December 4, 1970

Robert E. Lipsey
Vice President
National Bureau of Economic Research

Dear Bob:

Given the state of the market and the number of young people we have at the pre-doctoral level here at the Bureau, I think that we should become a little better organized in our placement activities. I realize that all of our pre-doctoral people are formally "the wards" of a university department so that we could say, simply, that we should pass the buck or burden of placement on to them.

However, I think that this is just a bit unrealistic. The actual fact is that these young people are resident here at the Bureau and as a consequence, they may be lost in the placement procedures or programs of their respective departments. Furthermore, we do receive a certain number of letters inquiring about the availability of our younger people.

What all this is leading up to -- as you may have suspected -- is to ask you to serve as the Bureau's "Placement Officer." The reason for asking you is simply that you also have responsibility for our research assistants, and many of the people to be placed, at least for formal purposes, are listed as research assistants. Therefore, you are much better informed about them than any of the other senior officers of the Bureau.

Furthermore, I really doubt that this will be an undue burden. What is involved is spending a few hours during the next couple of months writing letters and answering questions on the phone, etc.

At any rate, we do need a focal point to which people here at the Bureau can refer as well as for collating requests from people outside. I do hope that you will agree to accept
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this responsibility because quite clearly it should do much to help the Bureau's morale and image, both internally and externally.

Thanks very much.

Sincerely yours,

John R. Meyer
TO: STAFF OF THE NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
FROM: JOHN R. MEYER
DATE: October 22, 1970

It is with deep sorrow that we note the death last weekend of Dr. Alfred H. Conrad, our colleague and friend. In recent years, Alf has been a distinguished member of the National Bureau's staff as well as Professor of Economics at City College. At the request of his family, funeral services and interment were arranged to be private. We share in their bereavement. His passing is a grievous loss to all of us.

I first met him almost twenty years ago, so I hope you will forgive a few very personal reminiscences. He was, of course, above all a very fine and loyal friend. In addition, though, we also collaborated on more than one piece of research and writing. I cannot recall even one unpleasantness occurring between us during all of these efforts, in spite of the fact that close collaboration in professional matters can be quite trying under the best of circumstances. I am sure that this "good record" owes far more to Alf's good nature than to mine.
This is not to say that we did not have our disagreements. Indeed, I suspect that in matters political and economic, we disagreed almost as often as we agreed. But these disagreements were always intellectual and substantive, never personal. Above all, we never questioned one another's motives.

Again, I find that I may not fully understand his motives, but nevertheless I am aggrieved that he no longer will be with us. As I analyze my thoughts and feelings over these past few days, though, I increasingly realize that grief is a very selfish and personal concern, motivated by our loss, that is the realization that we shall be unable to enjoy his kindness, sensitivity, generosity and other fine qualities.

When school reconvenes at CUNY, there is the expectation that a memorial service will be held. I will surely keep you apprised of such developments.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: September 26, 1970
SUBJECT: Arrangements with Robert Gordon

You mentioned last spring that you were going to speak to Bob Gordon and make some more definite arrangements as to his financing and his obligations to the Bureau. I would like to follow up now on some of the promises he made at the time of his annual report, but I need some information about your conversations with him. Is there anything in writing you could let me have on this or, if it was done by telephone, could you let me know what understandings were reached?
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: September 12, 1970
SUBJECT: Ken Wright's note about effects of regulatory restrictions on portfolio behavior

The point Ken makes was recognized at the bottom of page 6 of our proposal, where we say that "... for them (insurance companies), statutory limitations may have overridden economic considerations in governing portfolio policy." The point is only mentioned in passing, however, and may deserve further comment in our presentation. Perhaps it should also be said that legislation and regulation are not completely independent variables. They too respond to economic factors, although probably with a lag.
MEMORANDUM

TO: ALL STAFF
FROM: E. K. Smith and Douglas Eldridge
DATE: September 4, 1970
SUBJECT:

Some members of the staff have raised the question of representation on the subcommittee of the Administrative Policy Committee which is now engaged in summarizing existing practices for a draft of an employees manual.

Because Dr. Meyer and some other members of the administrative committee are either on vacation or away and will not be available soon, we shall not be able to take up this matter until the next Administrative Policy Committee meeting planned for September 23.

In order at least to reduce, if not entirely to dispel employee misunderstanding of the matter, it is importthat to point out that there is no issue of voting or representation on the subcommittee because the subcommittee is now dealing only with questions of fact relating to present and past practice. There is no "voting" and there are no "representatives" of any group, but simply a group of employees thought to know about Bureau policies. And the employees who are on the subcommittee, but who are not on the Administrative Policy Committee itself, were chosen for their knowledge and expertise and "represent" no one but themselves.

