership in the faculty. To refuse this would appear to be unfriendly, and my friends in Paris would have been justified in seeing it in that light....

I have been committed to go to Oxford for several years past. But this is a special project without formal requirements. You will see that my real commitment in Princeton will be respected. If anyone can feel injured, it is myself, who have given up part of my rest and peace. But that is my responsibility.⁸⁶

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

deplored the numerous unfounded reports regarding his future activities, particularly concerning his contracts with... universities.

'My obligations,' he said, 'for the coming season are as follows: First, I have a permanent contract to lecture at the Abraham Flexner Institute at Princeton. Second, I have accepted a chair at the Collège de France. Third, I am engaged to lecture in Madrid. The Paris and Madrid engagements are for April and May, 1934. Fourth, I have been invited to lecture next spring at Christ Church College, Oxford. All other reports are devoid of foundation.'⁹¹

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Dear Mr. President:

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

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

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

With great respect and very deep regret, I am

Very sincerely yours,

Abraham Flexner⁹³

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I have no objection to your using the one-time remark in the manner suggested...

I suggest, however, that this expression might appear to the reader as frivolous; he might not understand the context. One can speak such thoughts in a conversational manner, but nature conceals her secrets in the sublimity of her law, not through cunning.⁹⁸

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Not one of them helped me.¹⁰¹

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

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

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

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

And again, speaking this time to mathematicians:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A year later Professor Einstein wrote Flexner as follows:

Lately I have been carrying on a scholarly correspondence with Schroedinger. In my judgment he would be a wonderful acquisition for our Institute. He wrote me of the intent to accept a call to Graz, since he is at Oxford only on a courtesy call, so to say; there is no real opportunity there for a scholar in theoretical physics.

I believe that the influential people at Princeton, after open discussions, would not have opposed a call to Schroedinger to our Institute...because of his refusal of the call to Princeton. One could hardly take amiss the striving of such an outstanding scholar for a position which promises him the opportunity to contribute his learning as completely as possible...¹⁰⁹

Flexner answered:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Alexander have talked to me about Morse, no one else has, and the matter has not even been mentioned to the Board. I do not possess the authority 'to bring the matter to a conclusion as soon as possible.' I find faculty somewhat inconsistent in matters of this sort. In one moment they resent the unilateral action of the president, and in another they want him to cut off and ignore the constituted authorities. I do not myself want to do either...

It seems a little funny that you should be in a hurry, while I, nearing the end of my tether, should be the cautious one; but I do not believe that in the long run we will lose if we use a method of procedure that is in the highest degree dignified and considerate, while at the same time holding ourselves to our ideals.¹¹²

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

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

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

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

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

With the cooperation of Dean Eisenhart and his associates Fine Hall has offered abundant opportunity to cultivate delightful social relations in this highly varied group. Every afternoon tea is served, and there is an attendance of 60 to 75 mathematicians who discuss with one another the subjects upon which they are working, and sometimes, fortunately, subjects which have no direct relation to their work. Once a week a mathematical club assembles to hear a paper presented by some member, occasionally a professor, occasionally one of the workers. The attendance is so large...that the largest room in Fine Hall has had to be used...

The workers are often busy in fields in which none of the professors has been productive, with the result that members of the group are engaged in teaching one another....The interest,

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

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

CHAPTER IV - NOTES

1. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 12/9/30.
2. Flexner, Memo to files, 12/1/30. David E. Smith to Flexner, 6/29/31.
3. G. D. Birkhoff to Flexner, 3/17/31.
4. Flexner, Confidential Memorandum, pp. 11-12.
5. O. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.
6. S. Lefschetz to Flexner, 2/28/31.
7. O. Veblen to Simon Flexner, 10/24/23. In part Veblen wrote: "In the modern case of the Einstein theory, the relation between mathematics and physics has been more one-sided than in the development of the theories of heat conduction and electromagnetic waves. Einstein's work is a contribution to physics in which mathematics is used as a tool. It happened that the necessary mathematics was already in existence...This left Einstein free to apply his genius to the physical and philosophical problem, using the mathematics wherever it was needed. Had he been under the necessity of creating the mathematical tools which he used in his gravitation theory, it is more than probable that this theory would have been long delayed and possibly never completed. Indeed, it may be added that without the pioneer work of the creators of non-Euclidean geometry, the frame of mind in which Einstein approached his problem would not have been possible." Veblen papers.
8. Veblen to Simon Flexner and Vernon Kellogg, 2/23/24. Veblen papers.
9. Flexner to Veblen, 1/21/30. Veblen to Flexner, 1/24/30.
10. Veblen to Flexner, 6/10/30. Flexner to Veblen, 7/7/30.
11. Flexner to Veblen, 12/9/31. Veblen to Flexner, 12/15/31.
12. Flexner to Veblen, 12/16/31.
13. Veblen to Flexner, 1/1/32.
14. Thorstein Veblen, The Higher Learning in America, B. W. Huebsch, 1918.
15. Flexner, Autobiography, p. 259ff. This is the same account in all details as had appeared in the first edition of Flexner's memoirs, I Remember, Simon and Schuster, 1940. Dr. Flexner's position was delicate. He was in a sense the guest of the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena. He had asked Dr. Robert A. Millikan, Chair-

man of the joint committee of trustees and faculty which administered the Institute, to welcome and inform the Founders on the nature of the C.I.T. and its administration the previous winter (see Flexner to Millikan, 1/27/31).

Only in the posthumously written Introduction did Allan Nevins correct the record: "by persistent, tactful persuasion he enlisted Dr. Albert Einstein" in the faculty.

16. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 2/11/32.
17. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 2/13/32.
18. Flexner to H. Weyl, 2/15/32. Flexner to R. Courant, 2/13/33.
19. Flexner to Birkhoff, 2/29/32. Terms offered: salary, \$20,000. Joint contributions to T.I.A.A. by the Institute and the professor, of 10%, the benefits to apply to a pension of \$8,000 on retirement at age 65, which might be deferred by agreement. His wife to receive a pension of \$5,000 should her husband pre-decease her. In view of the liberal terms, no other services for financial profit were to be undertaken by the professor.
20. Birkhoff to Flexner, 3/28/32. Birkhoff first accepted on 3/7/32, then retracted it to allow time for President Lowell to talk further with him. On 3/20/32 he again accepted, but was apparently dissuaded from leaving by a trustee of Harvard.
21. Aydelotte to Flexner, 3/1/33. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/3/33. Aydelotte papers.
22. Minutes, meeting, Members of the Corporation, 4/11/32, p. 3.
23. A. M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Coming of the New Deal, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1958, p. 256.
24. Flexner to Veblen, 3/17/33; 3/20/33.
25. Veblen to Flexner, 4/24/32.
26. Philip Frank, Einstein His Life and Times, Alfred A. Knopf, 1947, pp. 178, 266.
27. Flexner to Veblen, 6/6/32.
28. Flexner to Einstein, 6/6/32; 6/10/32; 6/14/32. Einstein to Flexner, 6/8/32; 6/10/32. The terms were: Salary, \$10,000; if the German government taxed this income, the Institute would pay the American income tax. Einstein would be eligible for retirement at age 65, but it might be deferred by agreement. Pension \$7,500, and for his wife should Einstein predecease her, a pension of \$5,000. The

Institute terms would run from the first of October to the middle of April. Earnings outside the Institute were proscribed. The object of the Institute was research and the training of a few competent workers to be chosen by the professor. Dr. Walter Mayer, Einstein's mathematical assistant, would receive \$100 per month from 10/1/32, and \$4,000 p.a. in salary should he accompany Dr. Einstein to the United States. The Institute would pay the travel costs of the Einsteins. (6/6/32)

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

29. Robert Millikan to Flexner, 7/25/32; 8/15/32. Flexner to Millikan, 7/30/32. Einstein to Flexner, 9/13/32.
30. George E. Hale to Flexner, 9/20/32.
31. Flexner to Veblen, 6/2/32. Terms: salary, \$15,000; joint contribution to T.I.A.A. of 5% with benefits to apply on pension of \$8,000 on retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. His wife to receive a pension of \$5,000 should he predecease her. Sabbatical leave for a full year at full salary every seven years, effective 10/1/32. Aydelotte and Veblen files.
32. Flexner to Mrs. E. S. Bailey, 6/3/32.
33. Flexner to Mrs. Bailey, cable 6/14/32; Interview with Mrs. Bailey.
34. Flexner to Veblen, 6/4/32; 6/30/32.
35. Veblen to Flexner, 6/5/32. Dr. Veblen suggested that the excess of the pension over T.I.A.A. benefits should be insured by the Institute.

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

It should be noted especially that uniform salaries were not contemplated as between the older and younger men. The budget provided for

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

36. Flexner to Veblen, cables 6/22/32; 6/28/32. Letter, 6/28/32.
37. Veblen to Flexner, 6/18/32; 7/7/32; 7/8/32; 8/12/32. Flexner to Veblen, 7/21/32. To H. Weyl, 7/21/32; 7/29/32. Weyl to Flexner, 7/30/32.
38. Veblen to Eisenhart, 6/28/32, with copy to Flexner. Flexner to Veblen, 7/12/32; to Eisenhart, 7/12/32.
39. Flexner to Einstein, 7/12/32. To L. Bamberger, 8/30/32.
40. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/18/32. Bamberger to Flexner, 8/19/32, Telegrams. Flexner, memorandum to L. Bamberger, Leidesdorf and Maass, 8/20/32. Letter to Bamberger 8/22/32, enclosing a letter addressed to Weyl dated 8/23/32, offering terms for salary, joint contributions to T.I.A., pensions and retirement age identical with Veblen's, plus an allowance for the education of Weyl's sons: \$300 p.a. while in secondary school, \$1,000 p.a. for university. The Institute would pay transportation costs for the family, and guarantee Weyl against double income taxation, as in the case of Einstein. L. Bamberger to Flexner, wire and letter, 8/26/32.
41. Frank, op. cit., pp. 180-187.
42. Interviews, Veblen and Eisenhart.
43. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/32, pp. 4-7. The terms of the appointments were as agreed upon earlier, except that no mention

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

44. Flexner to John Finley, 10/5/32.
45. New York Times, 10/11/32.
46. Weed to Flexner, 10/28/32.
47. Beard to Flexner, 10/12/32.
48. Edward Capps to Flexner, 10/11/32.
49. F. Frankfurter to Flexner, 10/29/32; 11/5/32. One may seek and find what appears to be a reason for Frankfurter's acerbity toward Dr. Einstein. Perhaps it lay in the fact that Einstein accompanied Chaim Weitzmann to the United States in 1921. On that occasion Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court withdrew from the chairmanship of the American Zionist movement, accompanied by some twenty followers, including Mr. Frankfurter, in differences over the highly controversial issue of Jewish nationalism. See Alpheus T. Mason, Brandeis: A Free Man's Life. Viking Press, 1946, pp. 460 ff.
50. Flexner, Autobiography cited, pp. 254-255.
51. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 10/14/32.
52. Veblen to Eisenhart, 6/28/32.
53. Flexner to Eisenhart, 11/12/32.
54. Veblen to Weyl, 11/11/32.
55. Flexner to Veblen, 11/17/32.
56. Eisenhart to Flexner, 11/26/32.
57. Flexner to Veblen, 12/1/32.
58. Veblen to Flexner, 12/13/32. This is the only instance of such contract in the record.
59. Flexner to Eisenhart, 12/3/32.
60. Interviews with Eisenhart and Veblen.

61. Flexner to Veblen, 12/9/32; 12/13/32.
62. Flexner to Veblen, 12/22/32. Veblen to Flexner, 12/24/32.
63. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/9/33, pp. 4-7. Terms of Alexander's appointment: salary, \$10,000, with 10% in joint contributions to T.I.A.A. Retirement at age 65, unless deferred by agreement. Effective date, 10/1/33.
64. Flexner to Von Neumann, 1/9/33; to Eisenhart, 1/9/33. It would appear that Flexner submitted the nomination to the Board, and that the Board declined to approve it, probably on the ground that the Institute should not take more men from the University. Professor Veblen did not know of the change in plans until 1/10/33, when he noticed the omission of Von Neumann's name in the Times; he later received a letter from Flexner. (Mrs. Veblen's diary, which noted that "Oswald was very mad.")
65. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 1/28/33. Terms of Von Neumann's appointment were identical with those of Alexander, except that the effective date was 4/1/33. Despite this appointment, Dr. Wigner remained as half-time professor of mathematical physics at the University, and as will be seen shortly, the University canvassed the field for a man to take the Jones research professorship. (See p. 182) Dr. Wigner accepted a full professorship at Wisconsin in 1937, returning to Princeton and the Jones chair in 1938.
66. S. D. Leidesdorf to R. Oppenheimer,
67. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/29/33.
68. Flexner to Veblen, 10/26/32.
69. Veblen to Weyl, 11/11/32.
70. Flexner to Veblen, 12/13/32; 7/31/33.
71. Flexner to Veblen, 12/11/35.
72. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty meeting, 12/14/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/20/35.
73. Veblen to Flexner, 12/19/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/23/35.
74. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5.
75. Flexner to Veblen, 4/5/33.
76. Veblen to Flexner, 12/2/32; 12/13/32.

77. Flexner to Veblen, 1/24/33. Flexner to Marston Morse, 1/25/33.
78. Veblen to Flexner, 6/19/31.
79. Veblen to Flexner, 12/2/32.
80. R. Courant to Flexner, 12/7/32. Flexner to Courant, (draft) 12/14/32.
81. Veblen to Flexner, 12/16/32.
82. I.A.S. Bulletin No. 2, February, 1933, pp. 4-7.
83. Veblen to Flexner, 7/10/33; 7/18/33. Flexner to Veblen, 7/10/33; 7/14/33; 7/18/33; 7/24/33; 7/25/33. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 7/14/33; 7/24/33. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 7/19/33 (wire).
84. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/1/33.
85. Aydelotte to Flexner, 8/18/33; 8/26/33. Minutes, Executive Committee, 9/6/33. Terms: salary, \$15,000; joint contributions of 5% each to T.I.A.A.; benefits to go toward a pension of \$8,000 on retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. Instead of a pension for Mrs. Weyl, Weyl was to receive \$1,500 p.a. with which to purchase insurance to protect his family. Effective date, 1/1/34, which was advanced later to 12/1/33.
86. Einstein to Flexner, 3/26/33.
87. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 5/29/33; 7/6/33.
88. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 7/6/33. Mrs. Einstein to Flexner, 7/19/33.
89. Frank, op. cit., p. 146.
90. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 7/19/33. Einstein to Flexner, 7/29/33.
91. New York Times, A. P. dispatch dated 8/4/33.
92. Leidesdorf and Maass to Flexner, 10/2/33. Flexner to Maass, 10/2/33, Telegrams.
93. Flexner to President Roosevelt, 11/3/33.
94. Flexner to Mrs. Einstein, 11/14/33; 11/15/33. Mrs. Einstein to Flexner, 11/15/33. Interview with Miss Helen Dukas.
95. Emil Hilb to Flexner, 11/30/33. Flexner to Hilb, 12/4/33. Einstein to Flexner, 12/9/33. Interview with Dr. Eugene Wigner. The mediator was Professor Ladenburg.
96. Flexner to L. Bamberger, with copy to Maass, 12/11/33.

97. Flexner to Maass, 2/19/34. Jesse Isador Straus to Flexner, 3/15/34. Flexner to Straus, 3/27/34.
98. Veblen to Einstein, 4/17/30. Einstein to Veblen, 4/30/30. Veblen papers.
99. Veblen to Flexner, 1/24/33.
100. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 12/12/36; 2/23/37; 2/25/37; 4/12/37. Einstein to Flexner, 4/11/37. Flexner to Einstein, 4/12/37; to Veblen, 4/12/37.
101. Leopold Infeld, Quest, Doubleday, Doran & Co., 1941, pp. 305-306. Minutes, School of Mathematics meeting, 2/23/37; 2/25/37; 4/12/37. These show that Dr. Infeld's name was held on a reserve list in February, despite Einstein's request. By the April meeting, shifts in the list of those invited left \$2,200 available, which was then obligated in other ways, and no part of it for Infeld. The budgets for 1934-1935 and 1935-1936 allocated \$10,000 of the \$30,000 stipends for the School of Mathematics for mathematical physics, at the request of Professors Einstein and Von Neumann (who was devoting half his time to that field). Thereafter, at Professor Veblen's request, the division between physics and mathematics was dropped. This occurred in face of diminished stipends for the School, due to the Institute's straitened financial condition.
102. Infeld, op. cit., p. 310 ff.
103. G. D. Birkhoff, Fifty Years of American Mathematics, Reprint from Vol. II, Semicentennial Addresses, Amer. Math. Soc., p. 307.
104. Frank, op. cit., p. 206.
105. Albert Einstein, Autobiographical Notes in Albert Einstein, Philosopher, Scientist, The Library of Living Philosophers Inc., 1949. Infeld, op. cit., p. 253.
106. Frank, op. cit., p. 114.
107. E. S. Schroedinger to Flexner, 6/25/34.
108. Flexner to Schroedinger, 7/4/34. Schroedinger to Flexner, 7/9/34. Flexner to Eisenhart, 7/4/34.
109. Einstein to Flexner, 9/3/35.
110. Flexner to Einstein, 9/7/35.
111. Minutes, School of Mathematics faculty, 10/8/35. At this meeting it was suggested and agreed that workers should henceforth be

called members, and grants-in-aid, stipends.

Minimum stipends for single and married members and assistants were set by agreement at \$1,500 and \$1,800 respectively. It was also decided that while concern was naturally felt by the faculty for members and assistants who had no positions to go to on leaving the Institute, letters of invitation and acceptance should make clear that the Institute was responsible for nothing beyond the actual period of appointment.

112. Flexner to Veblen, 9/14/34.

p. 1.

113. Veblen to Flexner, 1/14/35, / Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, pp. 4, 11. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/27/34. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/29/34, Aydelotte papers. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/14/35, p. 1. Terms: salary, \$12,500; equal joint contributions of 5% to T.I.A.A.; retirement at age 65 unless deferred by agreement. Effective 7/1/35.

114. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/29/34.

CHAPTER V

THE SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND POLITICS

Shortly after the first successful steps in organizing the School of Mathematics were taken, the Founders decided to withdraw from active participation as Trustees and the chief officers of the Institute. The Director seized the opportunity to replace them with two men on whose counsel he hoped to rely in establishing the School of Economics. As he had said earlier, this was "the realm most difficult and dangerous to approach" in research. It was not going to be easy even at the Institute, for Mr. Bamberger was very skeptical of the advantages of the researches Flexner had outlined in his book and the Memorandum of September, 1931. Mr. Bamberger apparently had little faith in a scientific approach to economics; he had evidently had an unfortunate experience with economic counsel in his business at one time or another.¹

In January, 1933, Mr. Bamberger announced a "decision of a personal nature" to the Board. He is reported to have said:

Mrs. Fuld and I have taken the closest interest and the most profound pleasure in our association with this enterprise. We feel, however, that we wish in its interest not to be burdened with responsibility but rather to leave responsibility in the hands of the Director and the Trustees. We have discussed this matter fully with the Director, and it is our opinion, in which he concurs, that the By-Laws can be simplified so as to permit a gradual evolution by dropping the offices of President and Vice-President of the Board of Trustees, so that the executive management of the Institute will remain in the hands of the Trustees while the Director will be responsible for the scientific direction. In addition, Mrs. Fuld and I would prefer to resign as Trustees and to accept a suggestion made by the Director that we become Honorary Trustees with the privilege of at-

tending meetings of the Board and the committees, and membership on committees.

This statement on my part, with which Mrs. Fuld agrees, will indicate to you our confidence in the Board and our firm belief that the warm reception and commendation which the Institute has received indicate that it is destined to fill a need in the higher scheme of American education. I trust that this informal notice on our part will be accepted by the Board and that suitable amendments and nominations may be submitted at the annual meeting....I assure you that my interest and Mrs. Fuld's interest have become keener and keener as time has passed and that we will do all in our power to promote the objects for which the Institute was founded.

I beg you to accept our warm thanks for your invaluable cooperation and support, and we look to you to maintain the high standard at which a beginning is now to be made.²

The By-Laws were amended at the next meeting; the Founders became Honorary Trustees "for the terms of their respective lives;" they would "meet with the Trustees and with each and every committee of the Institute and participate in the deliberations of the Board and of the several committees." Technically, they were not given the right to vote, but that was academic, for the mere expression of their opinion, usually secured in advance of any proposal to act, was more influential than the vote of any other Trustee. Despite the formal changes, Mr. Bamberger continued to exercise control over the appointment of members of the standing committees and the selection of Members of the Corporation and Trustees. Also, he maintained a close watch over expenditures since he continued to countersign the Treasurer's checks.³ Their offices were combined with others; the amended By-Laws provided that in the following;

The person elected to the office of President shall also be the Chairman of the Board and the person elected as Vice-President shall also be the Vice-Chairman of the Board.

The full powers and duties of the President became those of the Chairman;

those of the Vice-President became those of a new officer, the Vice-Chairman.

The Committee on Educational Policy was eliminated. The provision for faculty trustees had been eliminated at the request of the Founders on 11th January, 1932, and a substitute providing that "members of the faculty not exceeding three in number shall sit with the Board in an advisory capacity to serve for a period of three years" was approved. Now it was amended again, this time to reinstate faculty trustees without limit in number.⁴

The Trustees, gratified by these evidences of confidence on the part of the donors, expressed their thanks and their determination to administer the Institute without discrimination "directly or indirectly because of race, religion or sex." The resolution continued:

True to the spirit which has animated Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld, the Trustees pledge themselves anew to the upbuilding of an institution devoted to the purest and highest type of scholarship and to the pursuit of methods calculated to make the Institute what the Founders desired -- a paradise for scholars. The Trustees join in expressing the hope that the Founders may live long in health and happiness, observing and participating in the growth of the Institute which they have established upon such a lofty basis and with such pure and high ideals.⁵

Mr. Houghton was re-elected Chairman. Because of ill health, his attendance at meetings was very irregular, and Flexner foresaw that the Vice-Chairman was to be a very important officer. He and Mr. Maass viewed things in much the same light, and co-operated in achieving their objectives; the Director would like to see the lawyer in the new office. Maass was not an officer in the first slate, which had been chosen by Mr. Bamberger, but he agreed informally to serve.

Frankly, I have given our Sunday discussion much thought and after mature reflection can merely say that you know perhaps better than anyone else the extent of my interest in the Institute and its future. If, therefore, you feel that carrying out the suggestion you had in mind will enable me to cooperate with you to promote the welfare of the project which both of us have so close to our hearts, I shall be glad to conform to your views. On the other hand, the depth of my interest is such that I will be content to continue to serve in the present, or any other capacity that may be suggested, so long as I may have a part in bringing to fruition what has had so auspicious a beginning...⁶

Dr. Flexner secured Mr. Bamberger's approval, and Maass was elected Vice-Chairman. It seemed to be a fortunate choice. He was assiduous in attendance and in preparation for the meetings. Mr. Houghton was able to attend less than half of the Board's sessions before his death in September 1941, and was present at but one meeting of the Executive Committee, while Mr. Maass was absent from only two Board meetings and one of the Executive Committee during the same period.

The unexpired terms of the Founders were filled at Flexner's suggestion by Messrs. Felix Frankfurter and Walter W. Stewart. Both men deliberated for some time before accepting the invitations extended informally by the Director and formally by Percy Straus, Chairman of the Committee on Nominations. Mr. Frankfurter's letter to Flexner, with a copy to Mr. Straus, showed how seriously the Harvard man took his new responsibilities, and with what firm convictions:

If I have delayed action upon your kind suggestion to have me join the Board of Directors of your Institute, it is not for lack of deep sympathy with your efforts or keen interest in the realization of the purposes of the Institute. Just because I so strongly hope for great things for learning and the promotion of higher learning in this country, I have been hesitating lest I undertake a responsibility which I cannot, even within my limited powers, discharge. You know how I feel about dummy directors in general, and most fiercely

about dummy educational directors. They seem to me to violate the spirit of the Holy Ghost most flagrantly.

In saying this I do not mean to overrate the functions of the members of the Board of an organization like your Institute, for of course the essential direction of the Institute should be by its members -- a society of scholars must be governed by scholars of that society; and yet, certainly at the outset, there may be a useful function for a Board -- a temporary period, as it were, in the stages of the ultimate government of the Institute.

I wanted to be sure that I had the available time to discharge such a conception as I have of the duties of a member of your Board. On the whole I do not feel justified in refusing on a speculation in view of the special case you made to me for the enlistment of the interest and experience of men like Stewart and myself, now that you are engaged in the establishment of what roughly I shall call a school of sociology. I am prepared, therefore, to accept membership on your Board if you and the Board are ready to have me, in the light of the attitude of mine disclosed in this letter -- which, of course, is no news to you -- as well as upon the distinct understanding that if I find I cannot responsibly discharge the obligations of the office, you will release me.⁷

The Director's response showed no misgivings about the lawyer's reservations. He knew how able an advocate Frankfurter could be, and perhaps relied upon his help in converting Mr. Bamberger to a more friendly attitude toward faculty participation in academic decisions, as his answer indicated:

I am sure that men like you and Stewart, looking at the problems of social life from somewhat different points of view, will prove of inestimable value to those who are in the last resort bound to do the job.

It is one of my main ambitions to illustrate in the conduct of this Institute what under American conditions the relative functions of faculty, Director and Trustees are and should be.⁸

Of Stewart's acceptance on the occasion of their second luncheon together Flexner wrote Mrs. Fuld, paraphrasing the economist's response thus:

'I have thought over your kind invitation, and I shall accept. In my judgment, there is no place in Europe or America where a school of economics or politics has been formed in such wise that economics can be placed on the level of scientific medicine or any of the exact sciences. Our main difficulty in the present crisis is that nobody knows anything, and we cannot in the midst of this storm find the truth in a hurry. As I understand it, you are proposing to create for economists the conditions which are enjoyed by physicists, mathematicians, etc. If you do, it will make a new era in the world, and I shall be very, very proud to contribute my experience both as professor and as business man to the slow upbuilding of such an enterprise.'⁹

Mr. Bamberger showed his approval in one of his rare letters.

As Mrs. Fuld agreed to take care of the correspondence, I have kept in the background. I am now making an exception to our rule to say that we appreciate the new prospective Trustees. They will add influence and prestige to the Institute.¹⁰

The Director's reference to the differing points of view of the new Trustees was a masterpiece of understatement. They were unlike in personality, temperament, politics, professional experience and objectives. Mr. Stewart was quiet, almost shy, self-effacing, but firm and decisive nevertheless. Frankfurter was ebullient, vocal, witty. Stewart counseled few; he was reluctant to give advice, and averse to "making a record." Mr. Frankfurter was quick to advise, eager to see his counsel followed. Both men were of small stature physically. Stewart was dignified, charming and reserved to the point of mystery. Frankfurter has been well described by Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.:

quick, articulate, jaunty...inexhaustible in his energy and curiosity, giving off sparks...He loved people, loved conversation, loved influence, loved life. Beyond his sparkling personal qualities, he had an erudite and incisive legal intelligence, a resourceful approach to questions of public policy, and a passion for raising standards of public service. And, to make these things effective, he had what Mr. Justice Holmes had not unkindly described in 1920 as 'an unimaginable gift for wiggling in wherever he wants to.'¹¹

While Stewart mistrusted "politicians," believing that industry, commerce and finance should be left to manage the nation's economy without interference by government, Frankfurter was all for extending public regulation to new areas of public concern through the agency of administrative law. Their differences could be further elaborated, but to little purpose since the story to be told reveals them. Suffice it to say that Frankfurter's readiness to take positions and debate them ardently contrasted with Mr. Stewart's instinct to play a silent, but not inactive, role. He prevailed on Flexner not to record his infrequent remarks in the minutes.¹² The record reveals that he had profound influence with the Director who shared his conservative political views.

Dr. Flexner knew neither man intimately. He had first heard of Mr. Stewart from Mr. Henry Clay, Economic Adviser to the Bank of England, in the spring of 1932, as he consulted him about economists for the Institute. Clay, formerly Professor of Economics at Manchester University, had succeeded Stewart at the Bank, and was not himself interested then in Flexner's invitation to come to the Institute for Advanced Study as professor. Understanding that the Director was eager to secure men who had both knowledge of theory and practical experience in business and government, Clay suggested his predecessor and one of Stewart's former students, Dr. Winfield W. Riefler, then at the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, and author of the definitive work on money rates and markets in the United States. Flexner found that Stewart and Riefler were devoted to their present activities. At his first meeting with Mr. Stewart, or his second, Flexner asked the economist to come to the Institute and establish a School of Economics. Stewart declined, feeling he was bound to stay with his

firm for the time being. But the offer was left open, and Stewart became Flexner's chief adviser on economics, both men anticipating that within months or a few years Stewart would return to academic life as professor at the Institute.¹³

Flexner evidently met Frankfurter through his brother Bernard Flexner, also a brilliant lawyer and friend of Mr. Justice Brandeis. As has been said, he consulted Mr. Frankfurter during 1931 as he planned the organization of the Institute. Late in 1932, despite their seeming differences over the manner of governing the Institute, he intimated that he would like a lawyer of Frankfurter's quality in the School of Economics, and ventured: "you, yourself, may be the fellow." The record reveals no response. Later, he renewed his attack indirectly, again without evoking an answer.¹⁴

Each of the new Trustees seemed to believe that the Director contemplated development of the new School in the way he would like to see it done. Flexner had always emphasized economics as being the subject of most importance in the social sciences; as a youth he had fallen in love with the political economy of Thomas Edward Cliffe Leslie. In Universities he mentioned politics as important also. As he prepared his Confidential Memorandum of September, 1931, some ambiguity crept into this clear view. He talked first of economics alone, quoting Mr. Justice Holmes on the man of the future -- the man of statistics and the master of economics. But several paragraphs later, probably as a result of Dr. Beard's telling blow, (See p.104) he had construed economics "in the broad sense, inclusive of political theory, ethics, and other subjects that are involved therein." But when he spoke of the kind of man he

wanted, it was of the economist, and not the philosopher; a man "by turns a student of practice and a thinker," in touch with the realities of business and government, and yet not identified with either, but close to both and capable of analyzing them objectively and accurately.

He spoke of the advantages the Institute could offer the man who "may elect to study thorny and contentious financial business or social problems; he can take his time...Whatever his conclusions, his intellectual integrity is not likely to be impaired or impugned. On this basis alone can a university or institute be in the world and of the world...and yet preserve its absolute independence and freedom of thought and speech."

As has been said, Mr. Frankfurter had expressed his agreement with Flexner's choice of mathematics and economics, differing with his attributing to mathematics what mathematicians were fond of claiming for their discipline -- its stimulation of music, poetry, philosophy and the other humanities. That with other similar criticism of his draft caused Flexner to revise it, so that as presented it claimed for mathematics only that it was the foundation of modern science.

When he met Walter Stewart, he found the man who exemplified almost precisely the qualities he sought. He had had academic experience. He had then inaugurated the system of statistics and economic analyses most relied upon by the government. He was now in business. Thus he was conversant with business and government at high levels; familiar too with the economic theories of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and aware the twentieth was still trying to get along on outmoded generalizations on the nature of the phenomena it sought to understand. There

was a mutuality in Stewart's and Flexner's interest and understanding of the field. Thus Flexner wrote Dr. Aydelotte that "Stewart has decided that the way in which we are approaching the subject of economics is the most hopeful in the entire field today."¹⁵

Walter Stewart was at this time a master of monetary and banking theory and practice, and an outstanding economic analyst. A graduate of the University of Missouri, he was financial editor of the St. Louis Times before he began teaching economics, which he did for twelve years, first as assistant and associate professor at University of Missouri and at Michigan, and then, (1916-1922) as full professor at Amherst. He was greatly admired and respected by his students and colleagues, several of whom kept their friendships and contacts through the years. For the two years preceding his going to Amherst he was both student and colleague of Thorstein Veblen, iconoclast and satirist of the American society and particularly of its leaders in business and finance. A warm friendship endured until Veblen died in 1929; one is given to understand by Isaiah Dorfmann, biographer of Veblen, that the two men were close and companionable. Since Mr. Stewart was to exhibit none of the qualities of a rebel, it may have been Veblen's influence which led Stewart to write a sardonic parody of the Declaration of Independence in discussing J. P. Morgan & Company's disposition / of an application for a loan by revolution-torn Mexico.¹⁶ And perhaps Stewart's leaving Amherst was another instance of the same influence; Veblen's independence in personal conduct and in the freedom with which he spoke his mind that had shortened several of his successive university connections. Circumstances were different here. In June, 1923, Amherst's Trustees dismissed President Alexander Meikeljohn

because of his liberal policies, and Mr. Dwight W. Morrow, Morgan partner and influential trustee, tried to persuade Stewart to take the office, with the concession that his friend Meikeljohn could remain as head of the Department of Philosophy. Stewart declined, and resigned with several of his colleagues in protest.¹⁷ Neither episode seemed to prejudice him in subsequent relations with the House of Morgan which appear to have been quite close over the next decade.

