

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE May 15, 1951

TO L. Szilard

DEPARTMENT Radiobiology and Biophysics

FROM T. H. Davies

DEPARTMENT Radiobiology and Biophysics

IN RE: Sundry travel expenses.

This is to confirm Mr. Hogness' promise to underwrite Mr. Novick's transportation expenses to New York and return for the Cold Spring Harbor Symposium. Relative to the New York meeting in September for yourself, I find no Institute funds set aside for travel, no practice, except in one previous case, to pay travel expenses, and stern opposition in divisional offices to such a practice. I gather that there is some expectation that your Navy contract will be in hand by that time and thus solve the problem.

T. H. Davies

T. H. Davies

THD/sds

X

63 - N.L.

Paid

NIGHT LETTER

Dr. Louis Levin, Head
Biochemistry Branch
Office of Naval Research
Code 442, Building T3
Washington 25, D. C.

Dr. Leo Szilard of Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics has not learned decision on his research proposal submitted April 12 and acknowledged April 18. Mr. Jones in local Office of Naval Research has no additional information. We would be very grateful if you would inform us of the decision made on this proposal.

T. H. Davies
Acting Director
Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics
University of Chicago

October 9, 1951

cc: Mr. Harrell
Dean Coggeshall
Mr. Szilard ✓

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE October 9, 1951

TO Leo Szilard

DEPARTMENT IRB

FROM T. H. Davies

DEPARTMENT IRB

IN RE: Travel Expenses for Cold Spring Harbor.

As noted in my memorandum to you of May 15, 1951, I am directed by the Dean's Office to undertake no travel expenses for departmental members other than those expenses supported by outside grants. While I feel that it would be pleasant for us and advantageous for the Institute for staff members to have some travel underwritten by the Institute, I believe we will have to establish this as a principle for all and assure ourselves of the funds before getting into the practice.

T. H. Davies

THD/sds

December 3, 1951

T. H. Davies, Acting Director

IRB

Leo Szilard

IRB

Employment of Victoreen.

I understand that Victoreen is being given a raise of \$300 a year and that you wanted from me a statement concerning our intention of continuing his employment beyond December of next year. It is not our intention to employ Victoreen beyond the termination of his present contract in December of next year.

As you probably know, his present contract was given to him by the University without our knowledge. He was given this contract because the Institute listed his name in the budget without inserting the word, "vice".

LS/sds

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE January 4, 1952

To T. H. Davies

DEPARTMENT IRB

FROM Leo Szilard

DEPARTMENT IRB

IN RE:

According to my expense accounts, I have spent in the calendar year 1951 a total of 88 days in Denver, of which 54 days were spent there during the summer months.

These 88 days are broken up as follows:

Jan. 27, 1951 - Feb. 6, 1951 - 11 days

Apr. 28, 1951 - May 3, 1951 - 6 days

May 15, 1951 - May 31, 1951 - 17 days

July 12, 1951 - Sept. 4, 1951 - 54 days

Total Time - 88 days

Leo Szilard

LS/sds

June 25, 1952

T. H. Davies, Acting Director

IRB

Leo Szilard

IRB

Howard Lee.

Howard Lee expects to get his M.S. sometime between the middle of August and the end of December and intends to leave Chicago at that time. We have at present a very active problem, and we are very anxious to bring it to completion by March, at the time when Novick starts on his Guggenheim Fellowship. This might be impossible if Lee leaves us, and we would like to tempt him to stay on until March by offering him a salary increase that would yield for him \$500.00 for the six months between August and March for which we would like him to stay on. This would mean a nominal increase in salary of \$1,000.00 per year, but actually only an expenditure of \$500.00. I wonder whether we can make such an offer. If so, we would like to make the offer in about ten days, or as soon as Novick and I return from the Williamstown meeting.

LS/sds

The University of Chicago

CHICAGO 37, ILLINOIS

Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics

July 31, 1952

Dr. T. H. Davies, Acting Director
Institute of Radiobiology and Biophysics
The University of Chicago
Chicago 37, Illinois

Dear Dr. Davies:

As you know, I am interested in doing some work on the preservation of sperm, both human and bovine. My interest in this field goes back to a piece of fiction I wrote for my amusement two years ago, of which you will find enclosed a copy.

