

not sent

July 4, 1958

Dr. Arthur Kornberg
c/o Dean Alway
Stanford Medical School
Stanford, California

Dear Arthur:

I am writing hoping this will reach you before I call you early next week, probably on Tuesday.

Bob Alway's letter arrived yesterday. I felt that before taking any more decisive action on it that I had some obligation to discuss its implications with my colleagues, and the two deans and the president. Since Bob will be away all next week I will have ample time. I will probably have to discuss a couple of items with him over the phone, and I will welcome the chance to talk it over with you.

The letter is no masterpiece of clear statement, but if it means what I hope and think it does there is no question about my response to it. The University here has been very generous and sympathetic to my needs over the past 11 years and I can conceive of nothing (and have nothing to propose short of intercepting you before you reach Stanford!) that would greatly alter the situation. But Alway's letter had enough ifs and buts, and generalities that we had long since gone over that I will have to inquire what are the qualifications that he sees that might obstruct the actual organization and operation of Genetics along the lines of the budget. An illustration of what might be indecisive hedging is his salary offer. I had intended to ask for 15.5 (as a reasonable extrapolation from my prospects here) and had told him this when he volunteered 16. The budget reads 15. There is the same whittling tendency when ~~xxxx~~ he mentioned 13 to 14 in his letter (for Crow) though I imagine I can interpret this as 14 from the budget; I had clearly told him that we probably wouldn't get Crow for under 14. This may be a chronic disease of deans (there are signs of it around here too of course) but I am a little disappointed that Bob isn't exceptional; with our help he may develop some immunity. I am more worried about this as an overt symptom than its bearing on my own salary. I don't expect you to take any responsibility for these issues, and I am sure we can work them out for themselves. In fact the salary item may prove to be a useful bargaining point (should ~~be~~ be needed) if some small concessions are needed for example to get Crow here. But I think I should have a more explicit statement for 1960-61.

So there are no real issues. If I can get a satisfactory impression of the validity of Stanford's commitment by talking to Alway over the phone, and from your advice on how to interpret it, we may be able to settle by the 15th of July.

All the best, as ever