During his sabbatical leave (1922-1923) the economist had reorganized and directed the technical economic studies conducted by the Federal Reserve Board's Division of Research and Statistics; he returned to it as Director until 1926, when he became chief economist of the Wall Street investment securities firm of Case, Pomeroy & Company. Meanwhile he had become the chief economic adviser to Governor Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank who, supported by the City's great banking houses, had asserted and exercised control over the monetary policies of the new central banking system of the United States from its inception.¹⁸

The twenties witnessed the partnership of Strong and Governor Montagu Norman of the Bank of England in efforts to stabilize the currencies of Europe and re-establish gold as their foundation. Walter Stewart served constantly as Strong's adviser during these Herculean labors until he went to the Bank of England as its first Economic Adviser at the end of 1927. There he installed a system of statistical and economic studies like those of the Federal Reserve Board, and also acted as the liaison between the two central banks, remaining until April, 1930, though Strong died in October, 1928. The policies and practices of the

two great central banking systems as they struggled with the problems of international finance in the post-war period were those of the powerful American and British private bankers. Both banks were privately owned, and their owners were dedicated to the conviction that monetary controls belonged by right in their hands, and were not within the purview of governments. Thus sterling was returned to the gold standard in 1925 at its pre-war value by their mutual agreement. The pound could not maintain its position if interest rates in the United States were allowed to equal or exceed British rates. Support of Britain in these circumstances required Strong on occasion to adopt domestic policies which were said to conflict with the best interests of the American economy.

Notable in such case was Strong's action in easing credit in the United States in mid-1927, which aided England in the crisis but contributed to American inflation and to the orgy of stock-market speculation culminating in the crash of October, 1929, for which he was much criticized on grounds both of substance and method.¹⁹ No believers in political remedies for derangements in the economy, Strong and his advisers either could not think of any specific controls to limit market speculation, specifically, or were unwilling to propose measures for legislation giving the Federal Reserve Board more power. Thus it remained to New Deal advisers, notably two of Mr. Frankfurter's young lawyers, acting in cooperation with Dr. Riefler and other financial experts, to devise one specific: i.e., prescription of margins in brokers' loans by the Federal Reserve Board.²⁰ It was not long after the conference leading to the mid-1927 action that the rumor spread that Walter Stewart

was going to London to become Economic Adviser to the Bank of England. And that, because he was relatively unknown to the financial press, caused some frantic exploration of his background. What was gleaned came from his former students. When he left London in April, 1930, his departure was marked by expressions of the deepest esteem and affection.

Stewart rejoined Case, Pomeroy & Company, as Chairman of the Board, and continued, according to the press, to execute confidential missions for Governor George L. Harrison of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Governor Eugene Meyer of the Federal Reserve Board, and Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon. These he undertook with admirable dispatch and secrecy, moving with apparent invisibility between Europe and the United States, between New York and Washington. Indeed, he has been called the "grey eminence" of American finance of the period. Unlike the friar François du Tremblay, he did not walk vast distances in rope sandals and worn cassock, but like him Stewart, simple and unassuming, melted into the commonalty, holding great power in his quiet hands. Only once did he doff his cloak of invisibility and assume an assignment publicly; late in 1931 he represented Governor Harrison on an international committee called to advise the Bank for International Settlements on Germany's ability to resume reparations payments at the expiration of the moratorium then in effect. By virtue of his excellent economic preparation, his firmness and his tact, he caused his confreres on the Committee to take into consideration the vast commercial credits owed United States interests by Germany and other European countries, and to recognize, despite their reluctance to do so, that reparations and the commercial credits were in fact related, and must be dealt with accordingly.

Stewart was generally recognized as "the brains" behind the highly successful investment counsels of his firm. As a follower of Mr. J. M. Keynes' use of arbitrage, (although he opposed vigorously Keynes' general economic theories) he impressed Mrs. Raymond B. Fosdick, a client, with his success in handling her account in the adverse circumstances of the times. He met her husband, and became a friend of the family. Mr. Fosdick was so impressed with Stewart's quiet wisdom and his financial acumen that he secured his election as a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation, despite an inability to get the prior approval of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who was traveling abroad. When Mr. Rockefeller met Stewart, and observed his success with the Foundation's portfolio, he was pleased, and insisted that Stewart become also a member of the General Education Board. Later, when the philanthropist retired from the chairmanship of the two boards, he insisted that Stewart take his place, and the economist occupied both posts until he retired at age sixty-five.²¹

As the new Administration took office in 1933 in Washington, and newspapermen indulged their fancies as to cabinet members and other officers, Mr. Stewart was mentioned as possible Under-secretary of the Treasury, and Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. But there was little chance that he would be asked or would have accepted a post in the new Administration. For it was soon evident that the new government was determined to take from the New York bankers the power to control the nation's monetary system which had so long rested in their hands. The philosophy of Benjamin Strong, Stewart, Norman, and their supporters was rejected along with their practices; the interests of the nation

were to be asserted in a series of moves, some successful and some not, but all dedicated to shifting the center of financial power to Washington from New York.

Felix Frankfurter took his law degree from Harvard in 1906, and entered the practice of law under Henry L. Stimson, then United States attorney at New York. After eight years in public practice, he was called to the Harvard Law School, where he remained until President Roosevelt appointed him to the United States Supreme Court in 1939. Politically he was first identified with the Bull Moose Party, supporting such programs as public hydro-electric power and reformed welfare and labor legislation. During these years he briefed and sometimes argued before the Supreme Court cases arising under welfare law. He worked to elect Franklin Roosevelt in 1932, and according to Mr. Schlesinger, declined the President's offer to appoint him Solicitor General in 1933, saying that he could be more helpful to the new Administration as a "professorial free-lance."²² (According to his biographical account in Who's Who he had declined Governor Ely's offer of an appointment to the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts in 1932.) He aided the Administration by sending to Washington young and brilliant attorneys for government service who probably would have gone into private practice in normal times.

In the early years of the New Deal Frankfurter and his mentor and friend, Mr. Justice Louis D. Brandeis, disapproved of the basic social and economic policies of the national planners in Washington. Later their own policies came to the fore. Frankfurter, quoted by Mr. Schlesinger as saying in 1931 that government expenditures not matched by revenues showed

cowardice, met John Maynard Keynes in England during the first year of the new Administration and became converted to Keynes' conviction that if private spending did not support the economy, public, even deficit, spending must. It was some time before the Administration was forced to adopt the policy, though Frankfurter did what he could to see that President Roosevelt had the opportunity to meet Keynes and study his theories.²³

Frankfurter spent his first year as Trustee of the Institute at Oxford as George Eastman Professor, thanks to Aydelotte and Flexner. His absence from the country was to prove disastrous in his relations with the Director. Frankfurter's energetic attack on matters which engaged his special interest, his quick wit unrestrained by concern for the target, and after his election as Trustee his suddenly manifested impatience with Flexner's somewhat labored humor, had clouded relations even before he left for England in the summer of 1933. Flexner learned that a certain kind of playfulness was not helpful in writing to the new Trustee. Nor was his tendency to resort to hyperbole when he found himself unwilling or unable to disclose his position fully. It simply provoked the lawyer to deadly riposte which silenced intercourse. Indeed, Flexner had occasion to note that with his election to the Board Frankfurter's attitude changed. Thus as soon as he received notice of his election, he chided himself for his "thoughtlessness" about his commitment to Oxford, and again deplored "dummy" membership on educational boards. Flexner, in high good humor, replied that his situation was understood when he was elected, and that he wouldn't characterize being Eastman Professor as being a "dummy." Frankfurter replied stiffly:

No, I don't expect to be wholly a dummy at Oxford, but it does imply my absence...You will have to put up with my pedantry -- for about a few things which used to be called 'principles' I am a little fussy....It is...essential for my own serenity that in a formal way I be given leave of absence from your Board.²⁴

The first candidate for the second School who was discussed by Flexner and Frankfurter was Dr. Jacob Viner of the University of Chicago, who was commended to the Director by some of the European economists, notably Schumpeter, who considered him the best of the academic Americans, and by Taussig, Beard, Broadus Mitchell and others with the same opinion. Frankfurter gave Viner his unqualified endorsement, writing on 7th January, 1932:

I have tested Viner by encountering his mind on economic matters in which the law was implicated and as to which for years I have done a good deal of worrying. I found that I was up against a tougher and acuter mind than that of most of my colleagues whose job it is to deal with the legal questions that Viner was canvassing. Above all I value in Viner an intellectual rectitude that allows him to go wherever his mind carries him, undeflected by those considerations of optimism and prudence which subtly corrode the hardy thinking of so many scholars in America in social economics these days. Viner is like Keynes in his intellectual ruthlessness, in not mixing his insight with his desires or his hopes or in shrinking from the disagreeable.²⁵

Flexner had already met and talked with Viner twice, and promised Frankfurter to make further occasions to meet him. But it is apparent that he had not given the Chicago man serious consideration. He had found Viner's views as to useful research in economics different from his own. Nevertheless, he had requested the economist to inform him about contemporary American schools of thought and method, and Viner had presented him with an admirable short essay. He advised the appointment of the best of the European men: one who would not be wedded to

any specialty in the field, and who would be competent to research in any of them and adapt his method to the subject of inquiry. Above all, such a man must approach American economists and their methods with a fully developed critical viewpoint. Viner himself seemed inclined to favor the vanishing school of thought which treated economics as

primarily a social philosophy with special emphasis on the business organization of society, on standards of living, class stratification, prosperity and poverty, etc...usually with a marked ethical flavor....Economics here is...far away in the subject matter and methods of reaching its conclusions from the 'scientific' disciplines like physics and chemistryIt should have no pretensions to being scientific, but it should not, on that account, have too much of an inferiority complex.

The professor was very critical of the so-called "institutionalists" and the quantitative schools of thought toward which he found Flexner gravitating.²⁶

Despite their differing views, Flexner did not tell Frankfurter then that he was not really considering Viner. However, in the winter of 1934 the two friends became alienated, and Flexner took occasion to end discussion of the economist when it was announced that Mr. Morgenthau had appointed him to be one of his consultants. Then he wrote Frankfurter:

I am afraid Viner's relationship with Morgenthau and the need of cooperation in doing polite things may hurt him, although there is always the possibility it may simply enrich him.²⁷

The first appointment to the second School came about before the Director was really ready, and seems to have led Flexner into a different concept of it. Dr. David Mitrany, a Roumanian living in England, an internationalist, journalist and political scientist, had been a

friend of the Director since 1928. Flexner had been instrumental in Harvard's invitation to the journalist to take a visiting professorship for two years terminating in the spring of 1933.²⁸ Mitrany had met Frankfurter through Flexner and found a thoroughly congenial friend in him.

Dr. Mitrany asked Flexner to invite him to the Institute for a year to enable him to write a certain paper. Though the Director declined because he was not ready to organize the School of Economics, he expressed interest in Mitrany's possible later appointment.²⁹ Strangely, it was the offer of an appointment to Yale, where the political scientist had also lectured, and news that Harvard was seeking funds with which to call him in permanently, which precipitated the question of his employment by the Institute. During February Frankfurter added his weight to that of Mitrany, who for personal reasons did not want to remain away from England, and by the 21st Flexner acted on a consensus between them that Mitrany should be nominated at the annual meeting, to return to England for the next academic year to study the organization of the new School, hopefully to be opened in October 1934. The plan was carried out.³⁰

During this period Flexner had been led to decide on a broader School, to embrace not only economics, but political science, history and "a lawyer like Frankfurter." Mitrany made clear that he regarded some synthesis of knowledge in the social sciences essential, although he conceded that each scholar should "specialize in some field." The important thing in his mind was that "the members of the group should start with some sympathy of outlook upon their common road." He frankly

doubted the capacity of any economist to cooperate fully, to become part of a congenial group, without which he feared little of use would be accomplished. To this, Flexner replied that he was sure the three men were in total agreement that "the problem of society has got to be attacked by a congenial group from various angles...but not at the sacrifice of brains and originality to amiability or congeniality and second-rateness." Flexner added his wish that "Felix and Stewart will come to the Board."³¹

Mitrany suggested from the first a survey of the fields generally understood to comprise the social sciences so that a synthesis of existing knowledge and suggestions for specialized researches to be pursued in future might be obtained. But Flexner fended this off, and happily suggested that since Mitrany and Frankfurter would meet at Oxford, near which Mitrany lived, they might confer frequently together and also at times with his great friend Professor Llewellyn Woodward, a historian at All Souls.

Mitrany and Flexner carried on a voluminous correspondence during 1934. Throughout this, they drifted ever farther apart, so that by year's end they were frankly at odds. So were Flexner and Frankfurter, whose correspondence was truncated early, as will be described. Meanwhile, Flexner drew ever closer to Mr. Stewart, whose counsels carried him along the paths he had followed in Universities and in his organization memorandum: i.e., the emphasis on economics studied "scientifically."

Mitrany continued to urge that the planning of the School be put into the hands of a group of eminent social scientists who should be called together at Princeton for the purpose. This Flexner vetoed, saying

that neither he nor the Trustees would entrust that power to a group with whom they would have no influence. The political scientist also asked the Director to bring to Princeton a professor of sociology at the London School to advise him; the professor was about to take his sabbatical leave. But Flexner doubted the validity of sociology as a social science; moreover, he had read the latest book of the London man, and found it "scopey," a term of disparagement used by Frederick Gates to describe diffuse scholarly effort. Other suggestions and supporting arguments were made. Toward the end of October 1934 Mitrany summarized his various suggestions which Flexner had considered individually.

These are some main aspects of the work that might be undertaken, and inter-related, in the social sciences:

1. Sociology. Comparative study of certain social institutions and factors.
2. Economics. An analysis of the economic aspect of social institutions and of the social aspect of economic institutions.
3. Biology. The reality of social selection.
4. Psychology. The differential social psychology reflected in social institutions.
5. Philosophy. Re-examination and re-evaluation of the idea of progress.

On the scientific side, a survey and valuation of the available knowledge would in itself be a most timely contribution, and the only sound starting point for fresh research as well as for any attempt at philosophical restatement.

Finally Flexner brought the discussion back to his own original idea.

As I conceive the School of Economics and Politics, we are going to try to re-examine the postulates of economic theory

and to take a very objective view of political theory of government.³²

Meanwhile, an unfortunate impasse had been reached between Frankfurter and Flexner. It arose over the question of the Institute's policy on professorial salaries, and was touched off by a question from Frankfurter in December 1933 when he received a copy of the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting at which Hermann Weyl was appointed. He asked Flexner what his intention was as to salaries in the second School. Flexner hedged a bit, then recited the salaries so far established, which were at two different rates, with differing provisions for retiring annuities. In the argument which followed, he might have stood reasonably on the ground that the salary rates were justified according to the age and qualifications of the recipients. But he could not, for he was even then intending to complete the second School and initiate the third in the face of inadequate funds to enable payment of salaries according to the scale set in the School of Mathematics. Indeed, he was short of funds, and contemplated the necessity of offering salaries lower than any heretofore paid. But as was his habit, he would not admit his embarrassment. Instead, he defended individually-negotiated salaries on the ground that the English and German universities followed that practice. Moreover, he argued that he had arranged grants for study on the basis of individual need at the General Education Board, with what he termed complete success.³³

Mr. Frankfurter advocated classified salary rates objectively applied, and warned that individually-negotiated salaries were alien to institutions in the United States and were inevitably sources of discord

and discontent among scholars. Vainly he urged his policy on the Director with cogent arguments based on his academic experience. Flexner dismissed both by saying that everything being presently done at the Institute was "experimental," and therefore subject to change. The lawyer argued that in the meantime harm would be done. Moreover, he did not want to hear anything more for some time about the German universities; they had not offered effective and courageous opposition to Hitler's depredations, possibly because of the effects of the individual bargaining to which the professors had been subjected. The Director lapsed into hyperbole: the Institute was "a paradise for scholars," who really did not care for money, but only for the search for truth.³⁴

This touched off an explosion. Frankfurter, exasperated, replied that he did not

think it very helpful to take too seriously the exuberant rhetoric of thinking of the Institute as a 'paradise for scholars.' For one thing, the natural history of paradise is none too encouraging as a precedent. Apparently it was an excellent place for one person, but it was fatal even for two -- or at least for two when the snake entered, and the snake seems to be an early and congenial companion of man. Really, figures of speech are among the most fertile sources of intellectual confusion. Let's try to aim at something human, for we are dealing with humans and not with angels. I do not know by what right you may hope for a combination of greater disinterestness and capacity than, say, the Harvard Law School is able to attract, or, let us say, than is now found in the Supreme Court...I can assure you that neither of these institutions could be conducted on the assumption that it is a paradise. In both personal interactions play an important part; in both personal sensitiveness has not been wanting because of personal differentiations.

Temporary grants-in-aid were not to be compared with salary rates for permanent staff; he added:

I need not repeat the grounds of my objection. But I may say that such a society as I envisage precludes an administrator who plays Lady Bountiful or, to keep my sex straight, Kris Kringle....The Institute's concern is so to fix salaries as to enable a man to live as a civilized gentleman in a world in which the family is the ordinary social unit. You seem to me to have a little bit too much of the administrator's confidence in assuming (a) that you can spot the man 'who is trying to make a good bargain,' or (b) that you could plan the life of a man who is too shy or too proud to enter into the realm of bargaining. And if you'll forgive me for saying so, you also have a little bit of the optimism of the administrator who thinks his scheme 'works perfectly' because evils have not yet disclosed themselves, and particularly have not been disclosed to him.

From all of which you will gather that I feel very strongly about this. It is only one aspect of my conviction that a society of scholars implies a democratic aristocracy like unto the self-government by which say, Balliol is conducted. This implies impersonal equality and self-government by the group. Those are the aims to which I am committed. I write this frankly because you may think that, holding these views, I may not be a very useful member for your Board. If so, I'd better get off before I am on. In putting this to you, I am quite impersonal. It has nothing to do with our personal relations, and they would remain what they were before, were you to tell me that perhaps it is just as well that I resign before I become active.³⁵

The Director did not reply in the heat of his first reaction. He was a proud man, and sensitive as only a sentimental person can be. He consulted Dr. Aydelotte before answering. Then it was apparent that the sarcasm had found its mark; he reproved Frankfurter for his "bluntness." He had never attended a Board meeting at which some reference to German universities was not made, and probably never would. His "exuberant rhetoric" was merely a manner of speaking colorfully; men now and then engaged in such flights. He did not regard himself as an administrator; he was fully capable of directing the Institute. He gave not an inch and concluded with perfunctory politesse and the hope that "we may continue to enjoy the benefits of your co-operation and experience

as a member of the Board.³⁶

Mr. Frankfurter, aware now that Flexner did not care if he did resign, consulted his good friend Bernard Flexner, who in turn confided copies of the correspondence to Simon. The pathologist expressed admiration for the lawyer's "unusual clarity of insight, as well as felicity and power of expression." But, he added:

So far as Abe is concerned, he has had battles to fight at the General Education Board and has not sidestepped them. He also does not lack courage and conviction. I have no doubt that he will welcome Felix on his Board just as warmly now that he knows his opposing points of view.³⁷

Simon confirmed his brother's statement that young men at the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research were paid just enough so that they could be attracted by other institutions; however, when a man proved he was worthy of retention, he was given a salary in line with a "fixed scale" according to his class. Then he added a statement from his profound wisdom.

And yet, I have almost from the first run into those common human traits of selfishness, envy, jealousy, prestige, which must arise in a body of men. This is irrespective of the fact that the men who are striving and stewing could not be as well off as they are anywhere else in the country -- and they know this. At this very moment I am having a struggle, which should be impossible, all the circumstances considered. It involves the very principle of the existence of the Institute as a center of high productive research. Theoretically, the person on the staff involved is all for the principle; but personally he cannot see 'the wood for the trees,' and would block action if he could.

In other words, he is just an ordinary human being, along with being a fine craftsman...

One of our Trustees asked me how I accounted for the fact that occasionally a gifted scientist would let himself do so regrettable an act as to behave in an underhanded manner one way or another. I have had to answer this kind of question

often, and the answer is, as I see it, that he is just a human being before he is a fine scientist.³⁸

Undoubtedly reassured by whatever Ben Flexner wrote, Mr. Frankfurter replied to the Director's letter after a pleasurable vacation in Palestine, thereby bringing a fine philosophical detachment to the troubled atmosphere. His tone was placatory, friendly, informal. But he yielded no ground, and in defining his own idea of the Institute he was eloquent. It was precisely because

I care about...scholarship and learning so passionately that I want to see it promoted under conditions that are not self-defeating. And I must say that I derive much more direction by characterizing our aim as the creation of a 'society of scholars.' Only god (sic) can create a paradise for anybody, but by pooling their efforts, their disinterestedness, their confidence in one another, unimpeded by obstructive conditions, of which financial differentiation is one of the most potent in the world, a group of equals can, in course of time, evolve themselves into a society of scholars...

The basis of remuneration and the procedure, including objective classification, by which salaries are fixed, are matters which I deem central for a self-respecting society of scholars and therefore central for the realization of the ideal of learning which you and I share...Your...reply...leaves the central point of the communication unattended....³⁹

Individually-determined salaries themselves constituted decisions of policy; he wondered "whether the Board of Trustees adequately discussed what is involved in those individual decisions."

The Director was not mollified. He did not respond. Correspondence between the two languished. Mr. Frankfurter did not withdraw from the Board.

In June 1934 Dr. Flexner and Mr. Stewart sailed for England in the same ship. In contrast to the contentious spirit prevailing between himself and Frankfurter, Flexner found Mr. Stewart's tactful guidance

and the luxury of agreeing with him delightful indeed. He wrote Mr. Bamberger of his great confidence in the economist; Mr. Stewart would be the best possible man to head the School of Economics and Politics and to organize it, for he possessed a rare combination of knowledge and experience and was greatly interested in what might be accomplished by the Institute in his field. He was arranging for Flexner to meet the leading English economists. Again the Director wrote and said that he was exploring possible appointments, and was collecting the works of various economists which Stewart and others would read and evaluate for him.⁴⁰

While Flexner was at Oxford he interviewed a mathematical economist, a young Russian émigré, whom he and Stewart had evidently already discussed. Young Dr. Jacob Marschak was active in statistical work at All Souls. Flexner wrote Stewart in London:

Marschak may prove to be the man. He is most attractive and plainly able. I have his reprints. He actually worked with von Neumann in Berlin and knows Graham of Princeton, who has invited him to lecture there...⁴¹

This note raises a question about Mr. Stewart's thinking. At his first Board meeting (October 1933) he had talked to the Trustees about the economics program. The minutes said merely there was a consensus that "a historical approach to the fresh study...would be more fruitful than an approach upon lines hitherto pursued." The opinion prevailed that it would be wise to take promising young men who were uncommitted on controversial issues for periods of three to five years "during which their powers would be disclosed." At the time Flexner elaborated on this in a letter to Frankfurter, asking him to keep his eyes open for some younger

men of the type described:

Walter Stewart was very clear that we ought in view of existing experiments and conditions to make a fresh and scientific approach from the historic side. He was of the opinion that we would not get far with men who had already committed themselves about so many of the problems with which a school of this sort must concern itself. He thought in the long run we should do far better to take younger men of promise for a period of prolonged probation. It will be a slow development compared with mathematics, but Stewart thought that this method of approach offered the best chances of making a contribution of value to the field.

Frankfurter seemed to agree, but observed that such young men were "scarce as white crows."⁴²

At the same meeting Flexner and Dr. Sabin introduced the name of Dr. Edward Meade Earle to the Trustees. He was a young professor of history at Barnard and Columbia who was ill with what Flexner chose to call "an attack of tuberculosis." It will be recalled that Flexner had suggested his name for the Board of Trustees in May, 1930. This like his frequent cheerful letters to the sick man, had probably a therapeutic design. Earle was recommended highly by Dr. Beard. The following letter was one of the many which Dr. Flexner sent the sick man to encourage him in his uphill fight for life. It refers to the Board discussion.

Walter Stewart was present, and I previously had asked him to think the thing over and give us his views. They coincided with the views which have been gradually maturing in my own mind: namely, that we cannot begin in economics and history with a group of seasoned and distinguished persons as we have begun in mathematics...but that we shall have to take younger men and give them opportunity to show what is in them. So far I had gone in my own thinking.

Stewart went further. He made the point that,

inasmuch as economists have almost all published things, they have committed themselves to one form or another of economic thinking, whereas the economic world in which we are now living should be re-examined and not particularly from an econ-

omic point of view but from an historic view. He was strongly in favor, therefore, of starting off in the field of history with younger men, who would find themselves able to delve into the economic aspects of historical study. He is reading your book on the Baghdad Railway and likes it very much.

Miss Sabin and I both spoke of you as having known you from our own personal experience and as having been recommended to us by Professor Beard. I thought you would be interested to know that things are moving and that your name has actually been mentioned to the Board in connection with the next school which we shall organize within a reasonable period of time -- no hurry.⁴³

What this letter meant to the still desperately ill man may be imagined. The Board voted to appoint him for one year at half-pay on sick leave, provided Dr. Sabin found the medical prognosis satisfactory on her next visit to him at Colorado Springs, with a second year on the same basis permitted. The report was optimistic, and Flexner used the authority given him to put Earle on the payroll. The action was confirmed in October 1934.⁴⁴ Earle moved to Saranac in 1935, visited the Institute and the Founders briefly in the spring of 1936, suffered a cruel relapse which necessitated further operative treatment, and after another year and more of recuperation came to the Institute in the fall of 1937, to undertake his work.

The first full-dress discussion of the School of Economics and Politics occurred in October 1934 when Frankfurter attended his first meeting. Dr. Flexner reported in part:

I devoted two-thirds of the summer in Europe with a view to securing a nucleus in the subjects of economics and politicsIt is clear to me that in.../these fields/ which should be broadly conceived as the field of social justice, we shall have to proceed somewhat differently from the method pursued in dealing with mathematics. The sort of mathematics in which scientific men are interested today has a history that

is at least one hundred fifty years old. The economics that is in vogue is upon a very different basis. More and more as I conferred with men who are dealing with economic problems both in universities and in public life, I became convinced that economics ought to be viewed as a clinical science.... Men who are concerned with its teaching and investigation ought also to be men who have been in contact with practical problems of business and government. On the other hand, while the men working in economics must not be aloof from practical life, they ought not to be diverted to the performance of current tasks....The methods of developing economic science, which seem to me to be most promising, bear therefore a certain resemblance to what has happened historically in other fields.⁴⁵

Then the Director, noting that Mitrany was a specialist in government, and Earle interested in economic history, said he looked forward now to the addition of an economist; he had a list of a dozen or so young men who had not "committed themselves in writing" on controversial issues in the field, and hoped he could present a nomination at the next meeting.

Mr. Frankfurter differed; the evolution of economic principles resembled that of the law rather than of the medical sciences. The study should be historical rather than clinical. "Small groups should be called in for limited periods in hope of uncovering and defining the real problems." Mr. Stewart was recorded as saying only that the younger men should not advance beyond the probationary status until and unless they proved their worth. Professor Veblen suggested that they be brought in as "workers," as were the temporary members of the School of Mathematics; thus their academic connections would not be disturbed. The minutes reflected a consensus:

It seemed to be agreed that with the exception of a small permanent nucleus it would be unwise to make many additional appointments for terms of three to five years which would involve the withdrawal of men from their own institutions and thereby impair the freedom of the Institute in dealing with them.⁴⁶

When Mr. Maass received the minutes, he remonstrated with Flexner over the omission of Mr. Stewart's complete remarks. Flexner answered:

I promised Mr. Stewart personally that his name would not be mentioned in connection with any expression of opinion.

It seems to me that in preparing the minutes we must make the following distinctions: the chairman of a committee or the Director, who makes a report, is presumed to have given the matter careful thought and to be ready to stand by his words. We can therefore be named, but the Trustees discuss matters informally and may wish to change their minds. They will hesitate to speak freely if a permanent record of their names is made.⁴⁷

Though it might have been reasonable to hold that Mr. Stewart spoke with some authority in his subject, the matter stood thus. Meanwhile Flexner, in an excess of caution, asked Frankfurter if he cared to elaborate on or correct Mrs. Bailey's notes on his remarks.⁴⁸

Two weeks after the Board met, the Director polled by letter the members of the Executive Committee asking authorization to call Dr. Jaboc Marschak to the United States for interviews. Eight signified their approval; Mr. Frankfurter alone opposed the idea, and vigorously so. He challenged: (1) Flexner's right to consider a mathematical economist without prior discussion with the Trustees; (2) and his good faith in not having disclosed his interest in Marschak at the last meeting. (3) He questioned the wisdom of appointing first an economist unfamiliar with the American economy, and (4) asserted that to call an émigré with temporary status for interviews over such a distance would entitle him to believe that an appointment was assured.

Letters flew back and forth. Flexner answered that at the time of the Board meeting Professor von Neumann had not finished reading

Marschak's papers, but had eliminated several of the "dozen young economists" on grounds of poor mathematical powers. Now the mathematician insisted on interviews with the economist before giving his approval. As for Marschak's competence as an economist, (Frankfurter had insisted that mathematical competence was not enough) the Director said he had assured himself that economists here and abroad commended him. Frankfurter asked pointedly for Mr. Stewart's opinion; it was not forthcoming. As for calling Dr. and Mrs. Marschak for interviews, Flexner conceded it might have some effect on the émigré's opportunities at Oxford, and agreed not to proceed until he had first consulted the Warden of All Souls. The contested point emerged; did the Director have the sole responsibility to investigate candidates for appointment when there was yet no faculty in the School, and to nominate its members, or should the Trustees share it with him? Flexner maintained that the right and responsibility to investigate and nominate rested with him in the circumstances, and that the Trustees had only the right to approve or to disapprove his proposals. Frankfurter asserted that, absent a faculty in the School, each Trustee shared that responsibility with the Director.⁴⁹

Early in the argument Flexner agreed not to proceed until he had heard from the Warden of All Souls; this was because he now had another candidate. Obliquely he revealed the fact to the lawyer. But Frankfurter was intent on winning the argument over the principles. He sent copies of his and Flexner's letters to Messrs. Aydelotte and Stewart, apparently with the intention of gaining their support in bringing the whole question before the Board for consideration. Mr. Stewart returned the correspondence without answering the pointed question as to his

attitude on the acceptability of Marschak as the first economist at the Institute:

As matters now stand, I gather that Flexner does not intend, prior to a general discussion either with the Board or the Executive Committee, to go further with the Marschak proposal than to make a confidential inquiry of the Warden of All Souls. Since we will have this opportunity for an exchange of views, I am not now inclined to comment on the various issues arising out of the correspondence. While I take my responsibilities as Trustee seriously, as a correspondent I rate myself very low. I have for years enjoyed a bad reputation as a letter writer and I am sure you will not take it as a lack of interest in the issues you raise, that I should prefer to discuss them orally rather than by an exchange of letters.

Dr. Aydelotte, sorrowed by the illness and death of his mother, attempted to defend and uphold Flexner, but in doing so offended him by referring to his responsibilities and privileges as being "administrative," a characterization which the Director rejected. But gratitude for the support soon won over his pique.⁵⁰

Meanwhile a happy circumstance had rendered moot the Marschak matter. Toward the end of October Dr. Flexner learned that Dr. Winfield Riefler was considering giving up his positions in Washington and promptly met him, while Mr. Stewart arranged a conference in New York at which the possibility of Riefler's coming to the Institute was discussed. As a result, Riefler prepared a brief outline of the kind of study he thought it worthwhile to undertake at the Institute, sending copies to both Flexner and his former teacher. Briefly, he mentioned the confusion which prevailed in the field; the total lack of any

central core of accepted verifiable generalizations, such as are found in other major disciplines. There is no unity in the various subdivisions of intensive specialization, nor is there a common body of logic to serve as intellectual tools in the development of new hypotheses on the frontiers of advanced study. As a result there is confusion in accredited professional economic judgment on almost any major

problem...This has been emphasized during the past few years of divergent counsels when economists as a group have almost universally failed to speak with an authoritative voice either in their analyses of...events or in their proposals for their ameliorization or cure. Indeed, when professional counsel is most urgently demanded, economists have been found widely divided even upon questions of basic import where professional competence could be presumed to be final.