The preservation of bovine sperm is of considerable industrial interest, and I have been discussing with Mr. J. Rockefeller Prentice for some time the possibility of his supporting our work in this field.

Dr. Earl Wilson, whom you know, happens to terminate his present contract on the first of October, and I propose that we give him a six months contract at a salary of \$6,000 per year starting October 1st, with a title of Research Associate. This involves a commitment of \$3,000, and Mr. Prentice, to whom I talked over long distance, said he would be willing to "foot the bill".

This proposed arrangement is merely a stop-gap solution. I feel, however, that until I can have a thorough discussion with Mr. Prentice on the present status of the sperm work and until I see more clearly how deeply I myself want to get involved in this kind of work at the present time, it would not be fair to suggest to Mr. Prentice any expenditures going beyond the bare minimum.

July 31, 1952

Sometime in October or November I may review the whole situation with Mr. Prentice, and if we then decide to go more deeply into the matter we would then extend Wilson's contract to a year and give him a salary of \$8,000 a year rather than \$6,000. This higher salary is indicated because of the temporary character of Wilson's employment.

If the above proposal is OK with the University, would you be good enough to call up Mr. Prentice over the telephone at Superior 7-9756, between August 10th and 15th, and ask him to send you a check made out to the University of Chicago for \$3,000, earmarked for the support of my research in the Institute.

I expect to be in New York throughout the month of September. Having inveigled the Conservation Foundation to set up a five man working group which will make an intensive study of the need for creating a privately endowed Institute for the Study of Fertility, I now have to serve on the committee. The main interest here, of course, is not the preservation of sperm, but rather the development of new methods for the physiological control of conception which would be applicable in overpopulated countries for which our present methods are wholly unsuitable.

Sincerely yours,



Leo Szilard

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE August 18, 1952

TO Leo Szilard

DEPARTMENT IRB

FROM T. H. Davies

DEPARTMENT IRB

IN RE:

Dear Mr. Szilard:

A copy of the revised memo to the Dean's Office is enclosed. As you will note, in order to extend Wilson's tenure next winter, it will then be necessary 1) that he not have misbehaved and been discovered and 2) that you can assert that he is getting something done. After seeing your telegram and hearing a report of my conversation with Dr. Lester, Dr. Coulter seemed anxious to reach a mutually satisfactory agreement, and perhaps more optimistic than earlier that Wilson would work out all right.

My present estimate is that you should let the revised memo stand as the basis of the agreement. The probabilities of your tiring of spermatozoön, of Wilson, or of Wilson's seeking another job seem sufficient to me to make it not worth debating the matter further at this juncture.

I believe it advisable and fair to tell Wilson that Lester answered the Dean's queries about him by saying that he got along badly with his lab mates and that this has given us difficulties. This will allow Wilson to weigh his opportunities here against those elsewhere more realistically and to make the decision for himself. Incidentally, if peradventure Wilson has been at fault in the past this may encourage him to mend his ways. Let me know if all this is satisfactory with you. If yes, I shall 1) see Wilson and offer him the appointment contingent upon getting the funds and 2) write Mr. Prentice (who did not return to the city as anticipated). I understand from you that nothing remains to be done here but thank Mr. Prentice for his interest and tell him where to send the check.

Don't climb above 9,000 feet. The Institute is too small now.

Cordially,

Harrison Davies

Harrison Davies

THD/sds
Enclosure

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE August 18, 1952

TO Dr. L. T. Coggeshall, Dean

DEPARTMENT Biological Sciences Division

FROM T. H. Davies, Acting Director

DEPARTMENT Institute of Radiobiology and
Biophysics

IN RE:

This will memorialize discussions between Dr. Coulter and me on August 9 and August 15. The conversations concerned the appointment of Mr. Earl Wilson to the post of Research Associate in the Institute of Radiobiology and was in response to a memorandum from Mr. Szilard to me which I had transmitted to you.