The difficulty lay in the inapplicability of basic assumptions inherited from the past to modern phenomena. He selected for particular study the American phenomena of heavy industry and durable goods, and their impact and significance on the accompanying financial aspects of the economy, necessitating studies of savings and investment, of security and mortgage markets, money markets, foreign exchanges and currencies.

As a start, he said such investigations could lead to discoveries essential to an understanding of modern economic conditions, while lack of a defined objective could lead to more of the prevailing confusion. The Institute could contribute by formulating the special problems to be tested; this would require the collection of data not already being assembled or studied, which would be gathered by universities, research institutions and governmental agencies.

The Institute's faculty would be small and flexible, with a small clerical and statistical staff. They would maintain close personal contact with the institutions collecting and studying economic data to forge the materials basic to the research. The program would be chiefly confined to research; there would be no classes, and little opportunity for students as such,

but ample opportunity for close contact between intellectual workers on a common group of projects of high promise. Part of this group will be brought to Princeton, part will be working in the universities, and an important part will be located at centers of specialized research. The Institute should not

consider itself as a location but rather as a source of mental ferment embracing all of the advanced students.⁵¹

It would be difficult to imagine a more equivocal statement than Riefler's memorandum evoked from Mr. Stewart.

I am very much impressed with the memorandum Riefler sent you. It seems to be a cogent and effective presentation of his case, and I am persuaded that in making a start, it is probably wise to select some field of interest and use the problems in that field as a basis for selecting personnel and of establishing some unity in the work.

Whether the problem which Riefler has outlined is the problem is another question. From the form of his memorandum, I judge that with him it is a question of 'Love me, love my problem.' It forces us to a decision as to whether we want both him and his problem. He has the advantages of youth, energy, enthusiasm and intelligence, and has apparently reached the stage of intellectual maturity where he is possessed with a problem.

In economics, my preference runs toward someone who is possessed with some concrete problem but who is prepared to deal with its general implications. This seems to me to furnish the best hope of escaping from the vagueness of superficiality which has affected so much current work in economics, and of establishing a fresh approach.⁵²

If Dr. Flexner noticed the ambivalence he did not show it. Perhaps his ear was not tuned to the academic idiom. It is more likely, however, that he overlooked the nuances, for he had satisfied himself that Dr. Riefler was highly regarded in Washington as a most accomplished economist, and that he stood uncommitted on controversial issues since his writings in the Federal Reserve Board's Bulletin were anonymous. Indeed, it was in the very multiplicity of demands for Riefler's services that his own discontent lay. In addition to his regular duties in the Division of Research and Statistics at the Federal Reserve Board, to which Stewart had called him in 1923, he served as Economic Adviser (1933-1934) of the Executive Committee of the Board, and to the National

Emergency Council, and Chairman of the new Central Statistical Board. Moreover, Flexner suffered from the pressure exerted by Mr. Frankfurter, and wanted an early decision on the important first appointment in economics.

Mr. Stewart had commented favorably on one aspect of Riefler's memorandum: its insistence on starting with a specific problem and following whither it led. But according to Flexner's ensuing correspondence with Mitrany, even that approval seemed to be infirm. Thus the Director recounted a conversation with "his adviser," whom he characterized as "probably the ablest economic thinker in the United States:"

This man would prefer someone 'who is possessed with some concrete problem, but who is prepared to deal with its general implications.'

Continuing, Flexner said his adviser had quoted a friend, who did not think the Institute should outline its specific inquiries as yet. He quoted this one:

'I think it should assemble a group that would just stew around for a while and wonder what it is all about. After six months or a year probably somebody would think of something. I doubt the world is in urgent need of more statistics, more facts, more research; or that the Institute needs to start with a clerical and statistical force. In fact, I think that the members should be required to take a vow of total abstinence from statistics, data, and maybe even facts for a six-months period. This country is simply lousy with statistics, and crawling with research workers.'⁵³

One might almost conclude that Mr. Stewart's friend favored withdrawing all economic researchers from their labors just to enable them to lie fallow for a time. But clearly his "adviser," Mr. Stewart, was referring to the Institute, perhaps in the interest of keeping the situation there fluid for the time.

Dr. Flexner "quoted scripture" to ease Mitrany's fears, for the Professor, still in England, had heard indirectly that Flexner considered first a mathematical economist, and now an expert in money and rates. Mitrany was not reassured; he repeated his demands for a philosophical economist, and above all, for a congenial group. As for Dr. Riefler, had he been informed with equal candor of Mr. Stewart's views, he might have had serious misgivings about his future career in research at the Institute. He decided to accept the offer from Flexner late in December. While Mr. Frankfurter had been given to understand that Dr. Riefler was being interviewed by the Director and Mr. Stewart, Flexner's notes and agenda did not announce his intention to nominate the economist at the January meeting.

To the Trustees, Dr. Flexner gave a brief description of Dr. Riefler's qualifications, and expressed the hope that the three men then in the School of Economics and Politics would be able to work together in international politics and economics. They would have the same autonomy, individually and as a School, as was enjoyed in the School of Mathematics. The appointment was unanimously approved, but Mr. Frankfurter took vigorous exception to the fact that Flexner proposed and the Board granted a salary for the economist which exceeded by \$2,000 the full-time rates of his absent colleagues in the School. The minutes say that "standardized" rates were discussed, and noted "that most of the Board was opposed to the principle." Mr. Frankfurter asked to be recorded as opposed to the differential, maintaining that either Riefler should receive the same salary as Earle and Mitrany, or that their salaries should be raised to equal his.⁵⁴

Two days after the meeting, Frankfurter at Harvard wrote the following letter to Dr. Riefler, sending a copy to Flexner.

Ever since I have been on this faculty, for now a little over twenty years, it has been my practice to tell acquaintances whose names have come up for consideration directly what doubts or difficulties I may have had to raise in faculty meeting. This avoids misunderstanding through the dangers of misreport, however innocent, through indirect transmission. That practice of candor seems to me to be equally appropriate for you and me in the case of the Institute for Advanced Study.

Therefore, I should like you to know that I welcomed your accession to the Institute and voted for it with pleasure and hope. But I voted against the stipend proposed by Dr. Flexner, not because it was too high, but because it was higher than that given to your colleagues in the School of Politics and Economics. For I deem inequality of treatment among men of substantially similar age and scholarly distinction as inimical to the aims of a society of scholars. This is not the occasion to argue the matter; I simply wanted you to know precisely what my attitude was towards your coming to the Institute, and to the conditions of your coming.

If you have to leave government -- and I cannot conceal my regret that you are doing so, in view of my great interest in a permanent civil service -- I am at least happy that you are giving yourself to scholarship.⁵⁵

Reactions were prompt and severe. Dr. Riefler was shocked and unhappy. He sought to withdraw from the appointment, and suggested that Mr. Frankfurter bring the matter before the Board for reconsideration. He had great respect for the lawyer. As for Flexner, his anger was now fully aroused. He wrote Frankfurter declaring that his letter to Riefler was a "piece of unmitigated impertinence;" he was notifying the Committee on Nominations that "under no circumstances can they nominate both me and you for re-election. They shall have to choose between us."⁵⁶

To Riefler he wrote:

I wish to assure you once more that there is nothing within reason that we will not do to enable you to fulfill your own ambitions and to make you and your family happy in this new environment.⁵⁷

Unfortunately, this was a commitment which Flexner later seemed unable to fulfill.

The Trustees were naturally disturbed by what they regarded not only as a serious transgression against the confidential nature of proceedings within the Board, but also by the implication that any of them might similarly have violated that confidential relationship.

But Mr. Frankfurter was not quiescent. Again he tried to rally some of the Trustees to his side, as he had in the Marschak affair. He exchanged with Dr. Weed his correspondence in that passage for copies of Weed's correspondence with Flexner in the controversy over the placement of young mathematicians.⁵⁸ (See p.331) Professor Veblen, who had been ardently urging Flexner to establish a uniform salary of \$15,000 in the School of Mathematics, had spoken at the meeting, and Mr. Frankfurter wrote him also, sending a copy to the Director.

Of course I was gratified to have your confirmation about the importance of the general principle of equality of treatment of scholars of substantially the same age and distinction. I have long reflected on the problem and have had not a little experience in observing the consequences of departure from it. I am much confirmed by the testimony you bore at our Board meeting last Monday regarding the feelings of the members of the School of Mathematics. Of course, I know nothing about the 'historical considerations' to which you referred which are responsible for the present differentiations in that School. I have no doubt, however, that as a principle the practice is vicious. Bargaining for terms, with the diverse pressures wholly unrelated to scholarship, belongs to the world of commerce, and is inimical to the true size of a society of scholars.⁵⁹

Professor Veblen's response indicated something less than a firm conviction that he had represented his colleagues' views with fidelity:

I think I correctly reflected the feelings of our group -- but of course I would have a hard time if put under cross-examination. Also I should be disposed to go very far in support of Dr. Flexner, who seems, in his acts, to be

enormously better than anyone who is likely to succeed him in his present job...

I am sure my colleagues, as well as myself, would be delighted if you would drop off in Princeton some day and look us over in our lair.⁶⁰

Flexner was as good as his word; he refused to be nominated at the annual meeting if Frankfurter were also to be. Mr. Aydelotte undertook for the Committee on Nominations the difficult task of meeting and discussing the matter with Mr. Frankfurter, who was conscious of no error in his conduct. Finally, after review by the Committee of a kind of brief filed with them by Frankfurter, the Committee unanimously nominated for re-election only Messrs. Flexner and Straus, and the Members of the Corporation approved the report. For a time after that it appeared that Mr. Frankfurter believed that he had some cause for legal action against the Committee or the Board, but he finally accepted the decision.⁶¹

The first public announcement of the appointments in the second School was made in January 1935. It evoked the following notice in the

Princetonian:

Already the School of Mathematics, drawing so heavily from Princeton's Department, has borne rich fruit, and this community's position as perhaps the greatest center of mathematical study upon the American continent is rendered even more impregnable. And the same procedure, we hope, bids fair to repeat itself in the case of the social sciences. The proposed School will attempt a 're-examination of political and economic theory,' and 'with absolute freedom of thought, opinion and expression, study the economic and political phenomena of our own times.' In this time, when in so many countries the heavy hand of arbitrary censorship is crushing the impetus for free thought and untrammelled investigation, such a reaffirmation of academic freedom is a welcome note. And certainly, in this period of economic change, when so much that we formerly accepted upon blind faith as the truth is being upset, a re-examination of political and economic theory is very much in order...⁶²

Dr. Flexner had kept President Dodds informed of his progress, and had also consulted the senior economists of the University, who welcomed the news enthusiastically in an informal memorandum which said in part:

It needs hardly be said that...[the new faculty] should have a stimulating effect upon the scholarly work of our own staff, and we hope that we shall be able to contribute in some measure toward the attainment of the ideals of the new project...⁶³

Shortly after his appointment, and several months before he entered upon his new work, Professor Riefler wrote Flexner that he had been offered a highly remunerative position by the Social Science Research Council, an agency to which the Rockefeller Foundation contributed liberally. Said Riefler: "This offers one of those rare opportunities when an original commitment can be freely reconsidered..." Flexner's reply was unequivocal: "I do not want to let you out with honor or anything else..."⁶⁴

The economist took up his duties in October 1935. He visited Professor Earle at Saranac and conferred with Professor Mitrany on his arrival. It was soon evident that no slightest possibility existed for cooperative research, nor any real disposition on the part of the three men to plan a common approach to any problem of the School of Economics and Politics.

In October, 1935, Professor Riefler presented to Flexner his matured plans for research in finance which, he said, could result in valuable new knowledge in some of the most troublesome areas of contemporary economics. It was most timely, since "a huge body of factual data has recently become available" which could afford a real test of "our

theoretical analysis." Moreover, his own training and experience lay in finance, including the scope and functions of the securities and mortgage markets, economic fluctuations, employment and unemployment, production and trade, and certain governmental problems. His proposed researches were sufficiently limited to come within the Institute's resources, and were perfectly susceptible of meaningful research. He would require additional professional, clerical and statistical staff; the annual budget entailed would ultimately be about \$100,000. He set forth the following subjects, on which clear thinking was obscured by partisan interests as well as by lack of knowledge.

1. The banking crisis of 1929-1933, and the effect of the Federal Reserve System's attempts to mitigate it in 1931-1932. These actions, and particularly the government's concentration in 1933 on the rehabilitation of bank capital, merited careful analysis, "now that the...secrecy...imposed on all participants can be dispensed with, and its essential character can be analyzed for the benefit of all economists."
2. The nature and effects of the large cash balances accumulated by corporations during the twenties, which financed in part the stock market speculation of the end of the decade, and after the market crash contributed to the instability of the banking system in their mobile search for security.
3. The circumstances of Britain's departure from gold in 1931.
4. A study of means to achieve a wider distribution of economic materials among economists, so as to enhance their opportunities to study current data and to aid in its assimilation.⁶⁵

Here at last was the kind of program Dr. Flexner had wanted since 1930. Mr. Stewart seemed to be well disposed toward it -- at least, some unspecified part of it. For on the 31st October he wrote the Director.

I was very well impressed with the extent to which he [Riefler] has adapted himself to the problems of the Institute....You may feel, as I am inclined to, that we should act rather promptly on some of the things he has in mind... The evening's discussion confirmed my feeling of how fortunate we are to have a person of Riefler's intelligence, judgment and lack of conventional commitments to help us conceive the proper field of work in the social studies.⁶⁶

Again, Dr. Flexner seemed to misunderstand Mr. Stewart's idiom. For he assumed that the economist favored all the projects, and would recommend a beginning in "some of the things" Riefler had in mind. For the time being, Dr. Flexner proceeded in good faith to arrange for the necessary funds and authorizations. Three weeks after receiving Stewart's approval, he wrote Riefler as follows:

As far as my knowledge and experience entitle me to an opinion, the problems which you have selected and the methods by means of which you propose to attack them seem to me to be sound and promising. There is nothing in your program or our organization which will prevent taking advantage of them. I am sure that the Executive Committee will meet in the near future and authorize such expenditures as you may desire for the rest of the year, and our next year's budget can include the larger sum upon which you figure...

I have only one caution to suggest: you have outlined four problems. Is there any likelihood that...you may find yourself under pressure? While you are perfectly free to proceed according to your own judgment, I should myself take up one problem at a time and carry it far enough to be certain that I could take up another without getting in a rush. There is no hurry. Work such as you contemplate needs ample time for reflection...⁶⁷

It became evident, however, at the January meeting of the Board that Professor Riefler's budget had not been submitted to the Executive

Committee after all. At about the same time as Flexner received Stewart's letter, he had learned from an indignant Mr. Bamberger that in view of what he and Mrs. Fuld considered extravagance in the purchase of too large a site, they would give no further increments to endowment "at the present time" after meeting "present commitments."⁶⁸ (See Chapter IV) It would have been most unlike Flexner to make the statement he did to Riefler without having first received Mr. Bamberger's approval. But the Director's report on Riefler's needs to the Trustees in January, 1936, indicated that he was taking a most remote view of them. He remarked that any professor had the right to "cross lines" as between schools, and continued:

Professor Riefler is beginning to feel the need of mathematical or statistical help. There is nothing in the set-up of the Institute which prevents his obtaining from mathematicians either at the Institute, Princeton University, Washington, or elsewhere such cooperation as he may desire. There is nothing to prevent his adding to his own small staff a statistician, if he can find a person whose mathematical training is sound. The organization of autonomous schools, the individuals within which can cross any boundary they please, seems, therefore, as far as I can now see, to offer the best method for realizing our purposes.⁶⁹

This marked a retreat on the record, but his hearers could not have known either of Flexner's commitment to Riefler or the economist's proposals. If Professor Einstein had difficulties in getting and holding mathematical assistance, what chance would an economist have to get cooperative assistance from men whose devotion to "pure" mathematics was complete? But Flexner appeared to believe what he said, and sought and received confirmation of the appointment of three humanists authorized by the Executive Committee at a meeting which left no record except what

Board.
Flexner told the / (See p. 27)

He may have been hoping to secure funds for Dr. Riefler's work from some other source. The record shows several such attempts, none of which was successful. Thus he had asked Dr. E. E. Day, Director of the Social Sciences for the Rockefeller Foundation, for a substantial annual grant for economics immediately after Riefler's appointment. That disappeared without record. Then he had besought another philanthropist, who was interested in the better teaching of economics in secondary schools, to endow the Institute's studies so that better economics might be taught, but without changing his friend's mind. Still pending as late as March 1943, however, was a continuing petition to the Rockefeller Foundation for a large gift to endowment, which for some reason Flexner was always hopeful of securing.⁷⁰

But Professor Riefler was evidently told to ascertain professional attitudes toward his proposals and what degree of cooperation with his working plans he could find. It seems clear that he was not informed either of Mr. Bamberger's new posture, nor of the apparent hopelessness of his situation as far as Institute financing was concerned. The sum with which the Founders had met their "present commitments" amounted to just under a million dollars, and sufficed only to meet the cost of the land and to capitalize a part of the humanists' salaries.

By early March the economist had satisfied himself that highly placed authorities in official and academic economics were solidly in favor of his proposed researches; that they regarded him as entirely capable of organizing and directing them, and the Institute for Advanced Study was peculiarly able to sponsor them; and they had promised valuable cooperation which in some particulars would amount to large financial

contributions in kind. On the 13th March, 1936, Professor Riefler addressed a report to Dr. Flexner challengingly entitled: Shall the Institute concentrate its work in economics in the field of finance? His own answer was that it should; the researches he had outlined were timely, most important, and neither too large or too small. Moreover, he said:

It is of primary social and economic importance. Problems of finance, especially monetary policy, stand in the very center of the public problems with which the world is wrestling and will...continue to wrestle during the next generation at least...[They] call for insight and guidance from the economist.

No outstanding educational institution in the world has concentrated heavily in this field...Scholars of outstanding reputation can almost be counted on the fingers of two hands. Most of them work in relative isolation, and many of them, such as Walter Stewart, Henry Clay, Benjamin Anderson, R. G. Hawtry and Alexander Goldenweiser have no academic connections... 71

He continued; the necessary combination of the broad theoretical background with "a high degree of sheer technical proficiency" was rarely found among professors in the universities. It was therefore the more important to organize the studies in such a way as to make possible the acquisition of valuable experience. The fact that so much important information previously secret was now available, and that it should be studied for its light on obscure matters, made it desirable to proceed at once. Had Riefler been speaking from a fresh reading of the Idea of a Modern University or Flexner's Confidential Memorandum he could hardly have offered a more tempting prospect either to the Director, or to those who were aware they must have more exact information to avoid in future such violent cataclysms as had just occurred in the Western World. He continued with an imposing array of the support he had

received, and of one "unenthusiastic" response:

I have talked this proposal over with numerous key individuals who would be involved and so far have found them unanimously enthusiastic and urgent that we proceed immediately, with the single exception of Walter Stewart, who was friendly, but did not seem to me to be enthusiastic.

At the Social Science Research Council, for example, I was requested to frame a specific proposal immediately so that they could sound out the possibilities of financing the project. At the Reserve Bank of New York, I was urged to go ahead and promised hearty cooperation in making contacts and obtaining materials. At the Federal Reserve Board in Washington, Dr. Emanuel Goldenweiser was equally enthusiastic and thought that the Board might welcome the opportunity to cooperate formally in a joint, far-reaching investigation of the financial crisis, detailing its own experts to participate in shouldering the heavy expense that might ensue in the detailed examination of its own records. I have also gone over the general scope of the proposal with Stacy May, Assistant Director of the Division of the Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation who has made valuable suggestions as to the best form in which an inquiry of this kind should be set up.

To summarize these remarks so far: (1) The need for a comprehensive inquiry of the type contemplated is, I think, almost unquestioned; (2) I have found not only enthusiasm... but also an extraordinary desire to cooperate on the part of those whose cooperation would be most essential, so far as I have been able to sound them out; and (3) I have been urged from many sides to try to persuade the Institute to take the leadership in the undertaking.

Riefler's plan for the accomplishment of the work was well conceived; the School would be a small "distinctive school of finance." Its influence would be broad and deep, as he conceived it.

It would, then, assume leadership in formulating a broad inquiry into the causes and phenomena of the financial crisis ...set up as a project sponsored by the Institute...to be carried out disinterestedly in cooperation with all of the agencies and interests affected, and to be financed in part by the Rockefeller Foundation and in part by the official governmental agencies involved.

While the Institute would assume the leadership, little of the actual investigation would be carried on here. The Institute would represent rather a center of the intellectual stimulus. Specific problems...would be proposed here, their exact formulation agreed upon here after full consultation with scholars and experts from outside, and the results of the investigations as they are carried on would be subjected to constant evaluation and advice from the Institute which would act as the rallying point for disinterested and competent scientific opinion.

Was the Institute for Advanced Study the best possible organization to exercise leadership in such investigations? asked Riefler. He believed it was, and for most important reasons concerning the objectivity of the research.

A project of this kind must be authoritative, disinterested, completely free from suspicion of bias; it must command the respect of the community. It requires the complete cooperation of the parties at interest, but should preferably not be directed or controlled by them. This rules out automatically the use of the aegis of such organizations as the Chamber of Commerce, the American Bankers' Association, and the Stock Exchange. It also militates somewhat against the use of such a device as a Congressional Committee of Inquiry, or an inquiry inaugurated wholly and completely by the Federal Reserve System. With these sponsors eliminated there remain (a) the universities...(b) special research foundations such as the Brookings Institution and the National Bureau of Economic Research...(c) the possibility of organizing a special Institute...with special Foundation support. On balance...it would seem that the Institute for Advanced Study is as well equipped as any other organization to assume the leadership for the undertaking.⁷²

But later Riefler would have had to add that though he had been pronounced equal to the objective studies he contemplated, the Institute was not well enough equipped with funds to afford them, nor able to induce the Rockefeller Foundation to grant them. Meanwhile, he closed his memorandum with an estimate for professional help, statistical and clerical work, space for all and for some temporary members also, which would require

ultimately a budget of \$100,000 a year, and a lesser amount for fiscal 1936. He believed the Rockefeller Foundation would finance the services of various experts for short periods of work in Princeton. They could hardly be spared from their present duties for more extended participation, he felt.

Professor Riefler had also conceived and explored an interesting experiment furthering the lines Flexner had laid down in discussing the cooperation between the Institute and the University. It resembled the practices among the universities of the German-speaking peoples of the Empire period, in which the several institutions exhibited marked advantages for the student in certain disciplines, because of outstanding faculty, or facilities such as laboratories and libraries. Indeed, it foreshadowed the so-called "common market in ideas" currently being pursued by some Mid-Western American universities which receive students from any cooperating institution, recognizing that all cannot be equally excellent in all fields of graduate study. President Dodds welcomed Riefler's suggestion that Princeton -- the University's graduate school and the Institute -- might well in their advanced work in economics specialize in finance, and was prepared to shape the graduate faculty to that end.⁷³

The memorandum makes it abundantly clear that Professor Riefler expected an authorization to carry out the work it described. But now it was to appear that the one person whom he characterized as "friendly, but not enthusiastic," was standing in the way, either because of his quiet advice to the Director not to move on it with Mr. Bamberger, or because as a most influential Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation he

declined to support or sanction an income grant or one to endowment purpose. And considering that the social sciences constituted active programs in the Foundation, which recognized fully the need for competent researches in those fields, such aid would seem to have been a routine affair.

It would seem that Mr. Stewart played both the active and the inactive roles. Just one month after Riefler's demand for an answer, the Director reported to the Trustees in a manner which belied the economist's program and activity. He said:

Professor Riefler and Professor Mitrany have been working in their individual ways in the hope of finding a more promising approach to their several subjects than is generally current. As far as I can now see, neither will have workers associated with him for another year at least, perhaps longer, for they are dealing with the most tangled and difficult subjects, and neither of them is as yet certain that he has found a clew to the maze.⁷⁴

Mr. Stewart was present, (as he had not been in January). He evidently did not speak, which means he was party to the statement. On the other hand, had the Director ever taken the program up with Mr. Bamberger, who was also present, or with the Executive Committee, the members of which were likewise present, he could not have said what he did. For a knowledge of Riefler's program, and the assiduity with which he had sought to bring it into being, could not lie with this statement. And, though Dr. Flexner did not agree with what Mr. Mitrany outlined for himself, and withheld an assistant and members from him, the political scientist also was wronged by the characterization.

Professor Riefler was elected a Trustee at that annual meeting, and thereafter was to be constant in attendance at meetings of the Board.

But the beginning of September was to see signs of his bitter unhappiness, and indications that he was planning to leave the Institute. Then Mr. Stewart, who was still considering Dr. Flexner's open offer to join the faculty, and whose desire was apparently to keep Professor Riefler there without allowing the program of work and the kind of personnel recruited to become set in a direction he did not like, suggested to the Director that a single colleague be appointed who should be "as nearly as possible his [Riefler's] equal." Flexner consulted Mr. Leidesdorf and learned that money was in hand.⁷⁵ But the step was not taken. What happened?

Let Professor Riefler say in his own words, which appear in a memorandum to Dr. Aydelotte in December, 1939, just after the Swarthmore President had succeeded Dr. Flexner, and was seeking knowledge of what was going on at the Institute. With the following statement Riefler sent copies of his memorandums to Flexner of October, 1935, the 13th March, 1936, and of the 24th September, 1936:

My own activities since...[the memorandum of September] have been wholly devoted to carrying out the objectives therein set forth. My procedures, of course, have been flexible and adapted to what was feasible.

In the spring of 1936 Dr. Flexner did not feel that the Institute was in a position to proceed immediately, either with the additional appointments recommended...or with the program of financial research on the scale envisioned. Instead, he sent me abroad to improve my contacts with foreign economists and to gain first-hand experience with certain aspects of international financial problems.

On the day of my return, however, there came an opportunity to further the research program I had in mind in the form of a telegram from Joseph Willitts...[asking] me to attend a conference of leading bankers and economists to explore the possibility of inaugurating a more comprehensive attack on financial problems through a program of research. As a

result of the conference I undertook to act as chairman of a committee of the National Bureau of Economic Research to draw up such a program...

Under the leadership of Joseph Willitts, the program recommended by the committee was adopted by the National Bureau of Economic Research and large grants of funds have been made for its support from private banking institutions and public agencies as well as the Rockefeller Foundation....⁷⁶

After the Exploratory Committee completed its survey and recommendations, Professor Riefler undertook to supervise some of the projects. These differed materially from his own earlier recommendations, though there seems to be little question that his memorandums had an influence on the organization of the Bureau's program in financial research. Riefler supervised the exhaustive study of all corporate bonds issued in the United States during the twentieth century; a study of employment and unemployment, another of consumer credit. These might be described as some of the raw materials to be used in searching analyses of the economic phenomena he had wanted to investigate. They were highly specialized and uncoordinated; hardly the kind of investigations which sophisticated economists like Stewart and himself would want to engage in. This is not to say they were not useful, however, for they were, and the Bureau continued for a couple of decades to perform similar studies. Dr. Riefler devoted himself to the work, and demonstrated that he was a fine guide and mentor to young post-doctoral economists, helping them to formulate their problems, and supervising the preparation of their results.

But his own circumstances were unenviable. He spent half of each week at Hillside, an estate on the Hudson where the work went forward. He was not therefore the economist in residence, whom other

economists could visit to talk about their problems. Much time and energy were consumed in going back and forth to Hillside. That his situation was not satisfactorily explained -- nor could be -- to faculty and Trustees led to much grumbling. Professor Veblen dubbed him "a man of affairs," and the title stuck. It was an unfriendly appellation in an academic context. But the /deepest disappointments inhered in the failure of his important program to receive support. The exploration of projects at the Bureau was done with funds supplied by the private bankers. The resulting projects were largely financed by the same group, with aid from insurance companies and the Rockefeller Foundation; and special help from some governmental agencies. These were special projects and funds, not part of the Bureau's regular financing or work. The conditions were markedly unlike working in a sovereign institution which, though small, could accept or decline assistance as it wished.

But his lot was not unalloyed dissatisfaction. He had undertaken work at Geneva with the Secretariat of the League of Nations, sitting with the Committees on Finance and Business Depressions, which gave him valuable insights. His participation continued until 1941, when he was mainly instrumental in bringing to Princeton the League's Division of Finance and Transit of the Secretariat, with Dr. Aydelotte's delighted cooperation and Dr. Flexner's blessings. This made possible the continuation of its work, and its ultimate absorption into the United Nations. The economist was also called into consultation on occasion by the Secretary of the Treasury; in one such case, he guided the gold-buying program of the government from June, 1937 until March, 1938, serving without compensation except for his salary from the Institute and government reimbursement for his

expenses. He had no title, and shunned publicity. Professor Veblen, teaching and working at the University of Washington during the summer of 1936, questioned the Director sharply about this further absence from Princeton.⁷⁷

Professor Riefler must have been buoyed by some hope that Mr. Stewart would soon decide whether he would come to the Institute. He apparently viewed the prospect with mixed feelings, as well he might. However, there is no doubt that he looked upon his former college professor as a great and creative economist, whose return to academic life could make a vast difference in knowledge of the field. But after Mr. Stewart came, the realization was disappointing, for reasons which will be discussed later. Riefler was glad to be called to Washington to draft the plan for Economic Warfare, and then to administer the program as Minister to England from 1942 to 1944.

Relations between Professor Mitrany and the Director did not prosper after the controversies over the organization and concept of the School of Economics and Politics, nor after the departure of Mr. Frankfurter, who Mitrany was given to understand by Harold Laski, was victimized by the Director for exercising "freedom of speech." Mitrany came to the Institute first in October, 1935, and the contentiousness which had marked his appointment during 1934 continued. The Director now was unhappy with his impulsive action in appointing Mitrany and seemed to have little faith in his various projects, which required an assistant and some members whom Flexner at first denied him. That Mitrany showed no intention to domesticate himself in America was another cause

of discontent for Flexner, though the political scientist's wife was ill in England and he apparently did not feel that he could transplant her, nor had that been understood when he was appointed. Matters finally became so bad that Mitrany suggested that the Executive Committee, or Dr. Aydelotte and Bernard Flexner, mediate between them.⁷⁸ This evidently caused a re-examination of his position by Dr. Flexner, and relations were mended to some extent thereafter. Of course nothing could change the fact that Mitrany had been right when he said that if the School of Economics and Politics faculty were to cooperate in working around a central core of interests, they must be selected with that in view. Flexner endeavored to persuade both Earle and Mitrany to approach their work through economics, but neither they nor Professor Riefler warmed to the idea. These three were not only autonomous; they were actively disunited.

With the outbreak of the war in Europe Professor Mitrany remained in England to work in the development of information on central Europe. He was to relinquish his professorship later, retaining the status granted him by the Trustees of "Permanent Member" with the privilege of coming occasionally to Princeton to work.

Professor Earle was finally able to come to the Institute to take up his work in the fall of 1937. But he needed to circulate among historians, with whom he had lost contact over the past eleven years, and to meet the newcomers to the field. Somewhat to Flexner's distress, he traveled to Pasadena to work at the Huntington Library for a time. Later Flexner helped raise funds for him to travel in Europe. It was not until the beginning of 1938-1939 that Professor Earle settled to

work at Princeton. But his travels had valuable results for the Institute. For he was catalyst among men, and brought to the Institute through the following years some of the best non-mathematical members to come to it. He had decided firmly to concentrate his attention on American foreign relations, and the Director watched helplessly while the orientation there with the onset of hostilities inevitably became matters of defence and security. As late as 1938 the Director wrote Earle that he was advising Professor Mitrany to concentrate in his studies of international affairs "on the economic side," urging Earle to do likewise:

If you and Mitrany can interest yourselves in the economic aspect of your problems you will, in my judgment, not only be on the right track, but you will make a unit of the School of Economics and Politics, such as it will not be if there are three tangents. On the other hand, I do not want to dictate to you or to anybody else what he shall do...

I have the...feeling that economics will for the next fifty or one hundred years furnish the pattern and that political theory and statecraft will either enter into that pattern or shrivel up.⁷⁹

Earle pursued his own way. In 1939-1940 he conducted his first seminar, bringing to Princeton several European scholars and a number of Americans, notably three from Princeton University. In the same year he became Chairman of the American Committee for International Studies whose purpose was to encourage "basic research which is necessary to the formulation of an intelligent American foreign policy." Headquarters would be at the Institute, and Dr. Earle was assisted by a secretary to the Committee who was paid by the Rockefeller Foundation.

But Flexner made no secret of his wish to see Professor Earle produce another book like The Baghdad Railway, which was the very highly

regarded work of his career before his illness. However, Professor Earle, so long immured within four walls, understandably would not willingly return to such a setting for any purpose as prolonged as the creation of another book. His first meeting with Riefler at Saranac in 1935 was a happy occasion, for the economist agreed that he should work on America's foreign relations.

There is little doubt that Flexner's consciousness of early friendship for Professors Earle and Mitrany caused him to be hypercritical in judging their actions, plans and wishes. He felt responsible for their success in a highly personal sense, which they resented. His fault was exaggerated by his frequent references to the certainty and harmony with which the faculty members of the School of Mathematics seemed to function. (But he confessed he had no judgment whatever of what they did or how successful their work was.) His two friends deplored the fact that while all the mathematicians had personal assistants, they had none, though Flexner earlier would have been the first to grant that the complexity of their fields, the need for languages not their own, the wealth of written materials in any subject in their fields with which they should be familiar, made such help desirable.

It was curious that the one person in the School of Economics and Politics who had been promised the colleagues and assistants he required, not only before his appointment but twice thereafter, and who never received any of what was promised, was the Director's real friend. Riefler might have been so resentful of Flexner's failure to live up to his commitments that their relationship would have curdled. Like the Trustees, Professor Riefler had understood from the beginning of his

connection with the Institute that Dr. Flexner was awaiting a decision from Mr. Stewart, for whom he had had a great respect at Amherst. But he had not been close to Stewart after Stewart left the Federal Reserve Board in 1926; he was quite unprepared for the subtle negativism of the older man and its effect on the Director, who had fallen under the spell of Stewart's charm from their first meeting. He was also unprepared, as was Flexner, for the stony silence which greeted the Director as he approached his former colleagues at the Rockefeller Foundation for grants to finance eminently worthwhile researches of the kind and with the prospects the Foundation rarely or never before had the opportunity to aid -- proposals deemed to be so valuable that they were taken over by an agency heavily supported by the Foundation and served up in fragments.

CHAPTER V - NOTES

1. Interview with Messrs, Leidesdorf and Maass.
2. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/9/33, pp. 2-3.
3. Maass to Flexner, 4/7/33. Also, C. R. Hardin to J. R. Hardin, 4/4/33; J. R. Hardin to Flexner, 4/5/33, Hardin papers. The senior Hardin held that if the Honorary Trustees were given the right to vote, the Certificate of Incorporation would have to be amended.
4. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/11/32, p. 5. Minutes, meeting of the Corporation, 4/24/33, pp. 2-4. See Maass to Hardin, 12/17/31.
5. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/24/33, p. 7.
6. Maass to Flexner, 12/23/32.
7. Frankfurter to Flexner, 3/4/33.
8. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/6/33.
9. Flexner to Mrs. Fuld, 3/1/33.
10. Louis Bamberger to Flexner, 3/11/33.
11. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., Crisis of the Old Order, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1957, pp. 419-420.
12. Flexner to Maass, 11/14/34.
13. Interview with Flexner. See Clay to Flexner, 5/13/32. Also, Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/18/38, p. 6.
14. Flexner to Frankfurter, 11/7/32; to D. Mitrany, 1/17/33.
15. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/3/33.
16. See Joseph Dorfman, Thorstein Veblen and His America, The Viking Press, 1934, pp. 456, 457.
17. Gardner Jackson, The American Signer of the Basle Report, Watertown, N. Y. Times, 1/23/32, p. X12.
18. Lester V. Chandler, Benjamin Strong, Central Banker, The Brookings Institution, pp. 41 ff., 51 ff., 465.
19. Chandler, op. cit., pp. 438 ff. William Allen White, Puritan in Babylon, MacMillan, 1938, pp. 367-372. Schlesinger, op. cit., p. 69.

20. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Coming of the New Deal, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1959, p. 456.
21. Interview with Raymond B. Fosdick.
22. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., The Politics of Upheaval, Houghton, Mifflin Co., 1960, p. 225.
23. Ibid., pp. 235-237.
24. Frankfurter to Flexner, 4/27/33, 5/1/33; Flexner to Frankfurter, 4/28/33, 5/3/33.
25. Frankfurter to Flexner, 1/7/32.
26. Viner to Flexner, 7/10/31. Interview with Viner.
27. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/15/34.
28. See Wm. Yandell Elliott to Flexner, 11/7/33.
29. Mitrany to Flexner, 1/14/33; Flexner to Mitrany, 1/17/33.
30. Flexner to Mitrany, 2/21/33. Frankfurter to Flexner, 2/14/33. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/24/33, pp. 4-5, 8. Mitrany's appointment became effective 9/1/33, at a salary of \$6,000 for the year 1933-1934, or until he came to Princeton, when he would receive \$10,000. Regular joint contributions to the T.I.A.A. Retirement at 65 unless deferred by mutual consent. No public announcement was to be made then. It was understood that he would "devote himself, in cooperation with the Director, to studies preliminary to the organization of the School of Economics and Politics whenever the Board of Trustees shall authorize such action." Flexner secured permission to increase the salary to the full rate effective 9/1/34. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 11.
31. Mitrany to Flexner, 2/10/33; Flexner to Mitrany, 2/14/33.
32. Mitrany to Flexner, 10/31/34; Flexner to Mitrany, 12/13/34.
33. Frankfurter to Flexner, 12/11/33; Flexner to Frankfurter, 12/28/33; 1/4/34.
34. Frankfurter to Flexner, 1/24/34; Flexner to Frankfurter, 2/6/34.
35. Frankfurter to Flexner, 2/21/34.
36. Aydelotte to Flexner, 3/19/34. Flexner to Frankfurter, 3/21/34. Aydelotte papers.

37. Simon Flexner to Bernard Flexner, 4/2/34. Frankfurter papers.
38. Ibid.
39. Frankfurter to Abraham Flexner, 4/24/34.
40. Flexner to Louis Bamberger, 6/19/34, 6/28/34.
41. Flexner to Stewart, June, 1934. School of Economics and Politics papers.
42. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/9/33, p. 6. Flexner to Frankfurter, 11/1/33; Frankfurter to Flexner, 12/1/33.
43. Flexner to Earle, 10/12/33.
44. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, p. 11. Professor Earle's appointment was effective 9/1/34 at half pay of \$5,000 while on sick leave. The appointment was limited to one year, with the understanding it might be extended for a second year on the same terms. No contribution to T. I. A. A. was provided. In April, 1936, the budget for 1936-1937 carried full salary for Earle.
45. Ibid., pp. 5-6.
46. Ibid., p. 12.
47. Maass to Flexner, 11/11/34; Flexner to Maass, 11/14/34.
48. Flexner to Frankfurter, 10/10/34. Mr. Frankfurter's statement was received on 2nd November, and sent to the Trustees as an addendum to the minutes.
49. Flexner to Frankfurter, 10/27/34; 10/30/34; 11/2/34; 11/8/34; 11/12/34. Frankfurter to Flexner (telegram) 10/29/34; 10/31/34; 11/6/34; 11/9/34; 11/13/34.
50. Frankfurter to Stewart, 11/5/34; Stewart to Frankfurter, 11/28/34, Frankfurter papers. Aydelotte to Frankfurter, 12/21/34 and undated "postscript." Flexner to Aydelotte, 12/24/34, Aydelotte papers.
51. Riefler, Memorandum; Proposed Economic Unit, Institute for Advanced Study, 11/16/34.
52. Stewart to Flexner, 11/19/34.
53. Flexner to Mitrany, 12/13/34.
54. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/14/35, pp. 4, 6-7. Professor Riefler's salary was to be \$12,000, the appointment to be effective upon arrangement with the Director, with the usual provisions for retirement and annuity insurance.

55. Frankfurter to Riefler, 1/16/35.
56. Flexner to Frankfurter, 1/19/35. The terms of both men expired in April, 1935.
57. Flexner to Riefler, 1/19/35.
58. Weed to Frankfurter, 1/16/35; 1/29/35; 2/3/35. Frankfurter to Weed, 1/26/35; 2/6/35; 2/19/35; 5/14/35. Frankfurter papers.
59. Frankfurter to Veblen, 1/16/35.
60. Veblen to Frankfurter, 1/18/35, Frankfurter papers. It may be recalled that when Veblen submitted the proposed mathematical budget to Flexner with his letter of 6/5/32, it was with the statement that the four highest-paid professors would receive the same salaries, and the next group of three younger men \$10,000 each. That was the policy which had been followed, except in the case of Professor Morse, who as a younger man received \$12,500.
61. Aydelotte to Leidesdorf, 3/26/35; Frankfurter to Aydelotte, 4/3/35; Aydelotte papers. Aydelotte to Frankfurter, 4/17/35; 5/1/35; Aydelotte papers. Minutes, Meeting of the Corporation, 4/22/35, p. 1. The brief is not available.
62. The Princetonian, 1/16/35, pp. 1-3.
63. E. W. Kemmerer, Frank P. Graham, James G. Smith, C. R. Whittlesley, David A. McCabe, Frank H. Dixon, Stanley E. Howard and J. Douglas Brown to Flexner, 1/16/35.
64. Riefler to Flexner, 4/30/35; Flexner to Riefler, 5/2/35. The Rockefeller Foundation and the Spelman Foundation subsidized generously the Social Science Research Council in its many researches into sociological and economic problems.
65. Riefler to Flexner, Memorandum: Program for Economics in the SEP, Institute for Advanced Study, October 1935, SEP papers.
66. Stewart to Flexner, 10/31/35.
67. Flexner to Riefler, 11/20/35.
68. Louis Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.
69. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 4.
70. Flexner to E. E. Day, 1/28/35. Flexner to Victor Morawetz, 4/25/34; 5/3/34. Morawetz to Flexner, 5/10/34. Draft of proposed letter, Flexner to L. Bamberger, 3/10/43. Aydelotte papers.

71. Riefler to Flexner, 3/13/36. Aydelotte papers.
72. Ibid.
73. Ibid.
74. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/13/36, pp. 2-3.
75. Flexner to Stewart, 9/3/36.
76. Riefler to Aydelotte, 12/13/39. Aydelotte papers. In his memo to Flexner, 9/24/36, Riefler reinforced his previous recommendations for specializing in research on finance, because of the virtue of concentration, the favorable location of the Institute, and the fact that most universities were incapable of the kind and degree of specialization required to do what he had contemplated. Meanwhile, general confusion still prevailed over what to do with the economy to prevent future collapses, and to cure the present one. Then Riefler had formally told Flexner he was taking the chairmanship of the Exploratory Committee for Financial Research of the National Bureau of Economic Research.
Dr. Joseph Willitts was Director of the National Bureau of Economic Research (1936-1939). He was also Director of the Wharton School of Finance at Pennsylvania University (1933-1939). A close friend of Mr. Stewart, Dr. Willitts succeeded Dr. E. E. Day as Director for the Social Sciences of the Rockefeller Foundation in the fall of 1939. Dr. Day had left to take the presidency of Cornell in 1937. Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick wrote that the Rockefeller Foundation was the largest single financial supporter of the National Bureau of Economic Research between 1920 and 1951. (See Fosdick, The Story of the Rockefeller Foundation, p. 213.)
77. Veblen to Flexner, 7/3/37. Flexner to Veblen, 7/9/37. See Flexner to Secretary of the Treasury, 6/9/37, cautioning him against any publicity concerning Riefler's consultancy, and insisting that Riefler should have no policy-forming responsibilities. This was a little amusing, as it followed by only a few months publication of a letter by Flexner to the editor of the Herald Tribune, castigating President Roosevelt for bad faith in proposing the "court-packing plan," and suggesting that "if the President has his way, we may as well go further: abolish Congress and substitute for it a Hitler Reichstag which, on occasions, will meet for a few moments, listen to their dictator's decrees, and adjourn." Dated 2/7/39. N. Y. Herald Tribune for 2/9/39. Clipping, Aydelotte files.
78. Mitrany to Flexner, 1/18/36. Flexner to Mitrany, 1/21/36.
79. Flexner to Earle, 2/28/38.

CHAPTER VI

THE SCHOOL OF HUMANISTIC STUDIES

The humanities did not present a completely new challenge to the Director. In 1924 he had initiated the first programs undertaken by any of the Rockefeller foundations, inaugurating grants in the General Education Board to aid teaching and research in various humanistic disciplines in American universities. Gifts to the endowment of selected institutions supported the training of archaeologists, field explorations and research, and helped to maintain the American Council of Learned Studies, a federation of institutions dedicated to promoting humanistic studies. As Director of Studies of the International Education Board, he recommended and secured support for the American School for Classical Studies at Athens and the American Academy at Rome as well as for archaeological operations in the Nile Valley. In 1926 he persuaded Mr. Rockefeller, Jr., to underwrite anonymously the excavation of the Athenian Agora, thus earning the eternal gratitude of the American School of Classical Studies.

As often happens to the pioneer, Flexner was the target of acute criticism for these activities on the one hand, and on the other was accused by the classicists of failing to support the classics. In appraising Flexner's record at the General Education Board and the International Education Board, Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick later wrote:

In reviewing the history of the early work in the humanities ...one gathers that it was colored by traditional concepts, centering largely in archaeological excavations, in scholarly work in ancient cultures, and in researches centered in this

country for classical humanistic studies. Even at this time, this type of activity did not escape the criticism of some of the Trustees.¹

Fosdick quoted Anson Phelps Stokes as saying that Flexner's emphasis seemed to be "mainly on ancient history, ancient languages and archaeology;" he himself believed the humanities should be more broadly conceived and supported. Ten years later Dr. David Stevens, Director of the Humanities for the Rockefeller Foundation, characterized Flexner's early programs as a credit because of their "magnitude," but a discredit because "they buttressed scholasticism and antiquarianism in our universities."²

The Director could well have cited his own criticism of the foundations' failure to employ experts in the fields in which their aid was dispensed; as will be recalled, he urged in 1924 that qualified men be placed on the staff to handle the work in two new fields -- the humanities, and music and the fine arts. (See p. 33) When the Rockefeller foundations were reorganized in 1929, there were five or six divisions over which qualified experts presided in administering funds for aid to education on a world-wide basis. As Flexner was to make clear his views later, he apparently approved of the divisions into the social sciences, the humanities, and the sciences, medical education, etc., but regarded the geographical spread as impossible of satisfactory administration. But that is beside the point here. When he talked of the place of the humanities in his concept of the modern university, he urged a broad development, which was needed more urgently in the modern world than continuing discrimination in promoting the sciences. Thus he wrote:

Our world is not, however, merely a matter of democracy and science. Indeed, if some sort of cultural equilibrium is to be attained, the humanistic disciplines, in which philosophy is included, necessarily become of greater rather than less importance; and by humanistic disciplines I refer not only to the humanities as such, but to the human values inherent in a deep knowledge of science itself. With the quick march of science, philosophy and humanism have gone under a cloud; when they assert themselves, they are prone to do so apologetically, on the ground that they too are, or can be, scientific. To be sure, they are and can...But quite aside from their pursuit in a scientific spirit, the world has not lost, and, unless it is to lose its savour, will never lose the pure, appreciative, humanistic spirit -- the love of beauty, the concern for ends established by ideals that dare to command rather than to obey.

Now science, while widening our vision, increasing our satisfactions, and solving our problems, brings with it dangers peculiarly its own. We can become so infatuated with progress in knowledge and control...that we lose our perspective, lose our historic sense, lose a philosophic outlook, lose sight of relative cultural values. Something like this has happened to many, perhaps to most, of the enthusiastic, clear-headed, forward-looking, and highly specialized votaries of science. They are, culturally, too often thin and metallic; their training appears technological rather than broadly and deeply scientific. Taste and reason do not intervene to stop the scientist prosecuting his search for truth; they do sit in judgment on the uses to which society puts the forces which the scientist has set free. I say, our younger scientists not infrequently appear to have been dehumanized; so also do some humanists.

In the modern university, therefore, the more vigorously science is prosecuted, the more acute the need that society be held accountable for the purposes to which larger knowledge and experience are turned. Philosophers and critics, therefore, gain in importance as science makes life more complex -- more rational in some ways, more irrational in others.³

And so he urged that the gaps in man's knowledge of his history disclosed by paleontologists and historians be closed by studies in archaeology, philology, paleography, etc. "Further study of mediaeval and modern art, literature, music and history will inevitably revise

notions formed on the basis of defective data which have hitherto controlled our thinking," he added. More important, perhaps, was his thinking that the humanists would contribute "the philosophic intelligence trying...to see things in the large."⁴

When he spoke of the humanities in the Confidential Memorandum he was constrained by the modesty of the first endowment to limit the fields the Institute would consider then. Mathematics must come first, for it was the most practicable; economics second, for he was convinced the Institute with its freedom could discover means of helping democracy survive. After expatiating on these, he mentioned how readily "history literature, music...can be added when men, money and ideas are available." He continued from time to time to remind the Trustees -- and the Founders -- of his wishes to start the third School. Thus in April, 1934, as a gift was announced to enable him to make a start in economics, he said he "was inclined to think that, before I lay down my directorship, whenever the means are forthcoming, I should like to start with a nucleus... in the humanities." In January, 1935, as he nominated Professor Riefler, he expressed the fear that it would not be "feasible" to start a third School in the fall. The truth was, of course, that he did not have the funds with which to do it; he was reminding Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld that he wanted to move. So far he had kept his promise not to start what he could not see finished as far as funds were concerned, but he knew now that he was facing a vigorous competition for what funds were in sight from the active Committee on Buildings and Grounds. This came at a time when various pressures were being applied in behalf of one or another humanist who needed employment, or by the possible availability

of men whom he wanted particularly to associate with the Institute.

Flexner found congenial counsel in Princeton's Department of Art and Archaeology, which had in the past benefited from Rockefeller grants for archaeology. To cooperate with that Department was again, as it had been in mathematics, to "build the peaks higher;" it was at that time one of the strong departments in the University. Moreover, its Chairman, Dr. Charles Rufus Morey, was willing to cooperate with the Director by lending his academic authority to support the accession by the Institute of classicists as well as of art-historians and archaeologists. In the circumstances, one may understand that the scholars and their fields of interest who were chosen to staff the third School represented an accommodation between the two men.

Dr. Morey was a powerful administrator as well as an ardent art-historian. He had only recently become Chairman, although he was brought into the Department by Professor Allan Marquand, who, Morey said, was the first art-historian in any American university, since most men in the fine arts to the limited extent of their development in those early days inclined toward connoisseurship. Under the enthusiastic leadership of Marquand and his successors, the Department of Art and Archaeology acquired valuable art collections and two fine libraries, the Barr Ferree and the Marquand, which made Princeton a prime source of materials for the history of art.

Of Morey himself one of his colleagues and successors was to write at the time of his death that he had "a magnetic eye and a quiet but determined manner of speaking...a compelling personality and steadfast character, and where questions of value entered in, he could be uncomprom-

missing."⁵ His great value to Flexner was, of course, his academic authority; however, like Veblen, on whom the Director relied for the same sure guidance in mathematics, Morey was to prove difficult of assimilation into Flexner's plans for the whole Institute, which did not always go as far as Morey wished.

In what follows, it may be difficult to understand the Director's attitude toward the Department without bearing in mind that, with the Founders, he felt under the obligation to make some restitution to the University for having drawn so heavily on the Department of Mathematics in building the School of Mathematics. Corollary to that was the fact that Professor Veblen continually applied pressure for faculty government, even when the School of Mathematics was the only faculty present. It was absolutely necessary for Flexner to rely upon an unimpeachable academic authority, therefore, in making his recommendations. But Professor Veblen apparently questioned the good faith of Professor Morey in the first of his recommendations, and it appears from the defensive statements Dr. Flexner made at certain of the Trustees' meetings, apparently without context or reason, that the mathematician was inclined to resist every appointment which was not for the School of Mathematics. For Flexner not to have had backing as distinguished in the humanities as he received from Veblen in the School of Mathematics would have been disastrous for him.

In the light of this background, it becomes understandable that after several consultations between them, Dr. Morey presented Flexner with a memorandum for professors and research assistants which represented the interests of both men. These were prefaced by a description

of the Department, its past and present preoccupations and engagements, and plans for the new School which tied it in theory closely to the Department and its needs. The archaeology and art-history of classical antiquity and the Middle Ages were the Department's main fields of specialization. The Agora excavations for the American School for Classical Studies were directed by Professor T. Leslie Shear of the University; at this time Richard Stillwell, Professor of Architecture at Princeton, was assisting him and acting as Director of the American School for Classical Studies. Both men were also working on the earlier finds at Corinth. The Department also was part of a consortium which was excavating Antioch-on-Orontes, valuable source of information on the transformation from classical antiquity to the art of the Middle Ages. Two large research enterprises were going forward in the Department in Princeton; certain parts of the catalogues of the Museo Cristiano, and an Index of Christian Art. They represented ambitious projects in assembling and arranging authoritative source materials in both for the periods covered, and both were nominated for expansion into other periods and types of objects. The Index had been worked on for some ten or twelve years; its aim was to catalogue and bibliograph all known manuscripts and objets d'art up to the year 1400.

Morey frankly expressed the opinion that the School of Humanistic Studies could do nothing better than to "realize and fill the lacunae which have made themselves insistently felt within our...research -- and to fill these with scholars of outstanding ability who would add powerfully to the sum of archaeological scholarship that can be usefully concentrated at Princeton." He asserted that for the Institute to estab-

lish new objectives, say, in American archaeology, or Egyptian, or Assyrian, would be neither as satisfactory nor as economical; Princeton had gained "a considerable momentum" in its fields, and the Institute could be more effective in contributing to their development than by initiating its own fields of inquiry. To strengthen his position he quoted an opinion from Dr. Erwin Panofsky, eminent art-historian lately of Hamburg, and presently teaching as Visiting Professor at New York University.

'Art and archaeology would really be the best thing to begin with, for as things have developed, art-history has become a kind of clearing house (both literally and figuratively speaking) for all the other historical disciplines which, when left alone, tend to a certain self-isolation. This key position in modern Geistesgeschichte accounts also for the success of the Warburg Library in Hamburg, and it would be a magnificent idea to build up a similar thing (yet not a duplicate, thanks to the well-established tradition of your Department) at Princeton.'⁶

According to this pattern, Dr. Morey then listed five professional positions, and suggested four candidates as follows: (1) An art-historian in the 14th Century and the later Middle Ages, for which he named Dr. Panofsky, "the most brilliant scholar in...[those periods] that we know." (2) A paleographer in Greek and Latin, for which, with the admission that such a genius did not exist, he named Dr. Elias A. Lowe as "second to none in Europe" in Latin. (3) A specialist in Greek architecture, for which he suggested Dr. W. B. Dinsmoor of Columbia. (4) A Greek epigraphist, for which he named Dr. Benjamin D. Meritt, "outstanding...known for his brilliant work on the Agora inscriptions." (5) A Near Eastern archaeologist with a special competence in Islamic art. For this position he had no candidate. But he said that not only

was such a scholar needed for expertise in the art problems of the Middle Ages, but also for training two promising students in the Department of Oriental (Near Eastern) Languages and Literatures who wanted to specialize in Near Eastern archaeology. For research assistants he described three positions and named three men to fill them, saying that they were the men who would ultimately replace the scholars mentioned above, and would build on the foundations they have laid.⁷

As for facilities, Dr. Morey alluded to certain remodeling in prospect at McCormick Hall which housed the Department and the Marquand Library, and wrote:

In a conversation we had some time ago, you had some fun with me because I admired the 'installation' of the mathematics group in Fine Hall....The archaeologist and art-historian cannot say with Dr. Einstein that all they need 'is a pencil and a pad of paper.' We work with plates, architectural drawings, plans, maps, photographs, movable objects from excavations, etc...We cannot do without drafting rooms, large spaces in which to lay out comparative material, rooms for the classified shelving of photographs, facilities for photographing and photostating, and store-rooms for excavation records. And we must be near an adequate library, complete in the extensive publications by which archaeological scholarship is recorded.

When the...remodeling of McCormick Hall is completed...the group will have all these facilities...to meet present and minimum requirements [of the Department]. (Emphasis his.)

While one or two more men in the research staff might not tax facilities too heavily, more would. And so Dr. Morey suggested that the Institute should build a north wing to the museum to provide more space for offices and facilities. He closed with a warning note:

I mention this in order to give you as complete a picture as I can of the full extent of the commitments which the Institute might be assuming in undertaking an extension into the field of archaeology and history of art in cooperation with the Department of Art and Archaeology.⁸

In its tone this was less an outline for cooperation than a statement of conditions. But Morey's straightforward approach apparently satisfied the Director.

Though it would seem that he had intended to present some nominations at the annual meeting of the Board in 1934, Flexner was evidently dissuaded by the inadequacy of an addition to endowment then provided by the Founders. But a year later, faced with a similar shortage of funds and the rapidly advancing plans of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds which were competing for a share of them, Flexner presented two nominations to the Trustees on the grounds that (1) his best contribution to the Institute was to bring men to it before he retired; (2) the men concerned were then available, and would likely not be later since they were considering other offers which, if accepted, would hold them for several years. The first was Dr. Benjamin Meritt, and the second Dr. Erwin Panofsky. Dr. Meritt was a young scholar in Greek history, epigraphy, archaeology and philology, who at thirty-three years of age had two years before been called to the Hopkins' Francis White Chair, first filled by Gildersleeve. His rise had been meteoric. Now he was offered a chair at Chicago (which he was unlikely to take because the Hopkins had met the terms). Though Flexner did not explain the latter fact, it was true that if Dr. Meritt accepted the increase at Baltimore he would be committed to remain there for a time.

Meritt was an ideal choice; as an eminent American scholar, he hopefully would be the "leading spirit" of the School of Humanistic Studies, familiar with academic conditions in this country, and recognized as a very eminent scholar. Flexner's old friend and adviser, Dr. Edward Capps, who

may have known of Flexner's intentions early, wrote him in October, 1932, about Meritt:

I am looking forward to seeing Ben become the head of the Department of History and Archaeology of the Institute....

I believe that archaeology as a part of history is one of the subjects that can be successfully prosecuted on the higher levels of research in this country, and that such stimulus to research in that field is greatly needed here. Conducting excavations alone is all right if the excavator is trained to his job, but exploiting finds can be terribly superficial and will generally be so unless the scholar in question is imbued with the historical spirit from first to last and thoroughly grounded in his department of history.⁹

Few men could meet that test as could Dr. Meritt. He was willing to accept a call to the Institute, but only on specified conditions: he would devote his whole time to research in epigraphy; he would retain his positions with the American School for Classical Studies as Editor of its publications, as Member of the Agora Commission, and as Member of the Managing Committee of the School. He recognized that in leaving Baltimore he would have to surrender his work as an editor of the American Journal of Philology. Also he was committed to spend 1935-1936 at Oxford, and would keep the engagement. Flexner agreed.¹⁰

Dr. Panofsky was temporarily teaching at New York University full-time after being summarily dismissed from his position at Hamburg by Hitler's ministry in 1933. Like Dr. von Neumann, he had been teaching half-time in this country since 1931. But he did not intend to remain at New York University, especially after talking with Morey, who needed at Princeton a highly qualified art-historian in certain periods since the retirement of Dr. Frank Mather from the Department in 1933. Morey wanted "a specialist in the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, a Quattrocentist...whose preference for Italian or Northern Renaissance

would be immaterial, provided he would bring to bear upon our work an outstanding competence in the period, and the critical acumen and ability to synthesize the diverse phenomena of the end of the Middle Age...." He regarded Panofsky as "the most brilliant scholar [in the period] that we know."¹¹ He had introduced Panofsky to Flexner in 1934, and the Professor had fallen in love with Princeton, making his home here and entering his two sons in the University. Hopefully, he wrote Flexner, the Institute would soon open its third School, and would call him.¹²

In the early spring of 1935 the art-historian was being asked to accept a permanent full-time appointment at New York University, and was also considering a bid from the Renaissance Society of Chicago. Flexner feared the scholar would be lost to the Institute if he hesitated longer. Moreover, the opportunity to place an Institute man in McCormick Hall, without whose facilities no art-historian could hope to work in Princeton, was still open; Morey still needed Panofsky, and the Professor still wanted to come.

Mr. Percy Straus became a party in interest here. As a member of the governing board of New York University, he inclined to the view that Flexner was "competing" with his institution for Panofsky. When Flexner succeeded in convincing the Trustee that the professor had been deaf to his persuasions to remain at New York University, Straus adverted to Institute finances. The social sciences, he urged, would need substantial amounts of money for their development; they now had prior claim on the Institute. Straus was much interested in economics; he had recently had something to do with calling Dr. Beardsley Rumml from the University of Chicago to be treasurer of R. H. Macy & Company, and seemed

to be trying to persuade Dr. Riefler to shape his course in research to Rumml's views. Straus seemed to be certain that Mr. Bamberger would make but few more gifts to endowment during his lifetime, though he had no doubt the Founders' bequests would take care of the Institute's needs. The two men argued vigorously, they reached no accord before the Board meeting in April, 1935.¹³ Then, despite his knowledge that in following his usual procedure, Flexner would have cleared the appointments with Mr. Bamberger before proposing them to the Trustees, Mr. Straus precipitated a debate, evidently joined by Mr. Hardin. The minutes recite:

A question was raised as to whether, instead of beginning two new schools in the coming autumn, it would not be wiser to attempt a forecast of the possible budget of the School of Economics and Politics and a survey of the costs involved in the support of the two existing schools over a period of fifteen years. The Director stated that such a forecast was, in his judgment, impossible, and that the Institute could only develop if it carefully kept within the sum of money available from year to year, retaining a safe margin.¹⁴

This was tantamount to saying that since new funds became available only on a year-by-year basis, the Director could not withhold development of the first modest outlines of the Institute, especially since he was encountering vigorous competition for them. The other point in the debate arose from the fact that Dr. Morey was the academic sponsor for both appointments. "The importance of a more definite understanding with the Trustees of Princeton University was raised," say the minutes. Flexner defended the planned cooperation: not only was it working out well in Fine Hall, but it was successful as between the Bartol Institute and Swarthmore, and between the Carnegie Institute's Department of Embryology and the Hopkins' School of Medicine. In both cases what he called "free trade" prevailed. Moreover, he described the relations prevailing in

Princeton:

The cooperation... [between the University and the Institute] has been ideal. This is to some extent to be explained by the fact that the President of the University and the Dean of the Graduate School and the Director of the Institute have adopted a very definite technique: that of talking over with one another any points of interest to both institutions before undertaking any direct communications with the members of the faculty of either institution. There has been no crossing of wires, and there has been a thorough understanding on the part of the respective heads as to every detail before action of any kind has been taken.¹⁵

While the purpose here was to give particularity to his claim of harmony with the University, it may have been that his statement was provoked by questions from Professor Veblen, who was opposed to the influence of Morey in the appointment of Panofsky, although the only mention specifically of that fact was made in a letter from the Director to the Professor shortly after the meeting. But Veblen made no secret of his feeling that Morey sought to secure the services of Panofsky at the Institute's expense while avoiding any possible criticism by employing the eminent art-historian himself.¹⁶ Beside that, no statement of basic policy could have been so unacceptable to the mathematician, ardent advocate of faculty selection and approval of academic appointments, than Flexner offered here.