In the first conversation, Dr. Coulter expressed his and your doubt as to Mr. Wilson's suitability for the post proposed. The uncertainty stemmed from unfavorable answers to queries of the Dean's Office concerning Mr. Wilson's personality and behavior.

After I had submitted somewhat contrary opinions which I had collected from two staff members of the Institute for Nuclear Studies who were familiar with Mr. Wilson, and after further discussion, Dr. Coulter proposed that if Mr. Szilard persisted in his wish to install Wilson then he should be appointed for the six months period only. In so doing, no commitment for a longer period should be made by me to Mr. Szilard or by Mr. Szilard to Mr. Wilson. Dr. Coulter was further of the opinion that you would approve a later extension of Mr. Wilson's contract only if positive evidence of Mr. Wilson's productivity and satisfactory conduct could at that time be brought forward.

In the second conference, after discussing my phone call to Mr. Szilard, his attached telegram, and my extensive conference with Dr. Lester, Dr. Coulter felt that we could clarify his and your viewpoint as expressed in the paragraphs above. This clarification we agreed included an amelioration. We now agree that if after some months of service by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Szilard wishes to continue the arrangement and will testify to the satisfactory character of Mr. Wilson's performance, then in the normal course of events the Dean's Office would expect to approve such an extension. However, in view of the information which it has already received, the Dean's Office may in this case exercise its prerogative to inquire of, say, the new Institute Director whether Mr. Wilson has contributed to disharmony in the Institute and will expect a negative answer before proceeding.

Finally, the provisos for extending the contract which appear in Mr. Szilard's telegram remain in force. Dr. Coulter believed it unlikely that you would approve more than a years contract or that you would approve of a new salary at the \$8,000 annual rate suggested in Mr. Szilard's original memo.

Enclosure

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

DATE August 18, 1952

DEPARTMENT Biological Sciences Division
DEPARTMENT Institute of Radiobiology and
Biophysics

TO Dr. J. T. Coggeshall, Dean
FROM T. H. Davies, Acting Director

IN RE:

This will memorialize discussions between Dr. Coulter and me on August 9 and August 15. The conversations concerned the appointment of Mr. Earl Wilson to the post of Research Associate in the Institute of Radiobiology and was in response to a memorandum from Mr. Szilard to me which I had transmitted to you.

In the first conversation, Dr. Coulter expressed his and your doubt as to Mr. Wilson's suitability for the post proposed. The uncertainty stemmed from unfavorable answers to queries of the Dean's Office concerning Mr. Wilson's personality and behavior.

After I had submitted somewhat contrary opinions which I had collected from two staff members of the Institute for Nuclear Studies who were familiar with Mr. Wilson, and after further discussion, Dr. Coulter proposed that if Mr. Szilard persisted in his wish to install Wilson then he should be appointed for the six months period only. In so doing, no commitment for a longer period should be made by me to Mr. Szilard or by Mr. Szilard to Mr. Wilson. Dr. Coulter was further of the opinion that you would approve a later extension of Mr. Wilson's contract only if positive evidence of Mr. Wilson's productivity and satisfactory conduct could at that time be brought forward.

In the second conference, after discussing my phone call to Mr. Szilard, his attached telegram, and my extensive conference with Dr. Lester, Dr. Coulter felt that we could clarify his and your viewpoint as expressed in the paragraphs above. This clarification we agreed included an admission. We now agree that if after some months of service by Mr. Wilson, Mr. Szilard wishes to continue the arrangement and will testify to the satisfactory character of Mr. Wilson's performance, then in the normal course of events the Dean's Office would expect to approve such an extension. However, in view of the information which it has already received, the Dean's Office may in this case exercise its prerogative to inquire of, say, the new Institute Director whether Mr. Wilson has contributed to disharmony in the Institute and will expect a negative answer before proceeding.

Finally, the proviso for extending the contract which appears in Mr. Szilard's telegram remain in force. Dr. Coulter believed it unlikely that you would approve more than a year's contract or that you would approve of a new salary at the \$8,000 annual rate suggested in Mr. Szilard's original memo.

Enclosure