These appointments marked a new departure -- for a period at least -- in salary policy. The Director said:

I am strongly convinced that we should offer at the outset no particular financial inducement to those whom we invite to join the Institute. I do not abate in the least my conviction that...academic salaries in this country should be higher. I do not believe that the highest academic salaries paid by the Institute are too high. I feel strongly that everyone who is invited to join the Institute as a professor should also feel that in due time on the basis of merit and

that alone -- not on the basis of length of service or priority of appointment -- his salary may be increased should the Director recommend and the Board approve. Should the Board adopt my view and authorize the appointment of two persons as a small nucleus for a school of humanistic studies, I should suggest that their salaries be no higher than they are in the institutions with which they have been connected...I should hope...that if justified by their usefulness they might expect, as the resources...permit, to be gradually and eventually elevated to the standard upon which the Institute began.¹⁷

The Director then warned the Board that land and buildings should not be allowed to compete for funds needed to bring "brains" to the Institute:

I shall not in this report anticipate what the Committee [on Buildings and Grounds] has to say, but I wish to restate my conviction that the real greatness of the Institute depends and will forever depend not upon buildings but upon brains. Fine Hall is an excellent illustration of what can be accomplished through the establishment of a communal life, which does indeed require a separate building. But the several schools need not all be erected upon a single plot, and, if necessary, over a preliminary period of years satisfactory results may be obtained in rented quarters...Like the Johns Hopkins University in its glory, the Institute for Advanced Study may flourish in any sort of buildings...provided each school as established has assembled a group of men comparable with those who have already been brought together.¹⁸

With the conclusion that the Board should support "conservative leadership," the Trustees approved the start of the third School and the two appointments, although it appeared that even with Mr. Straus recorded at his request as abstaining, the vote was not otherwise unanimous.¹⁹

The debate seriously disturbed Flexner. He spent the next day interviewing possible sources of endowment in New York, informing Messrs. Bamberger and Straus of the fact. Straus was obdurate; he still could not see that Flexner had not prejudiced the work in economics, in which most universities were doing badly, he said. Somewhat surprisingly Flexner

replied that he saw little likelihood that the School of Economics and Politics would need more money in the immediate future -- evidently an indication of Stewart's unreadiness to accept appointment as professor, and his unwillingness to see a definite program undertaken until he was ready to do so. Nor was the School of Humanistic Studies going to expand substantially until resources increased; meanwhile, he said, "we can sit back and await developments without imperiling our solvency."²⁰

To Mr. Bamberger he said much the same thing:

I want to reassure you and Mrs. Fuld about the future. Nothing that was said by either Mr. Straus or Mr. Hardin was new to me...I have been looking day by day as far ahead as I can at the question of our relations with Princeton, and I have been watching the budget with the eye of an eagle...

As to future relations with the University, he saw only mutual benefits from his course of action,

because the interests of the two institutions absolutely coincide...Nothing is so apt to cement relationships as mutual interests, and mutual interests from which both parties benefit equally exist here.

As to the budget, we have a probable surplus of \$50,000 next year, and there are items in the mathematical budget which, though very important, could, if necessary, be dropped, with the result that our surplus would be almost doubled.²¹

Though he expressed hope that funds would come as the result of his interviews of the day before, he could offer nothing conclusive.

After this Dr. Flexner and his wife took a Mediterranean cruise, in the hope, as he wrote a friend, that he would recover from the effects of "a Board meeting, preparation for which had exhausted me."²² And well they might have. For Flexner had always taken certain precautions to avoid acrimony in disagreements in Trustees' meetings which would disturb Mr. Bamberger, who was extraordinarily sensitive to discord. Thus the

Director usually sought to iron out differences or to establish clearly the basis of argument, before the meetings, as he had here with Mr. Straus. It was a matter of course for him to secure the prior personal approval of Mr. Bamberger to every action to be submitted to the Board. In any ordinary situation Flexner would have welcomed a complete airing of differences. He had stood up in battle over program and principle with Mr. Gates and other Trustees in the General Education Board. It was not argument that was dangerous here; it was anger and bad feeling. True, this was not manifested in the instant discussion, but the difference with his policy manifested by two of Mr. Bamberger's close associates was troublesome. It was curious that in the previous meeting the first bitter difference to occur in the Board had taken place. Mr. Frankfurter had been extremely disputatious, so that Mrs. Fuld said sotto voce to Flexner as the lawyer was speaking: "This man has to go!"²³ But it was not for this reason that the Trustees voted unanimously to omit Frankfurter's name from the Board at this meeting. Flexner had lost a valued friend and a strong Trustee, whose voice he had expected to be clear and informed but reasonable in clarifying the academic practices and experience to the lay Trustees.

In the event, there was no time "to sit back and await developments." For Mr. Bamberger, disturbed by what he considered to be too ambitious a program of land purchase for the site of the Institute, decided with Mrs. Fuld that they would take care of "present commitments" and then cease giving financial aid "at the present time."²⁴ The Institute was to be frozen in whatever shape the Director could bring it to quickly; the need for decisions in respect of the schools of economics

and the humanities was clear. As has been said, he seems to have decided that no further development in economics should be undertaken then, and hastened to secure Mr. Bamberger's approval of certain additions to the staff in the humanities.

Three nominations were submitted to the Executive Committee which gave him permission to offer appointments on the 6th December. On the 20th January, 1936, the Founders made their last gift to endowment: cash and securities valued at \$994,000. On the 27th January the Board approved the appointment of Messrs. W. A. Campbell, Ernst Herzfeld and E. A. Lowe as professors in the School of Humanistic Studies.²⁵ The gift was sufficient to meet the estimated cost of the site, and to capitalize the salaries of the three new appointees with a little to spare.

Though it was the time for presentation of estimates for the following year's budget, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that the very substantial summary of requirements for the School of Humanistic Studies and the Department of Art and Archaeology presented by Dr. Morey to Professor Panofsky in November was related to Dr. Flexner's crisis. Not only were some of the items quite extravagant, but they totaled nearly \$50,000 annually, and contemplated a capital expenditure for the north wing at an estimated \$120,000 as well. In the budget there was approximately \$18,000 for positions deferred; \$15,000 for cash subventions to the Department of Art and Archaeology in view of its services to Institute members, of which \$8,000 a year over the next ten was to supplement the Department's appropriations for the Index, and \$7,000 p.a. for library accessions.

The memorandum was prefaced by Morey's Ptolemaic view of the relation of the School to the Department.

It may be stated at the outset, as a result of a great deal of thinking and discussion on the part of the art and archaeology group at Princeton, that they have become convinced of the advisability of developing the School of the Humanities in and around the Department of Art and Archaeology.... To attempt to develop in the Institute all the widely scattered humanity disciplines would not only involve it in a staggering expense, but would be likely to result in a faculty of more or less isolated specialties. If, on the other hand, the focus is placed in art and archaeology, the collateral demands of this subject (sic) will insure a certain breadth to the School, but at the same time insure its integration as a group of scholars with the necessary contact one with the other.²⁶

Needless to say, the cash subventions and the construction of the wing were not forthcoming from the Institute.

Dr. Elias A. Lowe, Latin paleographer, was then in his fifty-fifth year. He had studied, taught and researched in Europe since the beginning of the century; he had been a member of the Carnegie Institute in Washington, D.C. since 1911, and lecturer, then Reader, at Oxford since 1914. Since 1929 he had been working on a great project under the auspices of the Rockefeller Foundation, the Union Académique, and the American Council of Learned Societies which administered a grant of \$75,000 for expenses given by the Foundation in 1929. He was assembling, photographing and documenting all Latin literary manuscripts from 79 B.C., to 800 A.D. Ten volumes of the Codes Latini Antiquiores were projected, of which two were published by this time. The work was basic to the study of mediaeval history and literature.

The Rockefeller grant was now exhausted, and would not be supplemented. Dr. Lowe had begun to find the climate of Oxford oppressive

and unhealthful. He wanted to return to his native land. Having met Flexner at Oxford in 1928, and followed the development of the Institute, he naturally thought of the possibility of coming to it. But nothing seemed further from Flexner's mind than appointing a paleographer at the Institute when Mr. Frankfurter at Oxford, to whom Flexner had introduced Dr. Lowe, raised the question in January, 1934. He answered that while universities generally were not employing paleographers, Princeton might be interested in an application from Lowe to match its friendly rival, Harvard. Lowe then asked Flexner's intercession on his behalf; the result was that Dr. Morey recommended that the Institute employ Lowe. The paleographer enjoyed considerable support in American quarters which impressed the Director; Miss Belle da Costa Greene of the Morgan Library, Drs. John C. Merriam and W. M. Gilbert of the Carnegie Institute, and Dr. Waldo Leland of the American Council of Learned Societies among others were all eager to see the Institute give him an opportunity to complete the work he had undertaken in 1929. For that he needed a haven and means apparently not otherwise available.²⁷

Of Ernst Herzfeld's availability Dr. Morey had been lately apprised. The German scholar, at fifty-six, was an eminent Persian archaeologist, epigraphist and historian. Dr. Walter W. S. Cook of New York University joined Morey in urging Flexner to undertake the appointment. Herzfeld had the results of twenty years of field work ready or in preparation for publication. He had been dismissed by Hitler from his German connections, which had originated with the Emperor, and a contract with the Oriental Institute in Chicago was expiring. Morey supported his

appointment not only because of the Department's interest in the Middle Ages but also in the hope that Herzfeld would work with some Princeton students in the Department of Oriental Studies, who were eager to train in Islamic archaeology.²⁸

The third was young W. A. Campbell, Master of Fine Arts at Princeton magna cum laude in 1930, presently Associate Professor of Arts half-time at Wellesley, and supervising the Antioch excavations the other half. The consortium of which Princeton was part was then seeking renewal of its concession, and Princeton wanted Campbell to continue if it were extended. But Wellesley intended to appoint him to the Chair in Classics which became vacant. Accordingly Dr. Morey persuaded the Director it would be good if the Institute should appoint Campbell to a full-time position as a staff archaeologist to work on whatever explorations it might become interested in. But Dr. Flexner, evidently realizing the Institute would not engage in archaeology, presented the appointment to the Trustees as one of a young classicist of Meritt's type, who had the capacity to take his place in the higher ranks as had Meritt. This was true enough. After the Board had approved the appointment, a bad hitch occurred. Flexner had left all arrangements with Campbell and Wellesley to Dr. Morey. That worthy, claiming that he was unprepared for the routine announcement, protested that he had not informed either of his action or the Institute's. The episode resulted in much embarrassment and a year's delay, during which Campbell accepted the chair at Wellesley and the consortium succeeded in renewing its concession at Antioch. In January, 1937, Flexner presented a revised recommendation to the Board; it approved his nomination of Campbell as Field Archaeologist for the

term of the concession (1937-1943), to work half of each year at Antioch for the University, paid by the Institute, and carrying on his work at Wellesley the other half-year.²⁹

If this incident seemed to betray a certain negligence on the Director's part in passing on Dr. Morey's requests, nothing can be said to dispel the impression. Morey even reproved Flexner for approving certain men whom he nominated for membership and stipends without having seen and passed on their credentials. Flexner's reply that of course he assumed Panofsky had seen and approved them hardly carried conviction, for there is no evidence he had ever made Panofsky responsible for the observance of established standards.³⁰

The Director made the sixth recommendation for the staff of the School of Humanistic Studies in October, 1936, when he asked the Board to appoint Dr. Hetty Goldman, archaeologist, as Professor, and the Board obliged. For this action the academic approval of Professor Meritt appeared as follows in the minutes:

I remember our conversation of this summer about possible appointments in the humanistic Section and wish to give you this record of my opinion favoring the appointment of Miss Hetty Goldman, with whom I have been associated from time to time since 1922, when we were both at the excavations of Colophon in Asia Minor.

Miss Goldman is recognized as an outstanding explorer and excavator, who has done excellent work in both historic and pre-historic investigation. Her 'Fach' is a desirable complement to my own historical-epigraphical studies, and I should look forward to close association with her in the Institute with the greatest pleasure. Miss Goldman's published reports and books have been admirable, and I think of her appointment not with a view to any commitment of the Institute to field work as such, but as an opportunity for Miss Goldman's further exploitation of her unpublished material so that she may prepare it and studies coming from it for publication.

I should be particularly interested in continuing my own work with her on Colophon, but this I mention as one item only. The important thing, as I see it, is to get her where she can carry on her whole program most successfully.³¹

Dr. Goldman had been excavating at Tarsus in Anatolia for several years under the auspices of the Fogg Museum, the Archaeological Institute of America, and Bryn Mawr. At the time of her appointment she had resigned as Director of the explorations, and presumably would devote herself entirely to preparing her work for publication. Shortly after her appointment, however, she resumed her direction of the exploration at Tarsus, which took her abroad during each spring semester until 1940 when the war made further field work impossible. The cost of her expedition had been met in the past, and continued to be supported largely by a private donor, who was greatly interested in Miss Goldman's achievement and wished to remain anonymous.³² The Institute received a small donation from this source, which went toward paying for the Institute's expenses for secretarial assistance, members and research assistants whom she brought to Princeton to work on her studies. During the war the archaeologist spent all her time at the Institute. Her retirement in 1947 meant little in the way of decreased work, except that she did no further exploration. She has continued to work in her study at Fuld Hall, the only woman ever to be on the Institute's faculty.

In 1936 Dr. Edward Capps retired at seventy from the University, but continued for a time as Chairman of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies. His work was to be largely in Princeton, where he had no office and no means of getting one. His wife was ill. It appeared that he would not be able to afford high-cost

Princeton. At that pass Flexner stepped into the picture. He had a deep interest in the American School of Classical Studies, as has been said, and a deeper one in his old friend and guide of past days. Impulsively he suggested that Dr. Capps might occupy an office near Meritt's in 69 Alexander Street. That in turn led to finding an apartment nearby which would enable the classicist to take care of his wife while working on the Agora investigations. And, since his economic situation was precarious, Flexner also offered a visiting professorship at the Institute with a small honorarium; all apparently without previous consultation with either Meritt or President Dodds. The former expressed delight; the latter, rage at this gratuitous interference with University personnel, and its tacit reflection on the retirement system. But he did not make his anger public.

Professor Meritt supported both these appointments: Miss Goldman's because Dr. Morey had referred Flexner to Meritt for the purpose, and Capps because the arrangement was designed to benefit him particularly. Of this he wrote:

The appointment of Capps, who is one of the best-known and most highly respected classical scholars in America, would lend distinction to the Institute as such, and in particular his association would be most helpful to me because of the close connection we both have with the excavation of the Athenian Agora, Capps being Chairman of the Managing Committee of the School, and Chairman of the Agora Commission of the School, while I hold the less prominent positions of member of the Managing Committee and of the Agora Commission, and of member of the excavation staff in charge of epigraphy.

Our work together would thus afford a concentration which I know would be most useful to me -- and I hope in some degree to Capps -- in forwarding the best ideals of scholarship in which the Institute is interested.³³

Unfortunately, ambiguities crept into the Director's report as reflected in the Minutes of this meeting and the resolutions on which the Board took action. It is apparent that Professor Veblen did not understand that Dr. Goldman was being appointed a Professor of the Institute, but construed her status to be, like that of Dr. Capps whom Flexner first discussed, that of a visiting professor. The resolution which was passed however, showed that her position was permanent. Veblen questioned Mrs. Bailey about this; Dr. Flexner answered that Dr. Goldman qualified for a professorship, that he had recommended it, and that her compensation would have been in line with previous appointments had funds been available. The second misunderstanding was voiced by Mr. Mass, who had understood from the Director's report that the appointment of a curator for the Gest Oriental Library was to be for several years only, while she finished her task of cataloging the collection and took care of it in its informal repository. Flexner's reply was equally firm; he hoped the Gest Library, which would always need a Chinese-speaking Custodian, would be the "nucleus" of Oriental studies at Princeton, and had conferred with President Dodds on the subject.³⁴

Within eighteen months the Director had staffed the School of Humanistic Studies with five professors, each highly qualified in his field. Evidence is not lacking that he did this under the most extreme pressure: indeed, though he had one, Professor Meritt, in mind from the very beginning, and had every reason to be proud of the rest of his selections, he undoubtedly would have wished to defer all of them until funds were in hand to enable the payment of something like uniform salaries, and provision for adequate retirement benefits to those who were

too old to accumulate them at Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association. For whatever of doubt attended his actions in these matters, his devotion to higher salaries and better security in age was beyond question. In the race between land and buildings on the one hand and scholars on the other, he was forced by lack of funds to make otherwise indefensible arrangements with some of the humanists. Was this necessary? The Trustees and Flexner himself regarded it as imperative that the nucleus of each school be established before the first Director laid down his burden; again and again letters bear this out, as do his own frequent statements to the Board. For the other Trustees recognized that he was the only man with acceptable ideas of what the Institute should be and become who enjoyed at the same time the confidence of the Founders, on whose generosity the accomplishment depended.

Flexner had frankly represented the accession of Professors Goldman, Herzfeld and Lowe as of older scholars who needed a haven and auspices under which to complete the preparation for publication of their discoveries over long lives of study and investigation. He spoke convincingly of the scholarly waste in unpublished records such as theirs. Of course, the Institute had no fund for publications in the humanities, and no money to devote to it. Professor Lowe's ten volumes had all been paid for, one-third by the Clarendon Press which was publishing them. As for the rest, Flexner had to seek funds from the foundations, as he did for stipends for members in the humanities.

In view of the pressures on him, and the financial circumstances of the Institute, it was fortunate that the Director was able to make

reasonably generous arrangements with three of the humanists. It might be said that it was done in the face of continuing demands from Professor Veblen that two members of the School of Mathematics faculty should be given the maximum salary -- and apparently without special interest being manifested by the younger men themselves. Indeed, at the very meeting where the Director proposed a salary of \$4,000 for Herzfeld, who was, he said, "recognized as the foremost scholar in the field of Islamic archaeology," he was constrained to announce an increase in the salaries of Professors Alexander and Von Neumann by \$2,500 each, though he did so without mentioning their names (effective 7/1/36).³⁵

The accommodation of the humanists in quarters at the University was apparently not possible. The Chairman of the Classics Department was very unfriendly to the Institute, and apparently had no direct intercourse with Flexner. Perhaps Professor Meritt, an alumnus of Princeton, would have been welcomed by the Department, but President Dodds held a conversation with the Chairman about Messrs. Campbell, Herzfeld and Lowe, and transmitted some information to Flexner personally.³⁶ After that the Institute purchased a large old residence at 69 Alexander Street at what was evidently considered a premium price. It was remodeled during the summer of 1936 for use as offices, and by the time the new appointees arrived in Princeton in October, it was ready. Dr. Morey was eager to see Herzfeld's museum and library installed in McCormick Hall, and made space for it. But Herzfeld, claiming that he wanted access to his notes, library and artifacts all hours of day and night, asked the Director to rent space for him. The Institute rented a large apartment at 10 Bayard Lane, where Herzfeld and his sister also each had an apartment. Profes-

sorPanofsky was at McCormick Hall. Professor Lowe, coming to Princeton in the winter of 1937 after traveling to collect facsimilies, found inadequate the study prepared for his use at 69 Alexander Street and rented space in his home for his work, the Institute paying for the extra facilities. Professors Capps, Goldman, Meritt, Earle, Mitrany and Riefler occupied studies in the house on Alexander Street.

There is no doubt that Flexner hoped the School of Humanistic Studies would organize itself, as had the School of Mathematics, around and under the leadership of Professor Meritt. But the Professor spent his first year of employment by the Institute at Oxford and in Athens, arriving in Princeton in October, 1936. Meanwhile Flexner had implied his expectation that Meritt would unofficially "lead" the humanists as Veblen did the mathematicians by noting in the Bulletin that in the absence of Professor Meritt, "the task of beginning fell to Professor Panofsky."³⁸ But even after Professor Meritt's arrival, the faculty of the School showed no disposition to organize themselves into a group. Of course they were scattered; casual meetings were impossible, except for the three at the old house. One had to make an appointment, and they were so busy with their work that they failed to do it. Herzfeld and Panofsky were each giving a course of lectures at New York University and the Metropolitan Museum, and devoting some time to the Department's needs, while the greatest part of their thought and energy was devoted to completing their own studies.³⁹ Beside that, Herzfeld was a natural recluse. Dr. Lowe worked at home.

But humanists seem to be different from mathematicians in any event. The new men were more individualistic; the mathematicians were

delighted that Professor Veblen anticipated their needs and took care of them with Flexner. Dr. Morey was the only administrator among the humanists; he continued to press his demands upon Flexner through Professor Panofsky, whose survival in the direct line of fire between Flexner and Morey was a tribute to his tact and forbearance. But there was no longer any possibility of allocating a lump sum for stipends to the humanists, though the School of Mathematics continued to demand and get its appropriation. Flexner had to "pass the hat," so to speak, among the foundations, garnering enough to satisfy most of the entirely reasonable requests made by the humanists, and giving credit to the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation for their valuable aid in the Bulletin.

His dilemma was shown clearly when in 1937 he met Professor Panofsky's requests for stipends for himself and Dr. Morey with an irascible declaration that he could not continue to handle such demands individually for the School of Humanistic Studies, and rashly suggested that after the holidays he might call the professors and Dr. Morey too to a meeting. When Panofsky asked how much money there was for stipends for the humanists, Flexner thought better of his suggestion. He did not call such a meeting.⁴⁰ The reasons were obvious enough. Without explanations the professors would hardly understand why the Director aided the Department of Art and Archaeology. These would not be possible. Nor would it be possible to explain how the Institute became involved in Princeton's obligations under the consortium exploring Antioch, which bore little relation to any of the School's interests and displeased even Professor Meritt. But no humanist appeared to challenge Flexner's

concessions to the Department as did Professor Veblen, who had his own interests in doing so, as will be seen later.

In reality, an unhealthy situation existed now within the Institute. The hope that each school would be autonomous had not been realized. Nothing was further from the possibilities of the situation than the Director's suggestion that each might have a chairman, changing annually, as he understood it was done in Germany and elsewhere. The School of Humanistic Studies was composed of individualists interested in different disciplines, loyal to the Institute, while rather taking it for granted, but having little or no sense of solidarity within their group. The School of Economics and Politics was composed of three actively divergent personalities whom Flexner had tried vainly and mistakenly to weld into one. It could hardly become an autonomous School, for its members were each completely "autonomous;" and none was satisfied with what he was permitted to do. This vacuum of power or meaningful policy for grouping was in strange contrast with the School of Mathematics, where five professors allowed the sixth, with only occasional challenges, to take care of their needs. And not the least sinister aspect of the situation was the attitude of the Director himself. Weary and beset with problems which might have been met readily without the restrictions imposed by Mr. Bamberger, Flexner not unnaturally came to regard Professor Veblen as speaking for the entire faculty, as will later be seen. For Veblen moved expertly, and devoted much of his time to management activities, saving the Director many hours and conversations with the others. In a real sense, he was renouncing his personal concerns with each professor. This left the field to Veblen, who took it quietly.

The Institute's financial aid to the Department of Art and Archaeology began in the fall of 1934 at Dr. Morey's request. Dr. Flexner secured from the Board in October an appropriation of \$6,000 for 1934-1935, later extended to 1935-1936, to be spent for a survey of resources for art history between New York and Washington. Two excellent German art-historians, Drs. Helmut Schlunk and Kurt Weitzmann, were employed by Dr. Morey. Apparently they made the survey, in addition to helping with research projects in the Department, but it is not available. They supported Dr. Morey's position that Princeton was the first American university to be interested in the history of art, appointing Allan Marquand to a professorship in 1881, while Harvard inclined more toward appreciation. They suggested that if both Harvard and Princeton were made very strong in the fine arts, they would supply the other universities with the men to spread the interest in those disciplines.⁴¹

The real nature of the Executive cooperation between the Institute and the University became really apparent in 1936-1937, when the School began to operate. Then there were nine members enrolled in the School of Humanistic Studies, of whom all but one were nominated by Dr. Morey to work in the Department. The following year there were twelve members, of whom ten worked in the Department and two with Professor Meritt. In 1938-1939, twelve of nineteen members in the School of Humanistic Studies worked primarily in and with the Department, in addition to three men attached to the Institute's staff.⁴² The Director found the strain of providing the necessary stipends great, for the Institute was not able to pay them all; he depended for help in individual cases from the foundations.

In 1936, he decided to seek a lump sum grant for the purpose, and found himself in a very embarrassing situation. He wrote President Frederick Keppel of the Carnegie Corporation as follows:

Last year we began a program of the same kind [as in mathematics] in the fields of economics and the humanities. The economics group will develop very, very slowly, and its needs can be met from our own resources.

The humanities group can develop more rapidly...Indeed, it is almost entirely a question of money. I believe that, if the Carnegie Corporation voted an appropriation of \$25,000 a year for three years, it would beyond question be capitalized by friends of the Institute by the end of that period, and meanwhile facilities and opportunities of the Institute need not wait...

It is for the purpose of bridging this gap and enabling us to progress more rapidly...that I submit this application to you and your Trustees.⁴³

Mr. Keppel's reply was disconcerting.

We have been praying over your letter of October 31st. Our Trustees, or rather those I've had a chance to consult, are interested in the possibilities, but one of them suggests that, in view of the intimate relations between the Institute and Princeton University it might be well for you to see President Dodds at your common convenience to discuss the whole situation with him. Princeton may have some plans for us too, and we don't want to get the wires crossed.⁴⁴

To Flexner's answer that he talked often with President Dodds, and that frequent conferences prevented any "crossing of wires," Mr. Keppel noted that he also had talked with Dodds, and understood that the agreement between him and Flexner was one "in principle;" Keppel suggested that a "bill of particulars" should be drawn up to which agreement would be secured, then to be presented to the Corporation.⁴⁵

During this correspondence Dr. Morey presented to Professor Panofsky for Dr. Flexner a very ample budget for the Department of Art and Archaeology. The concession for Antioch had been renewed, and Morey asked

asked for two aides in addition to Mr. Campbell for the duration of the new contract period (1937-1942). He also mentioned two Princeton professors of art-history who needed sabbatical leave to prepare their work for publication, and asked for membership and their regular University salaries as stipend for the half-year. This had evidently been discussed previously; it was not made formal. Moreover, he renewed a previous request for a new chair in modern art-history, and named again the man he wished to see appointed to it. The Institute should also consider establishing a chair of musicology, but for this he had no candidate in mind. Also, would not the Institute be willing to halve with the Department the expense of bringing Dr. Adolph Goldschmidt, the German mediaevalist and art-historian, from Germany to teach the graduate students for a year? There was a final item: the Institute should remit to the Department \$2,000 to compensate for services of the custodian of slides, photographs, etc. rendered to Institute members. (Here Professor Panofsky put his foot down, for the members using the services were those appointed for the benefit of the Department.) The conclusion of Morey's memorandum was not calculated to ease Professor Panofsky's feelings:

This is a heavy offering. Nevertheless, it represents pretty much the sum total of the desiderata so far as our staff is concerned, and I think that friendly consideration of the research needs thereof as here set forth will make for an even greater degree of cooperation than that which the Institute and the Department have enjoyed ever since you came...

Since our conversation I feel dubious about this request. I think, however, that it is best for all concerned that a direct answer be made to it to clear up any misunderstanding as to the extent of the use the Institute makes of this section.⁴⁶

Flexner, usually equable, acknowledged the demands with rare irony: "with much appreciation for your marvellous cooperation -- sometimes a little too marvellous for our resources..."⁴⁷

Apparently the Director decided that relations with Morey now required some measure of formalization. Accordingly, an intra-mural memorandum to department chairmen affected by the operations of the Institute was dispatched by President Dodds on 27th November. It read:

The work of the Institute for Advanced Study is now of such scope as to make it desirable to regularize our administrative procedure in negotiations with them. This letter is, therefore, being addressed to the chairmen whose programs touch that of the Institute.

In choosing the personnel and determining the policy of the Institute for Advanced Study, Dr. Flexner has at times sought the advice of members of our faculty. Also at times members of our faculty on their own initiative have approached Dr. Flexner with suggestions, the adoption of which they thought would enlarge the opportunities in Princeton in their fields of study. In so doing they were recognizing the relationship possible between the University and the Institute in scholarly matters. For this reason the future development of the Institute is of interest not only to individual members of our faculty but to the University as a whole.

I have been considering ways in which our relations with the Institute may best be so coordinated as to avoid misunderstandings and the danger that various persons may work at cross-purposes. To this end I have designated the Dean of the Graduate School as our representative in these relations, and I am now asking that all members of the Faculty will consult with him before taking up with the Institute any matters which concern the cooperation between the two institutions.

I may add that this arrangement meets with the approval of the Director of the Institute.⁴⁸

As may be imagined, this statement, with its clear recognition of the advantages of scholarly cooperation between the institutions, and the admission that restraint was needed on the University's part, was not unwelcome to Flexner. It may have come as something of a surprise to some on the campus that the President found it necessary to protect the Institute. In the event, not all the items on Dr. Morey's budget for 1937-1938 were granted. The personnel for Antioch were all appointed

with stipends, probably because Flexner had earlier promised they would be if the contract was extended. President Dodds himself volunteered his approval of Morey's request that the Institute subsidize the two art-historians mentioned by Dr. Morey for their half-year of research and writing.⁴⁹

During the first five years of the School's operations, nearly forty individuals were registered as members in it for periods of six months to several years. Approximately one-half were nominated by the Department and worked primarily on researches of interest to it and to its professors. Dr. Morey tended to nominate men who had taken their highest degree at Princeton University. This was true of twelve, of whom six had their doctor's degrees and six were Masters of Fine Arts. Morey had adopted standards for the award of the Master of Fine Arts degree which required candidates to fulfill all the formal steps for the doctorate except the thesis. It was his belief that a man so qualified could, after several years of teaching, or administering a museum, or exploring, write a work "worth publishing on its own hook," a tribute not always earned by the doctoral thesis.⁵⁰

One of the members appointed for the Department was a Bachelor of Science, working on Antioch materials. The use of Dr. Schlunk's unused salary by Princeton's Committee on Antioch, left Flexner when the term opened with a notable exception to the post-doctoral rule which even Morey's Master of Fine Arts did not explain. This was evidently mentioned by Professor Veblen at the Trustees' meeting of the 27th January, 1936, (See p. 162) for Flexner said:

In principle, full time prevails throughout the institution.
Any departure from it would be made only in a particular case

and after the most careful scrutiny and under the most careful limitations. In no instance should any exception be cited as a precedent.⁵¹

There is a real doubt that Flexner regarded the members appointed for the Department of Art and Archaeology as in fact members of the Institute for Advanced Study. True, they received stipends from the Institute, or from one of the foundations at the Director's request, and their names appeared in the annual Bulletins as did the members' who came to work with professors of the Institute. But in the textual materials which gave a brief account of the activities in each School, the names of those who were called for the Department did not appear, except in rare instances. Dr. Aydelotte changed this policy, including as full an account of the work of these men as of those called by the Institute. Though Flexner was the true prophet of scholarly cooperation to achieve the largest possible results without a meum or teum, it was Aydelotte, who had not gone through the bruising experiences with Dr. Morey, who was able to describe the fruit of his predecessor's vision with clarity and generosity.

Flexner's accommodation to the needs of the Department of Art and Archaeology brought him much criticism which never took into consideration the worthiness of the individuals or the importance or value of their contributions to their particular researches, but rather / the propriety of the Institute for Advanced Study doing it at all. Here two members of the School of Mathematics faculty read unworthy motives in what the Director did, saying he sought to placate hostility at the University engendered by prejudice and bigotry. Manifestly it was to the advantage of Professor Veblen to deflect from himself any criticism for raiding the University for

part of the School of Mathematics' staff, which was the source of some if not most of the bitterness. Flexner, proud of the School, loyal to Veb-len for making a success of it, could not and would not believe in the seriousness of such canard.

Nevertheless, it might be conceded that when it came to making it up to the University, Flexner was generous and, though he was pressured by Morey's attitude, grateful for the art-historian's support in establishing the School of Humanistic Studies. Certain it is that he was deeply impressed -- unduly impressed, perhaps -- by the two strong men in the academic life of the Institute in those early days. But without them he might not have succeeded as he did.

In organizing the School of Humanistic Studies the Director was particularly insistent that the Board should recognize the experimental nature of everything which had been done, the flexibility which it must always preserve to change the fields of activity, as "men and money" might become available, or members of the present faculty retire or die. Thus he refused to establish "chairs" which must be filled when they became vacant, whether or not there was an outstanding man to call, or whether something new which did permit the appointment of an outstanding scholar or scientist gave greater promise. Here he alluded again to the example of the Collège de France. When he appointed three out of five humanists who were within eleven years of the retirement age, with the announced purpose of enabling them to finish writing their records for posterity, he manifestly had to refresh these most important principles in the minds of the Trustees. He did it in the following:

I hope that we shall never forget the truth of what our first years have abundantly demonstrated: namely, that the success

of the Institute depends solely and simply upon men and not upon accessories of any kind...If we will bring together men of great ability or great eminence, workers will flock to them regardless of the way they are housed. We have been careful to attach no specific title to any professor. Thus the freedom of an able man is completely guaranteed. On the other hand, it must be borne in mind that, inasmuch as the Institute for Advanced Study has no ordinary teaching duties, it is under no obligation to fill a vacant post. In the event that a chair becomes vacant several courses are open:

- 1 It may be filled in case there is a person of sufficient eminence and the subject itself is still a living one.
- 2 The amount expended can revert to the treasury to be used for any other legitimate purpose...
- 3 A new professorship in some entirely different subject can be established, provided a person of sufficient eminence and productivity is available.⁵²

Nor were all the favors on the University's side as one considered the relative gifts to the unique cooperation between the Institute and the University. Thus he also reminded the Trustees that

We have helped the University by bringing to Princeton a group of persons who possess the gifts, the learning, and the time needed to enlarge the advanced opportunities which Princeton University itself offers.⁵³

Perhaps nothing reveals the extent to which Flexner's plans were shaped by the desires and necessities of the humanists at Princeton University as does his handling of the opportunity to purchase the Gest Oriental Library. Mr. G. M. Gest, collector and owner of a valuable library of Chinese classics, had offered it for purchase to the Library at Princeton, which was unable to finance it. Mr. James Gerould, the Librarian, then asked Dr. Flexner's aid. The Director investigated and found that the Library of Congress valued the small Gest Collection as second only to

its own, and had asked for but been denied a congressional appropriation to buy it. Mr. Gest was in desperate financial straits; Flexner was certain that if the Library were not purchased promptly as a unit, it would be broken up into items and disposed of.

Deeply concerned lest this happen, and also influenced by Dr. Gilman's early vision that the probable importance of the Far East after World War I would lead to more intensive western studies of Chinese culture, and by the expressed hope that the Institute and Princeton's Department of Oriental Languages and Literature might soon expand to include a representation in the Chinese, Flexner persuaded the Rockefeller Foundation to contribute half the estimated cost of the collection, and secured the permission of the Founders and the Executive Committee to pay the rest.⁵⁴ The Board ratified the action on the Director's representation that its action, in view of Princeton's interest in the field, would recompense the University in some measure for the Institute's use of its various libraries -- general, art, and mathematics. The Institute's policy was to purchase the books needed by its staff members, and to place them in the appropriate Princeton library marked as Institute property with its bookplate and listed in a separate catalog.

The Foundation's grant was conditioned by the requirement that the Gest Library remain in Princeton, available for the use of both institutions; it was given with no promise that the Institute would later undertake to develop Oriental studies. As Flexner wrote Aydelotte later, he felt that while it was useless to urge the expansion by the Institute in the early forties, it should move in that direction by the time the second world war was over, because "relations in the Pacific...are going

to be such that studies...will be timely and indeed, essential."⁵⁵ It was a logical forecast, but logic did not determine the course of history.

When the collection arrived in Princeton, there was no place to house it but the cellar of 20 Nassau Street. It was necessary to employ a custodian for it, because of air and moisture conditions. Accordingly Flexner asked and received permission from the Board to appoint Dr. Nancy Lee Swann, a scholar in the language, to catalog and take care of it.

(See p.284) Expenditure of approximately \$7,000 a year to maintain the Library proved to be a target of Messrs. Maass and Veblen, who were hostile to the venture from the beginning. Their opposition was borne out by the facts that it was possible neither for the Institute nor the University to make real use of the Library during the forties, and that its usefulness required additional annual capital expenditures of approximately \$60,000 a year which the Institute did not have. Messrs. Maass and Weed therefore urged that it be sold.⁵⁶

But the University stood upon its rights, and declined to consent to its sale to any other university with an active program in Chinese literature, in the continued hope that it might some day make use of it. The completion of the new Firestone Library enabled the University to take custody of the collection, and the Institute was able then to avoid continued expenditures for it.

In November 1942, when the move to sell the Gest Library was at its height within the Board, Flexner wrote a statement of faith which bears repeating here. The letter was addressed to Aydelotte, who stood in the dangerous middle where Flexner had earned his deep scars, and was written to buoy up his old Friend.

The documents in the case completely settle the issue. We are obliged by every possible consideration of decency to the Rockefeller Foundation, to Princeton University, and to Dr. Swan, and any recommendation that looks to disposing of the library would be a disgrace to the Institute.

I do not believe it is possible or desirable at this time to figure out what an Oriental Institute may some day cost. It throws no light on our problem....

Every institution in this country that is worth its salt has grown and expanded in unexpected fashion. You did not know when you went to Swarthmore that you would get the money to finance honors work, nor did you know how much it would cost. You had faith, and faith moves mountains.

I have faith in the original conception of the Institute, as Simon had faith in his original conception of the Rockefeller Institute. Little did he dream when Mr. Rockefeller gave him \$200,000 that before he retired Mr. Rockefeller would have given him between sixty and seventy millions.

Our question is not the future, which we cannot foresee, but the present, and I am much more concerned about the present than I am about the future, for upon the present the future is going to depend.⁵⁷

CHAPTER VI - Notes

1. Fosdick, op. cit., pp. 238-240.
2. Ibid.
3. Universities, pp. 20-21.
4. Ibid., pp. 22-23.
5. Rennselaer Lee, Charles Rufus Morey; The Art Bulletin, December, 1956.
6. Morey to Flexner, 4/9/34.
7. Ibid. Two of the three assistants were to work directly under and with departmental professors. The third, a Princeton M.F.A. and a classicist, whom Morey nominated to assist Panofsky, was not employed.
8. Ibid.
9. Capps to Flexner, 10/11/32.
10. Meritt to Flexner, 3/31/35.
11. Morey to Flexner, 4/9/34.
12. Panofsky to Flexner, 3/29/34.
13. Flexner to Straus, 3/11/35; 3/22/35. Straus to Flexner, 3/18/35.
14. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35, p. 3.
15. Ibid., Appendix, pp. 9-10.
16. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36. Interview with Professor Veblen.
17. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35, Appendix, p. 6.
18. Ibid., p. 8.
19. Minutes cited, p. 4. Meritt received \$9,000, Panofsky \$10,000.
20. Flexner to Straus, 4/24/35; 4/27/35. Straus to Flexner, 4/26/35.
21. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 4/24/35.
22. Flexner to Paul Hanus, 7/19/35.

23. Interview with Dr. Flexner. See Flexner to Riefler, 1/21/35. "Professor Veblen, who was present at the meeting, and to whom he also wrote, has come to see me and has described Frankfurter's conduct as outrageous."
24. L. Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.
25. Treasurer's Report, Fiscal Year 1936. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, pp. 8-12, 14-15. Terms of the appointments were: Dr. Lowe: salary, \$10,000, effective 7/1/36. Usual provisions for insurance and retirement. Dr. Herzfeld: salary, \$4,000, of which the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced German Scholars would pay half. The Institute and Dr. Herzfeld would each pay 5% on the \$4,000. Usual retirement provision. Effective date, 7/1/36. Dr. Flexner was not entirely candid here; the fact was the New York University was paying Herzfeld another \$2,000 for a weekly lecture or seminar. Both institutions ceased their aid in two year's time, and the Institute met the whole small salary, which proved so inadequate that effective 7/1/39 the Director raised it to \$10,000. Mr. Campbell's salary: \$6,000, with the usual insurance and retirement provisions. Effective 7/1/36.
26. Morey to Panofsky, November, 1935.
27. Flexner to Frankfurter, 2/21/34. See Gilbert to Flexner, 10/5/34. Merriam to Flexner, 12/4/34. Flexner to Miss Greene, 12/7/35. Leland to Flexner,
28. Morey to Flexner, 9/3/35. 1/15/36.
29. President Ellen Pendleton of Wellesley to Flexner, 1/30/36; 2/17/36. Flexner to Pendleton, 1/31/36. Morey to Flexner, 1/31/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 13. The new appointment was for half of each year, 1937-1943, at salary of \$3,000. No provision for insurance. Title, Field Archaeologist, at Wellesley College.
30. Morey to Flexner, 3/25/36.
31. Meritt to Flexner, 10/6/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 6-7, 16. Dr. Goldman was to receive an honorarium of \$200 a month, with no insurance and no retirement provision. Miss Goldman was financially independent.
32. Flexner to Leidesdorf, 5/22/37.
33. Flexner to Capps, 7/13/36; 7/28/36; 10/15/36. Capps to Flexner, 7/18/36. Meritt to Flexner, 10/6/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 6-7, 16. Professor Capps was appointed for one year, with an honorarium of \$200. Though it was understood that the appointment must be renewed beyond that time, it never was by formal action, but simply by inclusion in the budget. President Dodds' anger was expressed to an Institute professor.

34. Veblen to Flexner, 11/5/36. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36. Flexner to Maass, 10/30/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, note pp. 6 and 10 particularly.
35. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 4.
36. Dodds to Flexner, 12/14/35.
37. Interview with Mrs. Bailey.
38. Bulletin No. 5, February 1936, p. 11.
39. Professor Herzfeld and Professor Panofsky both "proved" the rule against part-time employment at the Institute, but only Herzfeld earned outside money by so doing. Conditions were such as Flexner employed them that he could not have got Panofsky without allowing him to help Dr. W. W. S. Cook, head of the Fine Arts at New York University; Panofsky found great stimulus in working with the New York group. As for Herzfeld, the Director could not have afforded to employ him without the help of the University with his pay for the first two years. On 3/22/37 Flexner had to inform Morey that Herzfeld would be unable to continue his weekly lecture and conferences with five or six men at McCormick Hall; with the weekly New York seminar he found it left him too little time for his own study and writing.
40. Flexner to Panofsky, 12/16/37.
41. Minutes, Trustees' meetings, 10/8/34, p. 13; 4/28/35, p. 4. Dr. Schlunk left during the second year to become curator of a Berlin museum. Flexner permitted Morey to use the unspent appropriation to pay one of the Department's assistants in the Antioch project. Dr. Weitzmann remained on the Institute's rolls as member, at the urging of Dr. Friend of the Department. () In Bulletin No. 8 (1939) Dr. Flexner announced that he had been appointed Field Mediaevalist, but that is the only record of the transaction. It was left to Dr. Aydelotte to regularize his status.
42. The three were: Mr. Campbell, Dr. Hans Swarzenski and Dr. Weitzmann. Swarzenski became a staff member as Professor Panofsky's research assistant. (Bulletin No. 6, February, 1937, p. 6.)
43. Flexner to Frederick Keppel, 10/31/36.
44. Keppel to Flexner, 11/19/36.
45. Flexner to Keppel, 11/25/36. Keppel to Flexner, 12/7/36.
46. Morey to Panofsky for Flexner, 11/17/36.
47. Flexner to Morey, 11/24/36.

48. Dodds to certain department chairmen, 11/27/36.
49. Dodds to Flexner, 4/5/37. Flexner to Dodds, 4/20/37.
50. Morey to Flexner, 2/16/31.
51. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5. See Morey to Flexner, 7/10/35; 8/2/35. Richard F. S. Starr, B. Sc. Cornell, 1924, was the recipient of part of Dr. Schlunk's unused salary. He was working at Antioch. Flexner was unaware in July that the grant was being made to him. He continued working on the project, even after receiving his Ph. D. in 1938.
52. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 5.
53. Ibid., p. 6.
54. Secretary, Rockefeller Foundation, to Flexner, 6/23/36. Minutes, Executive Committee, 6/15/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 3-7.
55. Flexner to Aydelotte, 3/5/41.
56. Aydelotte to Flexner, 10/20/42.
57. Flexner to Aydelotte, 11/11/42.

CHAPTER VII

TOO MANY GENERALS

The establishment of the three schools in their initial outlines was accompanied by events and evidence of trends in the attitudes of the Founders and Trustees which now need some explication. It should be said that when Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld pledged their financial support to create a new institution in American education, and engaged Dr. Flexner to organize and direct its first steps, all three must have realized that little delay could attend the launching of the Institute for Advanced Study if they hoped to see the vision realized before they left the scene. The donors had declined to found and endow a small "university," and they had impliedly committed their fortunes to this Institute. Why, then, as has been revealed in outline earlier, did Mr. Bamberger with Mrs. Fuld's consent suddenly decide to cease the gifts to endowment which had compensated for losses in the portfolio due to depression conditions, and added to it to permit the Institute to expand according to the orderly pattern set forth by the Director? Admittedly a man in his middle seventies might be excused if he displayed some vagaries. But to withdraw continued financial support after only two years of actual operation -- highly successful years, by public estimation -- in face of the Director's continued planning to balance the staffs in the three schools, and while the Institute needed buildings and equipment, was hardly to be expected. So far they had given slightly less than \$7 million to the Institute.¹

Why did they take the action which Mr. Bamberger announced to Flexner at the end of October, 1935? How long would they refrain from giving to the Institute for its development? Could the Trustees anticipate that other philanthropists interested in the cultural growth of the country, and the advancement of its scholarship, would feel moved to step into the breach? Could the current endowment, by skilfull management, be increased as the country emerged from the great depression?

To the first question the answer appears to be that the Founders were piqued by the action of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds in recommending the purchase of what they considered an inordinately large acreage for the Institute's site. That does not explain the matter fully, however; they seemed to be alienated more by the fact that they were not consulted before the Trustees were asked to vote on a larger land program than they had previously approved. As to the second question, the record will show that the affair might have been smoothed over, were it not that further actions contributed to their disillusionment. For Mr. Bamberger's statement was in terms of "for the present," and not final.

The third question Flexner could have answered -- and did -- from his wealth of experience with philanthropists. Men do not come forward usually to contribute to an institution to which another has given his name. This was the point of his earlier suggestion that the projected small university be named after the State of New Jersey. But Flexner did not forsake hope, as the shadows at the Institute deepened, that the Rockefeller Foundation might contribute substantially to its endowment despite the basic change in Rockefeller policy adopted by the

General Education Board in 1925 to cease giving large grants to institutions "as wholes" -- i.e., to their endowment. His later correspondence shows that he was a steady suitor for such a favor from the Rockefeller Foundation. He probably felt he had very good reason to hope, considering that Mr. Stewart, an outstanding Trustee of both Rockefeller Boards, to whom both owed much in the expert management of their investments, was a Trustee of the Institute also. This feeling was undoubtedly strengthened by that Trustee's conviction of the worthwhile aim of the Director to develop the study of economics from a new viewpoint and with the new methodology based in large part upon the pioneering work in research technology which he had himself inaugurated in this country's central banking system, and in England's. For it was a time when the Rockefeller Foundation was turning with increasing interest and generosity to the financing of new and different economic researches.²

What of the chances through management to increase the value of the Institute's existing portfolio? The presence of Messrs. Bamberger and Hardin as the policy-makers on the Finance Committee made success in that direction unlikely. Mr. Leidesdorf vigorously urged a liberalization of investment policy to buy equities at this low point in the country's fortunes, sure that the economy would recover and that substantial profits and greater income could be realized in equities as it did. But Mr. Bamberger was by nature very conservative, and Mr. Hardin was President of a large life insurance company -- at a time when nothing but high grade bonds and other debt instruments were considered worthy of trust. They resisted the younger man, and so the Treasurer's reports showed continual amortization of premiums paid for bonds, for many of which

during the Institute's first years there was no market. One of the crucial decisions during the first two years was lost when in August, 1932 stock market averages reached their lowest point for the depression period, Mr. Bamberger and Mr. Hardin insisted on selling more than half the Macy shares, which sold that month between \$13 and \$57.³

At the end of that month, the total market value of securities in the portfolio was \$4,411,00. During the year the Founders gave some \$400,000 to endowment, without mentioning it, since it was doubtless to restore the capital account to the amount originally pledged. Nevertheless, the Treasurer gave the total at market value at the 31st December, 1933 as "in excess of \$4,500,000."⁴

But there had been signs that Mr. Bamberger was softening in his attitude with the startling success of the Director in the first appointments. In October, 1932 the By-Laws were amended with the Founders' consent to give authority to the Board to designate those who were entitled to countersign checks on the Institute's depositaries. Later, the rigorous annual tenure of the Director was relaxed "at Mr. Bamberger's request" when Mr. Maass moved and the Board approved that the Director and Mrs. Flexner should have the same retirement annuities as Professor Veblen's.⁵

However, there were few signs that Mr. Bamberger's investment policy would change. There was a moment in 1933 when it appeared that Mr. Stewart might become a factor in the situation. Maass wrote Dr. Flexner a hopeful letter:

Last week I had the pleasure of lunching with Mr. Bamberger, Mr. Leidesdorf and our new Trustee, Mr. Stewart, and cannot begin to tell you of the very splendid impression he created

and how helpful I am sure he is going to be in our affairs. The purpose of the luncheon was to review our investments, and we had the benefit of some very constructive criticism from Mr. Stewart, which is already leading to action, and will, I am certain, improve the caliber of our portfolio.

But apparently Mr. Stewart was discouraged by the attitudes revealed. He did not join the Committee on Finance if he was asked, which does not appear. Interviews disclosed that he was critical of the investment policy, even after Professor Riefler joined the Committee in 1936. He did not practice Keynesian arbitrage, as did Stewart.⁶

Before detailing the events of these years it will be well to describe briefly the general relationships which had developed at the Institute. It was clear that the deference paid Mr. Bamberger by his associates and advisers in the past was carried over into this enterprise. It appeared that despite his modesty and retiring manner Mr. Bamberger was the one who had the last word at L. Bamberger & Company. Even with Mr. Fuld, his position was as the governor to his partner's enthusiasm and initiative -- the motive power of the enterprise. Though he was known as a generous employer, who did kind things for his senior employees, it was not because he considered they had rights to his generosity, or as his employees any voice with respect to their working conditions. In this he was neither better nor worse than the other retailers of the times. Perhaps the most significant thing about his attitude was disclosed when, as he and Mrs. Fuld sold L. Bamberger & Company, they did not tell their nephews who worked in the firm, and were minor stockholders in it, until the sale was accomplished. Then he exercised his option to repurchase their stock, as had been duly prearranged, leaving the young men angry and unhappy. It is not strange

in light of his views that Mr. Bamberger did not change his attitude toward the right of the Director to consult with the faculty of the Institute, who with the Director himself were described as "employees" in the By-Laws.⁷

Indeed, the significant change in attitude on this problem occurred in Dr. Flexner who, having fought resourcefully for a moderate and reasonable faculty share in decisions in academic matters, was to turn against it decisively. But that was in his old age, and after many scars and battles. One will have to decide when the story is told whether it was his experience with a faculty or his lack of it that was responsible for the change.

Habits were established early within the Board, and even after the Founders nominally withdrew as active Trustees, Mr. Bamberger^{was} recognized as the overriding authority in all matters: expenditures, election of new Trustees, and appointments to all the committees of the Board. The other Trustees realized that this was so, and they also knew that nothing of moment was submitted for their own approval without having first been approved by Mr. Bamberger. Moreover, they realized that Dr. Flexner, who worked closely and harmoniously with the Founder's original advisers, was the most successful pleader of the Institute's cause. He took pains to keep his powers of persuasion bright and useful; this occasioned some resort to the arts of others, as in the case of the Committee on Site, and the employment of Dr. Weyl. But despite these devices, Flexner bore the main burden of planning and persuasion, and all the responsibility for ordering the development of the Institute.

Board meetings had quickly settled into a routine. In the

order of business only a brief statement from the Treasurer preceded the Director's report, in which characteristically he reminded the Founders and the Trustees of the purposes and nature of the Institute, recited in an interesting manner how it was operating, and carefully presented every favorable mention of it in either private or public utterance which had come to his eager attention. Proposed actions were adroitly approached, explained and justified in this discourse, and general discussion, if there was any, followed his report and usually preceded his presentation of formal motions and resolutions. Later it will be seen that this departure from parliamentary order gave rise to questions which derived from discussions of matters in general and without specific details. The Trustees were aware that any appearance of dissension, any slight conflict of opinion, was likely to trouble Mr. Bamberger. Strangely enough, however, they did not seem to be bored by the repetitive nature of Dr. Flexner's reports; their attendance records were very good, with one or two exceptions. In January, 1936, when Professor Veblen's challenge of established principles calling for post-doctoral members and full-time service caused Flexner to recapitulate the purposes and policies of the Institute, he gave a complete restatement of principles, which both Aydelotte and Maass, who had been absent, greeted with praise and enthusiasm when the minutes were distributed.⁸

From the very beginning the needs of the Institute pressed against its limited financial resources. Deliberate as was the accumulation of the original endowment, there were substantial savings in the modest income from it during the first eight years, which gave a false sense of ease, perhaps, to Mr. Bamberger and Mr. Hardin not felt by their

younger colleagues.⁹ These Trustees knew that the Director would have difficulty attracting outstanding men to staff the schools without assurances of ample salaries and generous retirement provisions, other things being equal. Dr. Flexner had a genuine distaste for applying direct pressure to the Founders, but did constantly apply the stimulus of his plans pointing the way for more rapid development of the schools. The homilies he delivered at each Board meeting usually emphasized the need to add staff when "men and money were available." It became^a well-worn cliché. He used his arts not only at Board meetings. Numerous visits to the Founders on vacation and at home found them in relaxed moods when he could be more persuasive and they more receptive. Nevertheless, as has been seen, he was compelled to compromise sadly as he added to the staff in the humanities, taking advantage of the sorry conditions abroad, and of the personal circumstances of individuals, to appoint as professors such older men as Herzfeld at low salaries and with patently inadequate retirement allowances. As he described this phase to Professor Riefler later, there were "financial inequalities;" he had faced a grave dilemma and made his decision:

Either we had to cease growing, which at my time of life would have been, I think, a very serious matter for the future of the Institute, or we had simply to regard our policy as one of suspense pending financial recovery or the receipt of future endowment.¹⁰

During this period Flexner occasionally spoke to the Trustees of his inevitable retirement or possible incapacitation, impressing them with the thought that his greatest usefulness to the Institute was his wide acquaintance here and abroad with educators and scholars and scientists, which peculiarly fitted him to recommend the first staff. Most

of the Trustees concurred. They knew Flexner had won Mr. Bamberger's confidence, and was the one most likely to gain the Founders' support for the course he was pursuing. There was a single exception; Mr. Bamberger had reservations about the Director's plans for economic research. Mr. Maass expressed the feelings of the Trustees generally when he wrote Flexner in 1937:

With no desire to hurry you in your selections, my only concern is that the program of expansion be enacted during the period of your own activities, and this I am most hopeful you will bring about.¹¹

The Institute was forced to get along without land or building for several years. The Director spoke soothingly of the benefits to learning to be derived from a measure of asceticism: e.g., "improvisation in rented quarters," from which his pride suffered deeper wounds than any other man's. He knew that Mr. Bamberger and his sister would have preferred to have a visible monument to commemorate their generosity, and were really hard put to it to appreciate the esoteric nature of the Institute, the more so since the opportunities to come in contact with the professors were usually at the social functions given by the Director and Mrs. Flexner. But he had put wise words in their mouths which proscribed impairment of capital for physical things. It was surprising that he was soon to find himself in conflict over ambitious plans for such things, not with the Founders, but with a member of the faculty, the group which had traditionally "starved," as Beard had put it, while working amid beautiful surroundings to which the substance of many colleges and universities had been extravagantly devoted.

The odds favored the physical things, simply because men of practical disposition can appreciate them more easily, while the contri-

bution of the scholar who disappears into his study and periodically produces a learned work has a highly specialized appeal. But in Flexner's case, there was another reason why the race became an uneven one; the Director temerarily brought to the Board of Trustees the Institute's most resourceful and insistent advocate for site and buildings, by arranging for Professor Veblen to be elected a Trustee. Of course he did this without realizing that, like Frankfurter, Veblen might become his adversary. Indeed, the Director appeared not to think in such terms; when he saw an able advocate for the things he valued, he could hardly wait to bring him face to face with the Trustees and the Founders, so that the man might exercise his powerful persuasions for the good of the Institute.

Professor Veblen had hardly arrived home from Europe after winning his appointment to the Institute than he engaged Dean Eisenhart in a discussion of a site for the Institute. He wrote Flexner of this interview:

This morning Eisenhart suggested on his own motion that some kind of land trading arrangement would probably be desirable. He intends to talk about this in general terms with Duffield and some of the Trustees. He thought the Olden tract would be excellent either for use or for trading purposes. The plot he had particularly in mind for the Institute is part of the golf course just below Princeton Inn. I said I thought the part above it would be better.¹²

No one could have loved earth more than Veblen; though he disapproved frankly of much in Princeton's administration, he admired its land-acquisition policy which had caused it to gather to itself some 2,500 acres in Borough and Township. Not only that; he had been mainly responsible for designing Fine Hall, which was once pronounced "the most luxurious building" devoted to mathematics in the world.¹³

From the time of his conversation with Eisenhart the Professor was constantly pressing the Director to settle on one of the large estates in Princeton as a site for the Institute. Flexner repeatedly put this off with the plea that the Institute had no money for such an extravagance. Nevertheless, it is clear that both men favored the Olden Farm as the best possible purchase because it lay just to the west of the University's western boundary, and was connected with it by some vacant lots bordering on the Springdale Golf Club's course. By the early spring of 1934, the Director, confident that the Institute had demonstrated a real measure of success, and that the Founders recognized this and would be prepared to increase their gifts to endowment as they had given promise of doing, pressed ardently for an opportunity to develop the School of Economics and Politics, and let the issue of a site come to the attention of Mr. Bamberger at the same time. This he accomplished by inviting Professor Veblen to present in writing his reasons for urging the immediate purchase of a site, and the nature of it. Flexner acknowledged the letter with real appreciation:

Thank you for your wise, thoughtful, and very clear letter of April 12th...I can see that it will give the Committee on Buildings and Grounds something very substantial to meditate upon. I have the feeling that what might have looked like dilatory procedure has really allowed our minds to work ...on what will become in the course of time a question of overwhelming importance. I shall bring this letter to the attention of the Committee at the earliest possible opportunity.¹⁴

Two weeks later Professor Veblen became the first faculty Trustee. He was promptly appointed to the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, formerly the Committee on Site.

In his memorandum the Professor said that the Institute should

purchase a large site, and that the "plant" should be near the University. These should demonstrate the institution's permanence as a "seat of learning" for the long future, and should contribute to the amenities of the community while keeping away "objectionable intruders from itself and the University." "We are all agreed it is very desirable to work in close cooperation with the University," but it was also agreed the independence of the Institute should be maintained, he wrote. If, as he foresaw, the region around Princeton was to attract a group of cultural institutions, the Institute would do well to be at its center rather than on its periphery. He said the first building should be something analogous to Harnack House in Berlin, or the Athenaeum at Pasadena, with rooms for social purposes for the faculty and members, a dwelling for the Director, and residential accommodations for visitors. The actual working quarters of the different schools might be located right on the University campus, "in contiguity to the appropriate department of the University," while in other cases, it might be preferable to locate the offices on the Institute's site. In any case, the site should be large enough to take care completely of the Institute's enterprises "in case circumstances at some time in the future should make it desirable to do so."

The School of Mathematics needed then, even in its first year, he said, a building of its own, contiguous to Fine Hall, which, with its nine large offices "with fireplaces" and its fifteen without, was already fully occupied. Indeed, while the permanent staff members of both institutions had each his own study, Veblen said, it was necessary in some cases for University instructors, Institute members and Institute professors' assistants to share rooms. He felt that, since the assistants conferred

with members on behalf of their principals, they should have privacy. To provide for the School of Mathematics he proposed that the Institute should buy or lease the University Infirmary and convert it to offices, building a new hospital for the University in a more suitable location. Or it could build a wing to Fine or Palmer Halls.¹⁵

Now it became obvious that the Founders grasped neither what Professor Veblen was advocating in terms of acreage, nor what Dr. Flexner needed to enable him to develop the School of Economics and Politics. For Mr. Bamberger presented a letter to the Director on the day of the annual meeting which read as follows:

Some months ago the Founders added a sum of approximately half a million dollars to the funds of the Institute. At my request no mention was made of this fact. I desire to inform the Trustees that an additional sum has been added to bring this gift up to \$1 million. The gift is made in view of two considerations: (1) that the Institute may shortly wish to acquire a site; (2) that the Director may feel more free to proceed with the organization of the School of Economics and Politics. While the same freedom will be left as to the members of the School of Mathematics, I desire to put on record my hope that the activities of the School of Economics and Politics may contribute not only to a knowledge of these subjects but ultimately to the cause of social justice which we have deeply at heart.¹⁶

As Mr. Maass read the letter to the Trustees, it was somewhat different; it had been edited with the consent of Mr. Bamberger. The \$1 million gift was announced as "anonymous," and Maass began to read with point 2, omitting mention of a site. As has been seen, the contribution added in 1933 was apparently designed to bring the total endowment to the original pledge. The half-million now added was quite inadequate to develop the second School, as Flexner immediately wrote Mr. Victor Morawetz, whom he asked to contribute to endowment, but without success.¹⁷

At the next Board meeting, the Director declared that he was

firmly opposed to the procurement of land and buildings until staffing was completed. This was the first meeting attended by either Mr. Frankfurter or Professor Veblen. Both cast light on their predelictions. There were some differences of opinion as to the development of economics in the views expressed by Messrs. Flexner, Stewart and Frankfurter. Stewart favored no permanent appointment; Frankfurter now opted for an historical study of economics, as distinguished from the "clinical" examination of the "economic plague" advocated by Flexner. Professor Veblen suggested that no permanent staff be employed, but that short-term members on the same basis as those assembled by the School of Mathematics be brought in, so as not to disturb their academic connections until their suitability for permanent employment was determined.¹⁸ The suggestion was not as ingenuous as it sounded. For Professor Veblen had favored from the beginning a school of economics organized around the comparatively new "science" of mathematical economics. He had pointed out to Flexner the rich opportunities to get men of this persuasion from among the emigrés from Germany.¹⁹ Beyond that, however, he was intent on satisfying the needs of the School of Mathematics as he saw them, before the other schools were organized. The record of his continuous and ingenious pressures for more money for the School of Mathematics, and his unremitting effort to hasten the purchase of a site, show that, no matter how much he may have appeared to favor a representation in the social sciences and the humanities, he did not favor the developments which the Director planned.

Shortly after the October meeting, he again asked Flexner to take advantage of the beautiful weather to walk with him over various

sites. Flexner's reply was courteous but unyielding: nothing was farther from his thought than consideration of site and buildings, though he would enjoy a walk with the Professor at any time. And he added: "I shall surprise you by the willingness and speed of my activity in the way of buildings and grounds when some Santa Claus drops into our treasury the requisite funds."²⁰ And on another occasion Flexner observed wryly that Veblen, younger than he, who was "near the end of my tether," was yet in more of a hurry; he counselled patience.

But Veblen was as restless as the sea, painfully impatient with the Director's priorities. He failed to show any insight into Flexner's difficulties in persuading Mr. Bamberger to see and meet the Institute's needs, taking what seemed to be an attitude that if the need was apparent -- as all which had been talked about were -- it should be met, presto! Flexner admired greatly the Professor's aggressiveness in promoting the prestige of his School, and showed rare patience born of an affectionate understanding when Veblen undertook to arrange things to suit his own ideas. Thus, shortly after the tempestuous meeting at which Professor Riefler had been appointed, when the mathematician demanded full faculty government, the appointment of a sixth mathematician (and a seventh professor to its School), and immediate provision for a building for the School of Mathematics, Flexner replied with a reasoned negative to each, and made helpful suggestions for the amelioration of the needs expressed. Then he tried to make his own position quite clear:

I am writing you as a Trustee, not as a Professor in Mathematics, and I should not even write if I were not anxious that in the long run there should be more professors on the Board. But that must necessarily depend on winning confidence -- a task to which I have devoted myself with all the ingenuity I possess ever since I first met Mr. Bamberger.

I have always been candid with him, as I have with the Board, but I realize that every board must trust those upon whom responsibility mainly falls.²¹

This might have affected Professor Veblen more deeply had not a spirit of dissidence manifested itself after Mr. Frankfurter's outburst.. (It will be recalled that Mr. Straus and Mr. Hardin opposed the beginning of the third School at the next meeting.) The problem of the seventh professor disappeared with the sudden and regrettable death of Dr. Emmy Noether in April, 1935. Flexner's answer on faculty government was threadbare by this time, and Veblen was silenced, but unconvinced. The question of special quarters for the School of Mathematics was involved in a larger one which was moving ahead; Flexner had informed the Board in January, 1935, that the Institute should soon select a site.

In April, he told the Trustees that the Committee on Buildings and Grounds was preparing to make a preliminary report, and himself brought up for consideration the desirability of establishing the several schools near the apposite University Departments. He said:

Fine Hall is an excellent illustration of what can be accomplished through the establishment of a communal life, which does indeed require a separate building. But the several schools need not all be erected upon a single plot, and, if necessary, over a preliminary period of years, satisfactory results may be obtained in rented quarters...I hope that the Trustees and the Director will never lose sight of the fact that, like the Johns Hopkins in its glory, the Institute for Advanced Study may flourish in any sort of building or buildings, provided each school as established has assembled a group of men comparable with those who have already been brought together. (Emphasis supplied)²²

During the spring and summer of 1935, a consensus developed that the Institute should purchase the Olden Farm and the lots which joined it to the golf course, and that cooperation with the University would be facilitated by placing the several schools of the Institute

near the apposite University departments. Flexner learned in July that some of the conjoining lots were to be sold for taxes. He promptly informed Mr. Maass, who secured permission from the Founders to take options on the farm property and to purchase the lots. During the summer Flexner conferred with President Dodds, writing Veblen on the shape of developments:

I have had a talk with President Dodds who told me that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings was very favorable to cooperation with us, and had left it to a committee composed of himself, [G. C.] Wintringer, and some other person whose name I forgot.... There was general agreement on the Olden Farm and the property connecting it with the golf course. The options all run until late next fall. If worst comes to worst, and we decide to build elsewhere than on the golf course, we should easily dispose of the lots which Mr. Thomas is going to secure for us.²³

Veblen urged that the first building should be some kind of central headquarters for the Institute: it would "set various doubts at rest in the community, and the latter would make the actual work of the particular group in question much more effective." "The latter" in this case referred to "the extension of Fine Hall" for use of the School of Mathematics.²⁴ Flexner's answer was that the first building should be a central headquarters, since that would enable the Institute "to offer something to Princeton." He hoped that, unless someone at the Institute were over-zealous, the two projects might be made to overlap.²⁵ And then, before the Institute's term opened, and, one may be sure, with Mr. Bamberger's approval, Flexner wrote President Dodds as follows:

Since the Institute for Advanced Study located at Princeton, the Committee on Site and I have been slowly deliberating as to the possible locations which would accommodate the offices of the Institute and such additional departments as might be established from time to time. As I did not at the beginning feel myself at home in Princeton, we have proceeded in a very leisurely way.

It seemed to us of cardinal importance so to locate this building that we might be able to render Princeton something like the courtesy and hospitality which Princeton has rendered to us in Fine Hall. We have also looked ahead in order that, as the Institute developed and required additional space, we need not feel ourselves hampered -- following in this respect the wise policy which the University has long since adopted. Finally, in the interest of the sort of cooperation which we have already established, it has seemed to us all that the nearer this location is to the University, the more readily cooperative relationships could be established and developed.

With these considerations in mind it appears that the most suitable site of any considerable dimensions that could be obtained would begin at the corner of Alexander Street and the road which leads to the Graduate College. Inquiries, however, ...indicate that the two wooden houses now situated at the corner and the lot belonging to three elderly women immediately back of these houses are at present unobtainable.

It would therefore seem that the nearest point would begin with the golf course and extend towards the Graduate College and back towards Princeton Inn. If in the future it is possible to obtain the properties which I have above mentioned, a second building, if and when required, could be located on that site.

In order that the golf course may not be curtailed, and in order further that the entire section extending beyond the Graduate College should be protected for the sake of both the University and the Institute, we have obtained options on the Olden Farm and on practically all the vacant property lying between the Olden Farm and the golf course. The precise amount of ground that we need for the first building we do not know and cannot know until an architect has been called into conference.

The really important point to decide at this moment is the willingness of the University to cooperate with the Institute by allowing us to obtain the land needed, each party relying on the good faith of the other and upon the determination of both to preserve as much open space on both sides of the Graduate College as is possible so as to preserve the amenities of the situation and to shut out the possibility of any real estate development which might be objectionable. The options which we now hold run until towards the end of October and involve the expenditure of about \$200,000. If the University is prepared to cede us the requisite amount of ground, the Institute would be equally willing to cede the University whatever may be needed on the plot we would possess in order to allow the extension of the golf course in that direction...

The experiment of cooperating with the University in the field of mathematics has been so brilliant a success, and the good will manifested by the University as respects the two new schools which we are proposing to establish, encourages me to believe that Princeton University and the Institute for Advanced Study have an opportunity to give the country an example of cooperation in the field of higher education such as the country has never before experienced; and in view of the mounting costs of higher education, on the one hand, and the present difficulties of securing funds on the other, cooperation of this kind becomes more and more important and desirable quite apart from its educational value. I am sure that these considerations, of such infinite importance to higher education in the United States at a time when more and more the United States are being thrown on their own resources instead of relying so largely as previously on foreign institutions of learning, may be expected to appeal as strongly to our successors as they do to those of us who are active now.²⁶

Late in November President Dodds wrote Flexner that the Committee on Grounds and Buildings of the University "would be prepared to recommend to the Board of Trustees at the proper time the transfer of the necessary land on the golf club house location, subject to whatever arrangement it is necessary to make with the Springdale Golf Club for an adequate club house elsewhere."²⁷

Meanwhile, a tragedy befell the Institute. When the Committee on Buildings and Grounds made its recommendations for a site to the Board in October, 1935, it asked and received permission to acquire not only the 200 acres of the Olden Farm and the adjoining lots, which Mr. Maass estimated could be purchased for about \$175,000, but also asked and was granted authority to negotiate for "two or three smaller properties...the cost of which should not exceed an additional \$75,000." No discussion was recorded; the Board appropriated \$250,000 as requested, to be spent by the Committee at its discretion. Allusions were made to the negotiations with the University for a building site, and at the Director's request the

Chairman was authorized to appoint five Trustees to serve with five University Trustees on a Joint Committee to consider the mutual concerns of the two institutions. Those chosen to represent the University were Dr. Wilson Farrand, and Messrs. Raymond B. Fosdick, Paul Bedford, Roland S. Morris, and President Dodds, ex officio. A month later Flexner wrote Dodds that the Institute's members were Messrs. Louis Bamberger, Aydelotte, Houghton, Stewart, and Flexner, ex officio. Mr. Hardin, who had been until recently also a Trustee of the University was to attend by invitation.²⁸

It soon became apparent that the Founders were opposed to the purchase of more land than the Farm and the lots, and that they had apparently not been consulted by the Committee before it presented its recommendations to the Trustees. Flexner himself had not been informed.

Two weeks of silence ensued, at the end of which Flexner, having consulted with Messrs. Maass and Veblen, wrote the mathematician pointing out again that at a time when the new schools must be developed, every dollar spent for land came out of income for that most important growth. He did not want to be compelled to complete the schools at the expense of the School of Mathematics, "yet unnecessary investment in real estate may threaten it." And he continued:

You are rightly insistent on the importance of additional space for the mathematicians, but we are unlikely to invest in additional space for the mathematicians if we are simultaneously confronted with the need for gradual expansion for the two schools and a considerable investment in real estate...

I have...no desire to speak with finality as to the order in which these various questions shall be met. In fact, the primary responsibility for decisions must be taken by the Committee on Buildings and Grounds. Having stated my own views, I shall carry out loyally any decision arrived at by the Board.²⁹

On the same day he wrote to Mr. Bamberger; he was happy that the Institute was acquiring a site, and had talked with both Maass and Veblen.

He continued:

Though I do not wish to criticize either...I think there is some danger that they will both be too enthusiastic about the acquisition of additional land. My own inclination is to go very slowly...[in order to continue] to acquire men of the highest quality.

This is the first criticism the Director had permitted himself to make of any of his colleagues. He must have had reason to think it was necessary for the good of the Institute to dissociate himself in Mr. Bamberger's eyes from the actions of the Committee, for he was not given to pettiness or to gossip. Mr. Bamberger's answer confirmed his wisdom:

Your letter of October 28 was quite impressive, as it expressed the thought that possibly some of our co-workers in the management of the Institute were inclined to rush along with more haste than wisdom. Mrs. Fuld has repeatedly commented on a policy of acquiring so much land for an institution that proclaims not size but highest standards. This also has been my feeling.

After our present commitments have been completed, our resources will not permit of further expansion at the present time. So far everything has developed beyond our fondest expectations, thanks to you. Nor have I any misgivings about the future.³⁰

Flexner still had their confidence -- an important factor in his intention to overcome their displeasure and cause them to reverse the decision. And so they added their final contribution to endowment -- \$994,000 -- which would serve to pay for the land and capitalize in part the salaries of the humanists. The only victory apparent in this grave situation was Mr. Leidesdorf's. He evidently asked that the major part of the gift be made in equities rather than in bonds, and accordingly several letters reached him from Mr. Bamberger noting the transfer and the deposit

in custody of some 13,000 shares of preferred and common stocks, all carefully containing reference to "Mr. Leidesdorf's request." Backstage the matter must have been a cause of some excitement, for Mr. Farrier wrote Flexner questioning the propriety of the Treasurer's serving as a member of the Committee on Finance, since it caused the paradoxical situation in which as a member he gave instructions to himself as Treasurer working under direction of the Committee. What happened to that question does not appear; Mr. Leidesdorf remained a member of the Committee for years.³¹

Not only did the nature of the final gift concede the importance of investing in equities, but during the year there occurred a turnover in some \$1.2 million worth of securities, after which stocks constituted approximately 28% in dollar value at cost of the portfolio. From a ratio of 6.2% in 1934, and 14.6% in 1935, this was quite a change. Indeed, Mr. Leidesdorf's victory was a continuing but gradually manifested one; year by year the proportion of equity issues increased, so that in fiscal 1943, the ratio was 53.7%. During this period, there was quite a turnover in the portfolio, with gains and losses overall about evenly balanced from fiscal 1934 on. The results Mr. Leidesdorf was able to accomplish during those years, marked as they were by occasional refusals of Mr. Hardin to countenance further equity investments, were as nothing when he could really assume charge of the investments. Under his management capital gains of more than \$4 million were made in nine years (1944-1952) for the Foundation.

But to return to 1935. From the time the Founders made their decisions the inadequacy of funds became ever more acute. Normal expansion

was out of the question. To complete a nucleus in the staffs in economics and theoretical or mathematical physics, as the Director clearly said he planned to do, was out of the question unless Mr. Bamberger changed his mind. As for an Institute building or buildings, Flexner hoped that if the golf club house location were finally made available, and the Joint Committee of Trustees were functioning well, Mr. Bamberger might change his mind. However, there is no evidence that Mr. Bamberger ever said he was willing to finance a building for the Institute at all at this time.

It soon became apparent that there were no accommodations at the University for the humanists, except for Messrs. Herzfeld, who rejected Morey's offer of space for himself and his artifacts and library, and Panofsky. The Institute succeeded in buying the residence at 69 Alexander Street, and remodeled it for use as offices during the summer of 1936. That fall it afforded offices to Professors Meritt, Goldman, Mitrany, Earle and Riefler, and Visiting Professor Capps.

The acres purchased at such a cost in harmony and to the Institute's future development were quite lovely. They were also a good investment, situated as they were near the center of the growing community, and gave assurance against the intrusion of subdividers on the University's preserve and the Institute's. But they were a non-productive investment: indeed, there was considerable expense in upkeep and taxes for the Institute to pay annually during a time when it might have used the money for other staff members more profitably. Also there is reason to believe that if the Committee had more tactfully managed its actions, with full consultation with the Founders before its report and recommendations

were placed before the Board for action, friendly consent and cooperation would probably have marked this important step, which succeeding generations at the Institute have appreciated so richly.

The Committee closed its purchases in 1936, acquiring 265 acres of field, woodland and meadow, a very small part of which was relatively elevated and bordered on Mercer Street. That Mr. Maass, a city man, had suddenly come to appreciate acreage qua acreage was shown when he reported that "the land owned by Princeton University and the Institute now comprised about 3,000 acres." The total cost of all the parcels, of the remodeling of 69 Alexander Street, repairing Olden Manor and renovating two tenant houses on the Farm, and of incidental expenses such as surveys, taxes, fees, etc., was \$235,694.³² The Hale and the Battle Park tracts -- these added straws which tested the Founders' charity -- lay to the west of the Farm, and included a part of the historic battlefield where the troops of Generals Washington and Mercer routed General Cornwallis from Princeton a few days after the crossing of the Delaware and the capture of Trenton.

That Mr. Maass was well aware of the disfavor in which the Committee was held seems to be evident in an oblique allusion in his report to the costs of administration, evidently aimed at the Director. He said:

In principle we adhere strictly to the original decision of the Board that as small a part of our resources as is possible should be invested in or spent on buildings and grounds and as large a portion as is possible should be reserved for that part which has within a few years already made the Institute distinguished: namely, adequate salaries and retiring allowances for men of...talent and genius. This principle applies not only to the question of real estate and buildings but administration, in respect to which precisely the same policy has been pursued.³³

As the proposal for the first building site for the Institute on the golf club house site continued to receive the careful attention of President Dodds, Professor Veblen found the School's position in Fine Hall ever more untenable. Numbers of members and graduate students both seemed to increase as the prestige of Princeton, mathematical center of the United States and perhaps of the world, continued to grow. Veblen continued to urge Flexner to supply a building for the School contiguous or adjacent to Fine Hall, and Flexner repeated his time-worn answer -- lack of funds. But he did propose a solution: the School should limit the number of members by insisting on higher qualifications in those admitted. This Veblen declined to consider, maintaining that the brilliance and prestige of the Institute's visitors attracted members in numbers which he seemed to regard as inevitable as the waves of the ocean. Nor did he favor Flexner's suggestion that any overflow could have studies at 20 Nassau Street. Plans for converting the Infirmary, and, indeed, for using part of the basement in Fine Hall for studies, were considered and rejected. Flexner sympathized with Veblen's discomfort, and never alluded to the actions which had brought the Institute to its present pass; he was on record with the Board and with Veblen himself as favoring separate and adjoining space for the School.

Meanwhile some of the Trustees, faced with the prospect of making do with limited funds, asked Professor Veblen whether his School was not admitting too many members. Veblen was quoted as replying in a manner which must have startled the Director:

...the economic and political conditions in the world had doubtless accelerated the School's growth... His belief was that the numbers in the School of Mathematics were

larger than anticipated, that contrary to what might have been expected by analogy with other educational enterprises, this decreased rather than increased the responsibility of the individual professor; that the group was so large and contained so many brilliant individuals that subgroups of those interested in particular problems formed spontaneously; that each person concerned himself with his own problems and conferred with others who were interested; and that if, instead of sixty members of the School there were ten or fifteen, the professors would feel more concern for each individual, and the load of responsibility would be very much greater than it was.³⁴

But the Board was seriously disturbed about finances. At the next meeting, Mr. Hardin asked why the income derived from the tuition fee was so small. Professor Veblen replied that the Institute was following the policy of the great English universities and some in this country in regarding post-doctoral students as "distinguished visitors," who gave as much to the Institute as they received. The Director in effect challenged both positions. He

commented that the really important question was not the collection of a small amount in fees but the admission of members so as, first, to preserve the high level which had been attained; second, not to cause any congestion in Fine Hall; and third, to leave the members of the staff abundant time for the prosecution of their own investigations.³⁵

Another Trustee suggested that the Institute was spending "an undue sum in stipends in the School of Mathematics." Dr. Flexner in reply pointed to the "cosmopolitan" character of the members, and urged that the School was raising the level of "mathematical instruction"; no part of Institute expenditures was more highly productive than the money spent in this way, he thought. The minutes mentioned a consensus that no change should be made.³⁶

That passage led to a prolonged interchange of letters between Drs. Weed and Flexner. The Hopkins man insisted that the \$30,000 in

mathematic stipends would better be spent in salaries for two professors in any of the schools; he objected to the appropriation of the sum seven months in advance of the budget; he insisted that not the School, but the Trustees, should approve the individual stipendiaries. Flexner, battling with Professor Veblen the while over the admission of too many members, and questioning the merit of many of them, but not revealing his suspicion that the more numerous they became, the more hope Vablen had that additional space would be made available, battled equally valiantly with Dr. Weed, defending the stipend fund as a flexible obligation which could, if necessary, be cut or omitted if the financial situation became worse, but also maintaining that it was a most valuable instrument for bringing scholars to Princeton for their own and Princeton's benefit. He rejected outright the suggestion that the Board was competent to pass on individual stipendiaries. Perhaps neither man convinced the other, but it was nevertheless significant that later Flexner named Dr. Weed Chairman of the Budget Committee.³⁷

Very shortly after the last discussion in the Board, Professors Alexander and Veblen addressed a memorandum to the Director entitled "Building the School of Mathematics." In it they asked him to purchase for the School of Mathematics a defunct dining club across Washington Street from Palmer Hall, on the ground that more space would be needed by the School in view of their intention to enter the fields of biology and chemistry.³⁸ Flexner, discounting almost automatically the proposed expansion, undertook an investigation of his own into the situation in Fine Hall, interviewing individually all the forty-one members enrolled in the first semester 1936-1937. An intensive debate ensued between himself and

Veblen, in which Flexner said:

'We have no present or, as far as I can see, future reason for taking chemistry and biology into consideration at all. It will be many years before our endowment is such that we can hope to enter the experimental sciences and, if and when we do so, some very large questions are involved going far beyond the provision of studies for the professors which those subjects need.³⁹

He had found, he said, that among the forty-one members a number were working with University professors, although this was offset by some of the Institute faculty working with graduate students. Of the cited total of seventy advanced students and members at Fine Hall, thirteen were duplicated in the count, since Fellows from the National Research Council and various foundations were registered by both institutions. In his own estimation, the space situation "reduces itself, therefore, to the possibility of procuring three large studies and two more small ones for the present staff."

Separate quarters for the School of Mathematics might result in the physical separation of the two groups, he warned. He repeated that it would be better to limit enrollment to about forty members "by excluding persons who have not obtained the Ph. D. degree, and who have not given plain indication of unusual ability." If the number should run above that because of the presence of, say, a Dirac, "we can cope [with that] as things now stand." He said: "there is a limit to what the professorial level can give to the post-doctorals, and it might result in the post-doctorals talking among themselves, and thereby losing what the Institute has to offer." Indeed, he had found that the members were reluctant to approach personally any of the staff members. Besides all these carefully made points, he had found that the club in question was mortgaged for more

than it was worth, and the University had need of it and two or three more buildings like it.⁴⁰ Veblen's answer was clearly a threat, in their mutual understanding:

On thinking over your letter dated October 31 but received yesterday, I find that the expectation that our quarters in Fine Hall would be extended either on the campus proper or into a building across the street, has played a decisive part in my thoughts about the future of the School of Mathematics in its relation to the University. Since it now appears that this expectation is not to be realized, my opinion on some of the fundamental problems has changed. I have no doubt that the same will be true of my mathematical colleagues, and therefore feel that I had better consult with them before replying to your letter. I hope that this will meet with your approval.⁴¹

Flexner replied in part:

I was surprised as I told you in my reply, on reading your memorandum entitled, "Building the School of Mathematics," to find that you had gone so far afield as to take in chemistry and biology without any previous communication to me in regard to this extension. Now to my further surprise I learn that your imagination has gone so far as to play a decisive part in your thinking not only about the future of the School of Mathematics but of the relationship of the Institute to the University. I feel that I should not have been presented with the problem in terms of space when, unknown to me, implications of which I had had no intimation.../were involved/

I should regard any decision on that subject i.e., consulting his colleagues/ as inopportune and ill judged. Knowledge that such a discussion had taken place would almost inevitably spread and would do incalculable harm. The relations between the Institute and the University are very intimate, and they are important to each other in ways in which you and your mathematical associates do not and cannot possibly know. A discussion on the part of the mathematicians on that subject would be futile and might be harmful. It would be like pulling up a tender plant after a short period to find out whether it is growing....⁴²

He said Professor Veblen had not been candid with him in discussing an enlargement of space when what he really had in mind was a change in the concept of the School, which Flexner considered quite impossible.

He repeated what he had often said: the interests of the other two schools had been subserved to those of the School of Mathematics; now, they were to receive the first benefits of any additional funds which might be found. The growth of the School of Mathematics must be truly remarkable, "if a man like Hardy asks me directly the question as to whether we really wish a monopoly on mathematics in Princeton." The closer problems attendant upon the cooperation between the University and the School were held, the better for fruitful work.⁴³

Behind the muted explosion, which apparently did not come to the attention of the colleagues of the two professors, was their feeling that to remain in Fine Hall was no longer possible to them. Both wanted to be out of it, but subsequent events showed clearly that the other four men liked their present environment. It was clear that Veblen and Lefschetz were not too friendly. Perhaps the latter resented slightly Veblen's patronizing oft-repeated assertion that he had been responsible for calling Lefschetz to the University despite opposition. It is more than likely that Veblen resented Lefschetz's authority and power as Fine Professor with certain administrative duties and prerogatives added. The situation was not improved when Lefschetz, the Department's Editor of the jointly edited and financed Annals of Mathematics, informed Veblen that the Department had agreed at his suggestion to "limit publication to papers of an original and not of an expository character," and asked whether the School would agree. The Institute group agreed, but at its next meeting inaugurated a new Mathematical Series, (presumably consisting largely of the class of material eliminated from the Annals) which it asked the Department to edit, referee and distribute in mimeographed form on a

joint basis. The Department agreed.⁴⁴ The discussion of building the School of Mathematics appeared to be closed with Flexner's letter.

On the 10th November, the faculty gathered at 69 Alexander Street in the evening, and walked to Princeton Inn in a body to present a small gift of sentimental value to the Director, who was about to have his seventieth birthday. The origin of the idea seems to have been in the humanistic group. The Director was deeply touched, and expressed his appreciation next morning in a letter to Veblen in which he sought to heal past wounds, and to re-establish their relations on a friendly footing.⁴⁵

Early in December, however, Veblen's patience with conditions at Fine Hall broke again when he learned that off-street parking permits must be obtained by the faculty members of both institutions to admit them to the limited space outside Fine and Palmer Halls. Veblen found it demeaning to have to ask Professor Smythe for the permit, and resented the exclusion of the Institute's members from the privilege. Patiently Flexner pointed out that members might park on the streets, or walk to Fine Hall, which afforded the School of Mathematics many valuable advantages:

the use of the Library, and janitor service, telephone service, and luxurious quarters, and what is more important than all of these...the easy opportunity for conference, cooperation, and contact with other men interested in mathematics and mathematical physics.

We must make a choice -- to continue our cooperation with Princeton, ignoring everything that is not of prime importance, or set up shop alone. In the former case, we shall hope to develop a great institution; in the latter event, we shall have a small one, and the first subject to suffer would be mathematics.⁴⁶

That irritation, too, appeared to wear away.

Meanwhile, Flexner, troubled by a kind of incredulity at Veblen's statements on the relationship between the School's professors and its members, had asked Veblen for an explanation. The Professor gave it to him under date of the 4th December. There is nothing to show that he had discussed it with his colleagues.

The program of the Institute is to give its permanent members an opportunity to pursue scholarship unhampered by any of the handicaps which such an organization can reasonably be expected to eliminate. It is also its policy to give a similar opportunity for limited periods (usually a single academic year) to temporary members. Some of these are men or women who have recently attained the Ph. D. and who need not only the freedom of opportunity implied by their residence at the Institute but also inspiration and help from the professors. Some are mature scholars whose primary need is temporary release from routine academic obligations. In the second class of cases it is often possible to induce the university to which the scholar is attached to give him leave of absence and pay half his salary. Men of this sort derive a great deal of stimulus and help from their association with the younger group as well as from the Institute professors. The latter derive a great deal of stimulus in their work from both groups of temporary members. Indeed, many if not all of our professors will testify that they receive more from the visitors than they give.

The significance of this establishment, consisting of a permanent group of scholars year by year in contact with a steady stream of colleagues from all parts of the world, is already well understood throughout the academic world. It is increasingly thought of as something which could not be diminished without serious loss to this world.

It would be hard to exaggerate the importance of the stream flowing through it to the Institute itself. If this stream should dry up, there would be danger that the 'academic heaven' would approach the state of Nirvana.

The funds which the Institute devotes to the stipends for temporary members are matched and probably exceeded in amount by the contributions from outside sources. Every university which grants a member of its faculty leave of absence to come to the Institute is making a contribution to scholarship of a definite pecuniary value. This is by no means always a

routine matter...The various universities and foundations (e.g., Trinity College, Cambridge, and the Rockefeller Foundation) which send young men here on fellowships are all making financial contributions to the same cause.

The founders and trustees of the Institute therefore have a right to feel that their generous support of scholarship is receiving recognition not merely in the form of words of praise and gratitude, but also in the more concrete form of pecuniary support and ready cooperation.⁴⁷

Only the first three paragraphs were read to the Trustees, and without attribution. The last two did not quite overcome such qualms as Flexner himself had voiced to Veblen in January, 1933 at the prospect of the Institute subsidizing rich universities such as Harvard, Yale and Columbia by paying half the salaries of professors asked to come to the Institute for a year. Admitting that the benefits of such an association as Veblen portrayed were bound to be mutually felt by the staff members and the visitors, Flexner might have remembered that in projecting his institute for mathematical research in 1924, the Professor had not feared nirvana. Indeed, he had suggested measures to protect his staff from the state by requiring some fixed duties to relieve the men engaged entirely in basic or pure research, such as the editing of a periodical or rewriting the Encyclopedia of Mathematics, and lectures to advanced students. The Director now had to reverse his concept of the master-disciple relations which he had expected would prevail between the professors and the young post-doctorals who would come to study with them. He presented the memorandum with a preface: the hope that better financial conditions would enable the universities to bear the entire cost of sending their men to Princeton, thus relieving the Institute of paying stipends.⁴⁸

As he surrendered his fond dream that the Institute would be a

training ground for the young post-doctorals, of whom Dr. Millikan was to write that, with the help of National Research Council fellowships, they had put American science in the forefront in the western world, he accepted the new concept. At the next meeting Flexner noted:

I hope that the members of the Board have examined with care in Bulletin No. 6 the list of members...during 1936-1937. I think it is no exaggeration to say that a group of this size and eminence, coming from all parts of the world to work in one or another of the Institute schools, has never been assembled before. There are workers from China, Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Norway, Italy, Holland, Belgium, France, Spain, England, and from universities in...fourteen named states making a total of fifty-eight members.

Most of these persons hold good or important academic positions and are studying in Princeton on leave of absence. A few... are men who have had modest posts and have surrendered them... to come to Princeton. For the coming year men who have worked at the Institute have already accepted posts at Yale, Cornell, North Carolina and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and what is true of mathematics will ultimately be true of the other two schools.⁴⁹

And at the following meeting, he found it necessary to say:

I am sure that it is no exaggeration to say that no American institution with an enrollment of between fifty and sixty members has anything like such a proportion of scholars and scientists from institutions of learning in this...and foreign countries. The number of those who are recent doctors of philosophy is negligible and should continue to be such because it is not easy usually to gauge the capacity of a young man to pursue independent work until he has demonstrated his ability after leaving the institution where he received his doctor's degree....⁵⁰

By far the larger proportion of the \$30,000 annual stipend fund for the School of Mathematics was allocated to arrivées, mature teachers from other universities. The rest went to the young post-doctorals, whom Flexner had assumed would be the more numerous. Thus early in October, 1935, the sum of \$5,250 of the \$30,000 was set aside for the younger group, and Professor Weyl was given the privilege of selecting the men

and inviting them, since he was the one most interested in them.⁵¹ When, as sometimes happened, some of the arrivées invited could not accept for the time specified, the residue of those stipends was then allocated to the younger men. In the first nine years of its operation the School counted two hundred sixty-eight individual memberships for part or whole of the academic year, some of which were held by men who stayed for several years. Of the total, one hundred twenty held positions, one hundred forty received Institute stipends, and seventy were Fellows. The cosmopolitan character of the members appeared in the fact that nearly one hundred came from abroad.⁵²

Princeton University, eminent in the sciences, had held undisputed first place in the list of institutions where the holders of National Research Council fellowships chose to study, as was demonstrated by statistics drawn from a bulletin of the National Research Council and published by the Alumni Weekly. This was true of the cumulative figures for the three sciences, as well as of those for the year 1934-1935. Moreover, while the cumulative figures showed the University of Chicago holding first place in the list of institutions training the men who received National Research Council fellowships, Princeton was a close second. Of the total number of National Research Council Fellows in 1934-1935 -- one hundred two in all three sciences -- eighteen had chosen Princeton, twelve Harvard, eleven California, eleven California Institute of Technology, etc. The Fellows of all foundations including the National Research Council were enrolled in mathematics in both institutions. Ten of the twelve in mathematics were at Princeton in that year.⁵³

In 1937, Professor Veblen, apparently reacting defensively to

some stimulus, perhaps Flexner's disclosures of October, 1936, suggested to Dean Eisenhart that thereafter holders of fellowships must register with one or the other institution, according to the connection of the man with whom each wished to work. The Dean agreed, and the information went out.⁵⁴ The result in the Institute's enrollment was surprising; one National Research Council Fellow registered with it for 1937-1938; none the next year, and two Fellows from other foundations in 1939-1940. This accounted in part for the drop in total enrollments in the School of Mathematics for those years: twenty-five in 1937-1938 and twenty-three in 1938-1939. But the quality of the members who came was high as the faculty took occasion to note formally in 1937: "the number of good candidates for stipends seems to be increasing, as compared with former years, and that among those to whom no stipend can be given are a number of quite first-rate candidates."⁵⁵

Dr. Flexner had advocated "borrowing" talent from other institutions, domestic and foreign, in his Confidential Memorandum of September, 1931.⁵⁶ It was not novel. But as has been seen, he did not envision the extent to which the School of Mathematics would use the device. Two very eminent men, P. A. M. Dirac and Wolfgang Pauli, came as visiting professors in 1935-1936 and 1936-1937 respectively. They were paid salaries out of the general funds of the Institute rather than the stipend fund of the School. When the Board consented to the appointment "of another American mathematician" in 1934, it did so with a restriction: the overall budget of the School must not be substantially increased by the action. The commitment to Dirac was outstanding; Flexner sought and received special permission for calling Dr. Pauli. But after that there were no visiting

professors in the School of Mathematics; all visitors were called members, and their stipends were supposed to come out of the fund.

It became Professor Veblen's objective resourcefully to persuade Flexner to make exceptions, to permit this or that item to come from the general budget. Frequently he succeeded, but with the critical attitude the Board evinced in 1936, the chances of success seemed less likely, particularly as there was not enough money to pay the stipends of members for the other schools. Nevertheless, Veblen decided to invite three eminent European mathematicians due to attend the Harvard Tercentenary in the fall of 1936 to come to Princeton for a visit, giving the Department an opportunity to share in the invitation and the \$2,000 honorarium he proposed to offer each. The Department declined, and Veblen, having told his colleagues he could get the sum from the general budget, asked Flexner. But the Board declined to authorize the appropriation, requiring that the sum should come from the School of Mathematics stipend fund. It is interesting to note that even though only two of the three came, (Hardy of England and Levi-Civita) the School spent \$6,000 over its stipend fund.⁵⁷

Professor Veblen's remark that the members formed sub-groups and conferred among themselves was no exaggeration. The Bulletins for these years show a great deal of activity among the members in lecturing, both in series and on single papers, and some conducted seminars during their stay. Not infrequently they worked with University students as well as with the younger post-doctorals. Flexner need not have worried that too many members would interfere with the Institute professors' leisure for reflection and creative thinking. As for his other concern: that the members might talk only "to themselves," it apparently was not

realized either, for they talked also with the people at the University. It was not, in Professor Veblen's view, any miscarriage of relations as Flexner had planned the Institute. However, this attitude of his is of particular interest in contrast to his eagerness during the first four years to admit as members candidates for the doctorate. However, his wish can well be understood in the light of his outstanding reputation as a notably successful guide and mentor in working with graduate students, so that both student and teacher were richly rewarded by the experience.

It has been said at the University that while the presence and activity of the many outstanding mathematicians brought by the Institute to Fine Hall were welcomed and found to be intensely stimulating, the atmosphere created by the richness of the opportunities to hear lectures and to attend seminars proved to be distracting to the graduate and other advanced students. They needed to concentrate upon studies of their own. Too often they were diverted, fearing that they might be "missing something" if they failed to attend a certain lecture, or to participate in a seminar. Dr. Infeld, a hypersensitive person, described Fine Hall's regular afternoon teas as "slave markets," where the young post-doctoral was no more eager to be "discovered" and invited to accept a position than some of the arrivées, who hoped to better their situations.⁵⁸

It will be recalled that Professor Veblen had been from the beginning an ardent advocate of full faculty government in academic affairs, and that Dr. Flexner had on each of the several occasions when the Professor raised the issue attempted to show that nowhere in the western world

were faculties entirely self-governing; there was always a superior power to act as check, critic or stimulant, such as the Minister of Education in a German state or a Royal Commission of enquiry in England. Moreover, while the School of Mathematics was the only School functioning, Flexner properly pointed out that it would be a heavy burden for it to assume to seek and select economists and humanists. He did not overtly question the ability of the mathematicians to do so, however. But Professor Veblen did question Flexner's choice of Professor Riefler -- "a man of affairs" -- and Dr. Morey's selection of Professor Panofsky. So far as the record reveals, the Director never revealed to Professor Veblen the history of his efforts to allow the faculty to elect its own Trustees and its own members to a Committee on Educational policy, and to be a consultant to the Director. It would have been against his policy (and his pride) to disclose the position of Mr. Bamberger in these matters. It will be recalled that he had discussed the problem of faculty participation in government quite fully in his Confidential Memorandum on the organization of the Institute, concluding bravely that if academic Trustees including faculty members did not suffice to provide satisfactory relations, "Further steps can be taken if problems arise..."

When in December, 1935, he found it necessary to remind Professor Veblen that the full-time and post-doctoral policies must not be breached, it appeared he believed such a problem had arisen. He had written:

I saw Professor von Neumann yesterday afternoon and read his minutes of the meeting of the group. In my judgment we would have made quicker and clearer progress had I been present at your meeting, for it seems rather absurd not to discuss matters of this kind, since it is obvious to me that there are

considerations affecting the mathematicians which I may not understand, just as it is equally obvious that there are questions of moment which are bound to affect me which the mathematicians do not understand....If we are to preserve the present cooperative relations with the University, I am compelled to take into consideration factors of which no single school is probably aware.⁵⁹

He made his feelings as to the seriousness of the problem unmistakably clear in the same letter, thus justifying his conclusion that he should attend the faculty meetings. (See Chapter IV, p. 162)

When Professor Veblen replied that cooperation would be more difficult "under the restrictions which you are now contemplating," Flexner answered kindly that he could understand that the significance of what had early been undertaken was only slowly being realized, and added:

Other problems that likewise go to the very root of things may from time to time emerge. Should such be the case, it would, I think, be in the interest of speedy and intelligent decision if we discussed them together rather than separately. I am certain that, if I had been present at the meeting of the mathematical group when my letter of December 11 was discussed, it would not have been necessary for Professor von Neumann to take the trouble of drawing up a minute or of submitting it to me. On the other hand, I have no love for committee meetings and do not care to participate in them unless we can save time and reach wiser decisions by means of them.⁶⁰

There was reason in Flexner's suggestion.. His occasional consultations with Professor von Neumann as liaison with the School perhaps gave him insights he had not had before, when his communication had been with Veblen alone. Now he felt that Veblen did not always represent to him correctly the views of his colleagues, and that by the same token his views did not always get to them through Veblen. He would have a surer knowledge were he able to attend the faculty's occasional meetings. It is not clear how much of the differences over post-doctoral and full-time

standards he discussed with Professor von Neumann, but he did write to him insisting that the notice of Institute stipends published in Science must be amended to state they would be considered only for post-doctorals who had demonstrated "ability in independent research."⁶¹ Definite gains in understanding might be realized by his attending the School's meetings; Veblen's colleagues would know more of his problems and thinking and he of theirs from occasional meetings. But he could hardly attend without an invitation from Veblen, both for his own comfort in the academic milieu, and for justification in contravening Mr. Bamberger's clear wish. In the event, he neither received the invitation, nor attended as a matter of right.⁶²

But if the Director was not invited by Veblen, he could demonstrate his ability to call the whole faculty together for a discussion of great importance. And on the 10th February, 1936, he did just that, for the purpose of consulting it about no less important a matter than the proposal to appoint an associate director, an understudy to himself. The background for this action lay in his election of Dr. Aydelotte as his successor just before the Trustee visited the Founders to persuade them to drop their opposition to the appointment of Dr. Weyl in 1933. Then he wrote Mr. Bamberger that he and Aydelotte had been going over Institute matters past, present and future, and added:

I feel that I have in him an 'understudy' whom you and Mrs. Fuld were rightly anxious that I procure. Whatever happens to me, the Institute is safe, for he and I are in perfect accord as to the principles and ideals which underlie the enterprise.⁶³

From that time forward he confided extensively in Aydelotte, and also asked him to speak his own mind clearly on certain business at

Board meetings. It appears that the Founders, Aydelotte and Flexner were the only ones who knew of the arrangement. Whether it was Flexner's age, or the fact that Dr. Aydelotte faced another crisis at Swarthmore during the latter part of 1935, and called on Flexner to suggest that he was ready for the appointment as understudy, is not clear. In January, 1936, the Director told the Trustees that though they appeared to want him to remain in his position for the time being, he felt that, considering Mr. Bamberger's solicitude about the future of the Institute, it would be wise if a continuity were arranged by the appointment of an associate director on an annual basis, with the understanding that he might, if he qualified, be appointed Director. He himself was approaching his seventieth birthday, and though he was well, his health might fail. The Board thereupon approved this resolution, which he presented.

That after seeking advice from the several professors in the Institute and from such other sources as he may desire to consult, the Director be, and is hereby authorized to submit to the annual meeting of the Board a nomination for the post of Associate Director, it being understood that this is an annual appointment and that it does not involve succession to the directorship, unless sufficient evidence of the qualifications needed in the directorship has been displayed;

And be it further resolved that the Executive Committee be and is hereby authorized to arrange all further details that may be necessary in connection with the establishment of this post.⁶⁴


Dr. Aydelotte was absent; in sending him the minutes Flexner

wrote:

It was impossible to present the associate directorship without the element of risk which I think is really negligible. I am going to get the faculty together next week and simply ask them for suggestions. I am not expecting anything of moment from them so that I shall make the nomination practically on my own responsibility.⁶⁵

The Director did not consult the faculty members separately, but called them together instead. Of the thirteen professors who had been appointed, there were present the six from the School of Mathematics, and Messrs. Mitrany, Panofsky and Riefler. Professor Earle was still recuperating at Saranac; Professors Herzfeld, Lowe and Meritt were in Europe. Dr. Flexner recapitulated briefly the purposes and history of the Institute, explained the resolution passed by the Board, and asked his auditors for suggestions for an associate director. He encountered opposition to the idea; Professor Panofsky was probably not alone in saying that the man who would be a good Vertreter (deputy) might not have the requisite qualifications for directing the Institute. Some names were suggested, (but not recorded) and the meeting adjourned with the understanding that the faculty would meet again for further discussion and recommendations.⁶⁶ Flexner then visited the Founders in Arizona, and while there called on Professor Veblen to assemble the faculty for further discussions and to ask each man to send his recommendations directly to Flexner. He set forth arguments for and against the course he had suggested, and asked Veblen to read his letter in full to the faculty. One suggestion he made specifically:

In choosing a person, if the Board decided to take such action, we should, I think, seek not a distinguished specialist, but rather a person of my own type, namely, one who has varied interests and sympathies, a large acquaintance with men and institutions in this country and in Europe, and profound respect for scholars and their own individual ways of solving their own problems. This sort of choice seems to me important at this stage, while the Institute is gradually expanding. A decade hence, some other type may be more useful; but while I shall present my views to the Board, with whom the ultimate responsibility lies, and in my judgment should lie, I shall not, of course, insist upon it.⁶⁷



The faculty's response, written at the direction of the members by Professors Riefler and Veblen, thanked the Director for inaugurating what they hoped would be his future course in consulting it, and then discreetly insisted that the idea of an associate director was not in its opinion feasible. They doubted that a man of the required caliber would accept such a position on a temporary basis. The letter continued:

We also doubt whether the duties which could be found for him to perform, in case he did accept, would be compatible with the qualities of the man who should be chosen. You have made it one of your main purposes to reduce administration as such to a minimum and to establish scholarship here on the basis of minimum interference with the faculty. Under these circumstances the Director is a sort of an artist. He must be sensitive to conditions in the University, to conditions in the Institute, and intimately aware of the deeper currents in the world of scholarship.⁶⁸

They suggested instead that a standing committee to consist of two Trustees, two faculty members, and the Founders and the Director, be provided for in the By-Laws. This committee would make a continuing study of the field, so that when the time came to appoint a successor to the Director, they would be ready with a recommendation. The suggestion was tentative, and not for Board consideration.

The Director presided over the next meeting, which occurred on the 31st March. Professor Veblen later found two memorandums in Flexner's file, dated for the occasion; he had read one of them. The first was brief; it suggested that a decision was not needed then, but might be reached in the fall after further thought. But it objected to the formality of the committee; the Director felt the preservation of informality was more desirable:

The trustees and faculty should therefore approach these problems rather as committees of the whole than through representatives who might easily get into the position of being attorneys,

one group for the trustees, the other for the faculty.⁶⁹

In the second memorandum, which Professor von Neumann believed was the one Flexner read, the Director elaborated his objections to the formal procedure:

My whole effort during these five years has been directed to preserve informality in my relations with the trustees, and in the relations between the trustees and the professors. I have tried to get you acquainted with one another in a gradual way so that a good many of the prejudices and pre-occupations which exist in American institutions may never come to the Institute. Whether I shall be successful in that I do not know, but at any rate that has been my idea....⁷⁰

He detailed some of the more onerous responsibilities of administration which he had not been able to avoid, though he had kept them at a minimum. He conceded that the faculty members were right in objecting to an annual appointment on the ground that would make it difficult to attract a man of the proper caliber, and concluded that one would have to be found who would take it on an "indefinite" basis and "on a chance." Then Flexner would absent himself after a period of training, and test the ability of the Associate Director.

If he measures up in these trials, the presumption would be that he would be considered first...I believe that the post is so attractive, and the possibilities of the Institute are so great that some highly competent person, confident of his own ability and with imagination enough to realize the possibilities of the Institute, may be willing to be an understudy for an indefinite period -- a year, two years, or three, perhaps more, dependent upon my health and strength.

He devoted some paragraphs to a wise analysis of what the Institute really needed: not the committee suggested by the faculty, for that would tend to bring about formal and opposed positions.

If any such feeling as I have described is brought about, the representatives of the faculty will always be outvoted...As it would be a division that you have brought about, you would

have no reason to complain. In other words, you will exchange influence which you now possess for power which won't amount to anything. The important factors in a small institution are informality and cooperation, not power. I don't myself want power and you don't need any....There is another fallacy in representation. You all know there are divisions in every faculty: divisions between the young and the old, divisions between conservatives and progressives. If you appoint representatives, they will always represent the majority, and the minority will go unrepresented, though it may be that the minority is the wise section. If you keep the thing on the basis of influence rather than representation, an influential and correct minority may have far more influence than a reactionary majority.

The Director then asked the faculty members not to go about contrasting their conditions with those of Princeton's faculty.

It is in our interest, as in theirs, that the University should be made as strong as possible. If therefore any question should ever arise as to whether a particular person should be invited to join the University faculty or the Institute faculty, I should without hesitation step aside in order that the University might secure him.

He added that he had done precisely that in the case of Professor Meritt, whom he had recommended for appointment only after the President at his suggestion had consulted the Department and learned that they wanted a man whose interests were more general, rather than Meritt's more highly specialized field.

That attitude ought, I believe, to characterize every step we take. If it does, Princeton and the Institute together will have made a notable contribution to American scholarship in the form of a new type of cooperation.

He confided to them that when he had told Mr. Bamberger he was too old to organize and direct the Institute in 1930, Mr. Bamberger had said he wanted him to do it, and added that "I should do as he would do in his own business, namely, train an understudy." With a few more words in support of continued informality, and a request that the members should

continue to suggest the names of likely candidates for the office under consideration, he closed with this observation directed against the concept of formal faculty government:

As a matter of fact, in an experience covering a third of a century devoted to improving higher education, only once, so far as I can recall, did my main obstacle lie with the trustees. It was the faculties who with their instinct for self-preservation blocked the way....⁷¹

The final meeting of the faculty in this series was held on the 2nd October, called by Veblen at Dr. Flexner's request. The group, now augmented by Professors Herzfeld and Meritt, abandoned its tentative recommendation, but still insisted it would be wrong to appoint an understudy. They wanted the Director to participate in the selection of his successor, and therefore suggested that he confide his suggestions from time to time to the Board and perhaps even to the faculty. The letter, again written by Riefler and Veblen, closed with the following paragraph:

In the meantime, we have one practical suggestion to offer toward deferring the problem for as long a time as possible. We feel that the severity of the weather in Princeton in February constitutes the greatest hazard to your continued good health. Would it not be possible for you to repeat regularly the vacation which you took last winter with such satisfactory results?⁷²

In a response addressed only to Professor Veblen, the Director expressed his gratification with the faculty's decision, and said he would confide his thinking to notes entrusted to Mrs. Bailey, so that he might change his mind without troubling anyone. He asked Veblen to "let Mr. Riefler see this, and use your own discretion as to communicating it to the other members of the faculty group."⁷³

Meanwhile Flexner wrote to Dr. Aydelotte indicating a relaxed situation; the faculty had been having some sessions without the Director

since the term opened, and would probably have something to report soon.⁷⁴ But no word of any report to the Board remains, or of Dr. Aydelotte's attitude.

Why did Dr. Flexner direct his last letter to Professor Veblen only? The faculty had seen fit to entrust Professor Riefler also with expressing its views, but the only recognition Flexner took of the fact was a casual reference. And his treatment of the faculty itself, leaving Veblen to decide whether to inform the rest of his answer, showed an unfamiliarity with the proprieties, or an indifference. One cannot escape the suspicion that the Director was in some difficulty over having called the whole group together. This might have come about while he was in Arizona; his request for individual answers was perhaps significant. In such case, the compliment for consulting the group must have been uncomfortable, as well as the expressed hope that it set a precedent. One also is entitled to wonder why he called the professors together in the first place. It was clearly a demonstration of his power in the face of Veblen's decided opposition to inviting him to meet with the School, but it is doubtful that Flexner was interested then in a showing of such power. He may have sensed that the collective mind would be opposed to the idea of an understudy, as he himself perhaps was, and as Mr. Bamberger apparently also had been since he overlooked the possibility that his nephews might have been trained to assume the management of L. Bamberger & Company. The timing was perhaps too early to allow the supposition that, knowing the real cause for Veblen's restiveness, he sought to show the Professor that his colleagues wanted close cooperation with the University.

That speculation introduces another one of great interest. Though

the conferences ended as Professors Alexander and Veblen were proposing the expansion of the School of Mathematics as a reason for added space, the restraint and good spirit reflected in the faculty letters allow no inference that Professor Veblen had introduced the question into faculty discussions. Thus Flexner's strongest point in opposing the mathematician's threat to discuss his problems with his colleagues appears in the following passage of his letter of the 7th November:

Should it ever become necessary, as I hope it may never become necessary, to have a faculty discussion on this point, the discussion could not be limited to the mathematical group. It would be called by me, and would be attended by all groups. I should preside and actively participate, for the very obvious reason that, leaving all else aside, I am far better informed than anyone in any one of the groups regarding the substance of the relationship. Any move that at this moment suggests that the relationship be modified, when it is the rock on which we now rest, and anything that could possibly interfere with the type of collaboration which we are trying to work out would be deplorable. In my opinion, therefore, and this is the result of very careful reflection, the whole subject should be dropped and the entire incident regarded as closed...

I trust that you will not misunderstand this letter. You surely know that I set the highest value upon the services which you have rendered to me personally and to the Institute, but your memorandum and your letter have both disturbed me, and it seemed to me only right that I should put you quite candidly in full possession of every doubt that has crossed my mind since receiving them.⁷⁵

For whatever reasons, Professors Alexander and Veblen were silent on the point for some time to come, and when it was revived, it was with another strategy.

Meanwhile, Veblen had decided to take into his own hands, and those of his associates of the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, immediate action to create a social center for the Institute without reference to his position of the previous summer that the projected building on the

club house location should fill that need, and thus without any consideration of the pending plan for the University's possible final action.

"Without initiating any general discussion," he wrote Mr. Maass, he had consulted Dr. and Mrs. Aydelotte about a few simple and relatively inexpensive changes in the Olden Manor -- the old Colonial home on the Farm -- to provide rooms on the first floor where the members might gather socially and some nine residential rooms on the two top floors for visitors.⁷⁶ In December, 1936, he presented blueprints and an estimate of \$10,000 to Mr. Maass for the attention of the Executive Committee, which was to meet on the 28th. Maass passed these to Flexner for the agenda, with another proposal -- a plan for Institute aid to Institute professors in building their homes which Dr. Riefler had prepared at the Committee's request. Both received the approval of the Executive Committee.⁷⁷ But the Director prepared no minutes of the meeting, and took no steps to carry out the plan for Olden Manor, writing Professor Veblen frankly that the Institute had no money for that purpose, and that the housing plan demanded all his attention.⁷⁸

The younger professors had been able to rent homes during the depression; now that economic conditions were easier, families were returning to Princeton to occupy their own homes, and since appropriate commercial rentals simply did not exist there, something had to be done to help the new permanent arrivals establish themselves, as the University had long since discovered. Professor Veblen knew this, and so when Flexner challenged his plan he apparently did not press the social center further. But he did not fail to note the high-handed attitude. Flexner wrote:

Let us get our minds so full of the purpose for which we exist that we will all become relatively indifferent to buildings and grounds...

It is, I think, quite clear that these things dwell much less largely in your mind than they do in mine or Riefler's or Meritt's, for we are strangers to them, but I fear them...for these young men bursting with ideas and alive to opportunities who find themselves distracted...So far as housing is concerned, they have got to take a minimum amount of their time to settle their problems in a brief period once and for all as you settled yours many years ago.⁷⁹

Whether Professor Veblen told Messrs. Maass and Aydelotte of Flexner's reasoned intractability does not appear, but it was not until August that Mr. Maass, apparently just recalling the business, asked Flexner what he had done about Olden Manor. Flexner made show of being reminded, and indicated he was consulting Mr. Leidesdorf about the expense. Nothing further happened.⁸⁰

For by that time much had happened to the carefully laid plans by which the University Trustees had agreed to cede land at the club house location to be used as the site for the Institute's building. Flexner had reported that approval to the Trustees at their meeting in January, 1937. Mr. Dodds had confirmed his verbal information by letter in February. But by April, there seemed to be real doubt that the Princeton Trustees had remained firm.⁸¹ After that no mention is made of the club house location. From what can be learned, however, alumni opposition to moving the club house caused the Trustees to reverse their position. Flexner called on the Founders at Murray Bay in July and it was evidently on learning this news that the Founders, who had never volunteered at any time discernible on the record to finance a building on the College Road plot, now expressed their willingness to finance one on the Institute's own property.

The Director had really called on the Founders to urge them to authorize steps in the development of the staffs in mathematical physics and economics. However, when they offered to finance the building, Flexner again found himself in the old conflict between men and bricks. While he confided good news to Aydelotte, Maass and Riefler on his progress for economics, there is in his letters no single word about the projected building. He did promise news when he met Aydelotte in September. He also informed Mr. Maass in time to plan the first steps in taking advantage of the Founders' offer, which he announced proudly and gratefully at the October meeting. The news did not become otherwise known until the Director told the Trustees:

that the Founders wished to furnish the Institute with funds necessary to erect our first building without drawing upon the capital funds, on the income of which the Institute lives.⁸²

Meanwhile the housing plan for the professors had been worked out favorably with some effort by the Director, Mr. Leidesdorf and Mr. Maass. Professor Riefler's plan had contemplated subdivision by the Institute of a plot lying between the west end of Battle Road and Mercer Street into building lots, providing street, sewerage and utilities. The lots were to be leased for fifty years, renewable at the option of the professor or his heirs. The Institute would supply funds to build the homes, and take mortgages and notes at $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ to be amortized over twenty-five years, the Institute to be safeguarded by life and fire insurance, etc., to cover the debt.⁸³ After consideration by his Committee and the Executive Committee, Maass recommended approval by the Board. The rate of interest had been reduced to 4%, and the lots would be sold rather than

leased. The Institute would advance the costs of subdivision and construction to be amortized over twenty-five years. The benefits were summarized: the professors would get homes, the Institute would receive the rate of return it was receiving on high grade bonds, and would be protected from the perils of the landlord. Each professor would select his own architect and builder. No mention was made of a recapture clause. The Board approved the general plan, but ordered that when the final details were worked out, the Committee on Buildings and Grounds should secure the authorization of the Executive Committee before proceeding.⁸⁴

The interval allowed the Director to visit Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld in Arizona in February, and to persuade them to permit the Institute to sell the lots for \$1,500 as had been suggested by Mr. Leidesdorf, instead of the \$5,000 apparently set by the Board earlier.⁸⁵ Further action was taken by the Committee on Buildings and Grounds in March, and by the Executive Committee on its report in April. As the Executive Committee approved it, the houses were to be planned by one architect and built by one contractor; \$30,000 was the limit for each; the new price of the lots was \$1,500 plus the prorated costs of subdivision, and it was provided that each deed should contain a recapture clause "by which the Institute would be vested with the right to repurchase the respective properties from the owners." Interest charges were to begin with occupancy.⁸⁶

The first contracts, with Professors Meritt, Riefler and Weyl and their respective wives, received Board approval in January, 1938. The interest charges began on the 1st March, 1938. In October each owner was called on to sign a second bond and mortgage covering his share of

subdivision costs, with interest retroactive to March. ⁸⁷

As will be detailed in the next chapter, the Director's conversations with Mr. Bamberger and Mrs. Fuld at Murray Bay so encouraged him to believe they intended to resume gifts to endowment for staff in physics and economics that he was prompted to suggest and work out a new By-Law, by which a more formal budget procedure would be established. It would have done little good to propose such a thing when demands were made for funds which were not there. He hoped to persuade the Trustees to approve a provision for an annual reserve as a percentage of income, but found there was reasoned opposition from Aydelotte and Straus and others. No such provision was enacted.

But a Budget Committee was set up in the By-Laws in October, 1937, by which the Director was required to take the "recommendations" of the several schools for their needs, prepare a budget with them as submitted, and then consult about it with the Chairman of the Board and make such amendments as they deemed advisable. Thereupon the budget went to the Budget Committee of three members in addition to the Chairman, the Treasurer and the Director as members ex officio, with power to amend. No professor Trustee could be a member of this Committee. The Budget Committee submitted its recommendations to the Board. The Director had suggested in 1931 that he should consult the schools on their needs, but had received no answer. Now the Trustees had become increasingly aware of various pressures and were willing to see them met. The Director's explanation for the move was his expectation of more funds to conserve, and the need for more careful scrutiny than the Board could give the budget, as he told the Trustees. But he also confided to Dr. Aydelotte that it was necessary

to protect funds from the faculty, which tended to use up everything available, and for good purposes, indeed, but beyond the resources of the Institute to afford.⁸⁸

The first Budget Committee, appointed with Mr. Bamberger's approval and announced in January, 1938, consisted of Messrs. Weed, Chairman, Aydelotte and Stewart, the Treasurer, and the Director.

CHAPTER VII - NOTES

1. The Treasurer's reports which are available indicate the Founders' gifts in cash and in securities at cost were as follows:

Up to and including 1/7/32	\$5,324,866
Fiscal year 1933*	404,856*
Fiscal year 1934	513,196
Fiscal year 1935	634,183
Total	\$6,877,101
Fiscal year 1936	993,881
	<u>\$7,870,982</u>

*figure derived. Treasurer's Reports for fiscal 1932, 1933, not available. But summary at 12/11/52 made derivation possible.

2. See Fosdick, op. cit., pp. 207 ff. Mr. Fosdick explained that though two of the Rockefeller foundations had spent considerable money in grants for research in the social sciences, and especially in economics, including subventions to the Social Science Research Council and the N.B.E.R., something seemed to be wrong with the programs. Therefore in 1934 he chaired a committee to study the matter. In its report it recommended the abandonment of programs in which research was an end in itself:

"We are interested in research which is a means to an end, and the end is the advancement of human welfare... The mere accumulation of facts, untested by practical application, is in danger of becoming a substitute rather than a basis of collective action."

Fosdick says that thereafter two criteria guided the Foundation in its giving: (1) the subject must be socially significant; (2) it must be susceptible of "scientific" treatment.

This sounds much like Flexner's treatment of research in The Idea of a Modern University. It is of more than passing interest that the Foundation did not hasten to support Riefler's projected studies of November, 1935, which the Assistant Director of its Division of the Social Sciences favored.

3. The 10,000 shares of Macy common were valued at cost at \$1,070,000 in the endowment. Approximately 3,400 shares were sold before February 29, 1932, when according to the Treasurer's Report, 6,599 remained. By August 31, 1932, only 1,100 shares remained. That the sale was debated in late July, with Leidesdorf and Maass opposed, seems clear from a note, Flexner to Maass, 8/2/32.
4. Report, Treasurer, 8/31/32. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/29/34, p. 11.
5. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/10/32, pp. 7-8. Ibid., 1/9/33, pp. 8-9.

6. Maass to Flexner, 7/10/33.
7. Interview with Walter Farrier.
8. Aydelotte to Flexner, 2/7/36. Maass to Flexner, 3/10/36.
9. See Leidesdorf to Hardin, 12/3/31. Hardin to Leidesdorf, 12/5/31. By informal agreement they turned the annual savings to capital account for immediate investment. The policy seemed to be acceptable to all.
10. Flexner to Riefler, 11/2/38. As for Professor Herzfeld's salary, he continued to receive \$6,000 until 1938-1939, when Dr. Flexner adjusted it to \$8,000, and then to \$10,000 in 1939-1940.
11. Maass to Flexner, 8/18/37.
12. Veblen to Flexner, 10/17/32.
13. Infeld, op. cit., p. 294. A professor at the University was to comment humorously that the number of showers in Fine Hall might give some men an idea that the mathematicians did little but bathe.
14. Flexner to Veblen, 3/27/34; 4/13/34.
15. Veblen to Flexner, 4/12/34.
16. L. Bamberger to the Trustees, 4/23/34.
17. Minutes, Meeting of the Members of the Corporation, 4/23/34, p. 3. Flexner to Victor Morawetz, 4/24/34; 5/10/34. Morawetz to Flexner, 5/13/34.
18. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/8/34, pp. 6-8, 11-12.
19. Flexner to Veblen, 11/4/32.
20. Flexner to Veblen, 10/25/34.
21. Flexner to Veblen, 2/27/35; 3/2/35. Veblen to Flexner, 2/28/35.
22. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/22/35. Appendix, p. 8.
23. Flexner to Veblen, 7/6/35.
24. Veblen to Flexner, 7/28/35.
25. Flexner to Veblen, 8/25/35.
26. Flexner to Dodds, 9/25/35.

27. Dodds to Flexner, 11/19/35. This letter was not presented to the Board until the 13th October, 1936. (Minutes, p. 14.)
28. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/14/35, pp. 1, pp. 6-7. Dodds to Flexner, 11/1/35. Flexner to Dodds, 12/10/35. No record is available of the discussions of the Joint Committee, except that Dr. Flexner told the Trustees on April 13, 1936, that the first took place at dinner at Prospect ten days before, and was pleasant and cordial. There were apparently further meetings. The meeting scheduled for April, 1937, was postponed. Whether it was held later does not appear.
29. Flexner to Veblen, 10/28/35.
30. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 10/28/35. Bamberger to Flexner, 10/29/35.
31. L. Bamberger to Leidesdorf, 1/30/36; 1/31/36. Farrier to Flexner 1/10/36.
32. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 12-15.
33. Ibid., p. 12.
34. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/13/36, p. 7.
35. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/13/36, pp. 11-12.
36. Ibid.
37. Flexner to Weed, 10/15/36; 10/23/36; 11/17/36. Weed to Flexner, 10/19/36; 11/12/36; 11/21/36.
38. The memorandum is not available.
39. Flexner to Veblen, 10/31/36. See also Flexner, Memorandum, 10/23/36, showing results of his investigation, which may have been prompted as much by the discontent of the Trustees as by "Building the School of Mathematics." Veblen papers.
40. Ibid.
41. Veblen to Flexner, 11/5/36.
42. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36.
43. Ibid.
44. Minutes, S. M. meeting, 10/22/36; 2/23/37.
45. Flexner to Veblen, 11/11/36.

46. Flexner to Veblen, 12/4/36.
47. Veblen to Flexner, 12/4/36.
48. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 5. See Flexner to Veblen, 1/24/33. Veblen papers.
49. Robert A. Millikan, Autobiography, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1950, p. 184. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, pp. 4-5.
50. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, p. 4.
51. Minutes, S. M., 10/8/35.
52. Statistics, S.M. 7/14/41. Aydelotte papers.
53. Princeton Alumni Weekly, 2/15/35.
54. Eisenhart to Flexner, 5/8/37.
55. Minutes, S. M., 2/23/37. The stipend fund was reduced in 1937-38 to less than \$27,000.
56. Confidential Memorandum, cit., p. 16.
57. Minutes, S. M., 1/20/36. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, p. 14. Treasurer's Report, Fiscal year 1937, Schedule 1.
58. Interviews. Infeld, op. cit., p. 299 ff.
59. Flexner to Veblen, 12/11/35; 12/20/35.
60. Veblen to Flexner, 12/19/35. Flexner to Veblen, 12/23/35.
61. Flexner to Von Neumann, 11/22/35. Minutes, S. M. meeting, 12/14/35.
62. The point was important. Professor Veblen answered Flexner by saying that he had not called the meeting, but that the staff had, after reading Flexner's letter raising the questions in the first place. However, the School minutes say:
"Professor Veblen informs the group that Dr. Flexner communicated to him his opinion
 - a. To adopt the rule that only persons possessing the Ph. D. degree should be admitted to the Institute.
 - b. That no part-time appointments should be made in future of assistants or stipend-holders (who at the same time undertake teaching obligations in the University....)"And the discussion shows clearly that he did not cite the rest of Flexner's letter to support his position. It would seem natural that any discussion between Flexner and Von Neumann might disclose this.

63. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/1/33.
64. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/27/36, pp. 12, 15.
65. Flexner to Aydelotte, 2/7/36. Aydelotte papers.
66. Veblen, Memorandum (for Dr. Aydelotte), without date, a copy, giving Professor Veblen's account of all general meetings of faculty during Flexner's incumbency until 3/30/39 from 10/1/33. Veblen's papers. For this Professor Veblen took and kept various letters and memorandums from Institute files, thereby making them unavailable to succeeding Directors. Flexner to Panofsky, 2/12/36.
67. Flexner to Veblen, 3/6/36. Veblen papers.
68. Riefler and Veblen to Flexner, 3/14/36. Veblen papers.
69. Flexner, Memorandum No. 1, 3/31/36. Veblen papers.
70. Flexner, Memorandum No. 2, 3/31/36. Veblen papers. It was Professor von Neumann's recollection that Flexner had read Memorandum No. 2.
71. Ibid.
72. Riefler and Veblen to Flexner, 10/9/36. Veblen papers.
73. Flexner to Veblen, 11/2/36. Veblen papers.
74. Flexner to Aydelotte, 10/8/36.
75. Flexner to Veblen, 11/7/36.
76. Veblen to Maass, 10/26/36.
77. Veblen to Maass, 12/14/36. Maass to Flexner, 12/22/36.
78. Flexner to Veblen, 1/6/37.
79. Ibid.
80. Flexner to Maass, 8/25/37.
81. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 2. Dodds to Flexner, 2/17/37. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 4/19/37, pp. 8, 9. Interview with Dr. Eisenhart.
82. Flexner to Riefler, 8/5/37; to Maass, 8/7/37; to Aydelotte, 8/17, 9/16, /
Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, p. 5. 9/20/37.
83. Riefler, Memorandum on Professors' Housing, 12/3/36. S. E. P. papers.

84. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/25/37, p. 10 ff.
85. Flexner to Maass, 2/3/37; to Leidesdorf, 2/12/37.
86. Minutes, Executive Committee meeting, 4/19/37.
87. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 1/24/38, p. 14 ff. Leidesdorf to Riefler, 10/14/38.
88. Minutes, Trustees' meeting, 10/11/37, pp. 9-10, 12-13. Flexner to L. Bamberger, 8/19/37; to Maass, 8/25/37; to Straus, 9/29/37. Aydelotte to Flexner, 9/27/37. Flexner to Aydelotte, 9/29/37.