It is also to be noted that in all probability the draft of an employees manual will have to go through several stages and that at one or more of these stages all employees will be given the opportunity to correct errors, suggest changes and amendments and to otherwise help in developing a wholly satisfactory and acceptable manual. Certainly in a small organization such as ours this sort of review is not only possible but also productive, and we know we can rely on employee cooperation in making it so.
To: National Bureau Employees

From: Douglas H. Eldridge

Date: July 30, 1970

Subject: Administrative Policy Committee Decisions, July 20, 1970

At its meeting on July 20 the Administrative Policy Committee considered the questions and proposals with respect to employee-management relations that had been addressed to them by the Employee Committee. There was unanimous agreement that employees should be kept informed of Administrative policies and decisions which directly (or indirectly) affect them, and it was decided that several things could be done immediately to enhance communication and broaden general understanding of National Bureau affairs. Since Bureau policies are reviewed and ultimately determined by the Board of Directors, the minutes of the last Board meeting held April 27, 1970 and of forthcoming Board meetings will be circulated to employees to acquaint them with policy discussions and developments. Also, to keep the staff apprised of personnel, project, and policy developments, a periodic staff memorandum or newsletter will be inaugurated. Suggestions about the type of items and topics to be covered in the newsletter would be welcome and may be conveyed to Nancy Scotton.

Partly to comply with requirements for Federal Government grants and the development of an "Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Program," the Bureau's administration has for some time been concerned with taking steps toward a more explicit and commonly understood set of personnel procedures, which parallel some of the proposals made by the Employee Committee. These steps include preparation of an updated Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook, detailed position descriptions reflecting functions in respective departments, and arrangements for reports each six months on performance effectiveness of employees. In order that there can be more general knowledge of the steps being taken, the Administrative Committee decided that copies of the document submitted to the Agency for International Development regarding the Bureau's "Affirmative Action Program" be made available in the Library reading room for all interested employees.

The Administrative Committee approved the proposal that each employee's job evaluation, which is now to be made every six months, will be available to him on request. If the employee disagrees with the report, he is to discuss it with his immediate supervisor, and, if the employee wishes, with the person to whom his supervisor is responsible.
The Committee also agreed that the proposal for the Bureau to enter the Unemployment Insurance System be sympathetically and fully explored. It was recognized that this would involve an appraisal of costs and benefits with respect to various groups of employees -- full time, part time, those on specific assignments, those in New York, New Haven, etc. The extent to which the Bureau would seek unemployment insurance coverage for employees would depend upon the assessment of costs and benefits. Members of the Employee Committee have also been looking into these questions.

For many years the Bureau has had a set of office working rules including provisions for hours of work, holidays, vacations, sick leave and fringe benefits of the retirement plan, life, medical, and disability insurance, and tuition reimbursement. In 1969 a summary of these provisions was issued in a Manual for New Employees in order to acquaint newcomers with the standing rules. With growth in personnel and changes in the Bureau, including adoption of a new medical and disability insurance program, it is advisable that the rules be reviewed and extended to accord more closely with current conditions and needs. President Meyer appointed a subcommittee of the Administrative Policy Committee to review the existing rules and prepare a current Personnel Policies and Procedures Handbook. This committee is comprised of Edward K. Smith, Chairman, Douglas H. Eldridge, Ruth La Pan, and Robert E. Lipsey from the Administrative Policy Committee, and Dorothy Chesterton, Mildred Courtney and Christine Mortensen from the staff. Among the matters to be considered are the adequacy of the Handbook in terms of the Equal Opportunity Affirmative Action Program, and the possible development of more explicit rules of the type proposed by the Employee Committee for handling dismissals, severance pay, and the publication of salary scales.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: Robert Lipsey
DATE: July 22, 1970
SUBJECT: Letter to staff

I am glad you are writing to the staff and I think the main points in your letter are things that needed saying. However, I have several suggestions about organization and content.

1. The letter is too long and too detailed on individual cases. I think that whatever the employee committee does, we should follow the rule that we do not discuss individuals in public, and especially not in writing, without their permission (and perhaps not even with it, as far as writing is concerned). I suspect that An-loh, for example, would be embarrassed by the reference to him, and that the typist and secretaries who left are entitled to protection against identifiable references to them in a widely distributed document.

2. I would prefer the order of the letter changed so that all the budget discussion came first and then a separate, shorter, discussion of Stanford. If you want to discuss Stanford in detail, it might be better in a separate memo.

3. The point about salaries at the higher ranks is good, but I do not think that mentioning the specific amounts is helpful, even though I am accustomed to an arrangement under which salaries are virtually public information. They may not impress those who know academic salaries but they might sound high to some one who has just received a raise to $8,000 or $9,000. It might be more effective simply to say that our staff and executive salaries should compete with academic salaries and that, at present, even the VP's salaries are below the 9-month salaries for professors in the CUNY system.

4. I would delete the discussion about the assistant on pp. 18-20, both because it is personal and because it hides an important point: merit does count, and the person involved was a good candidate for dropping in any case, budget stringency or not. Furthermore, she was not a figure in the employee group and I don't think you should dignify, with a denial, the absurd idea that there was any retaliation involved. I would avoid a defensive tone about this and other matters.
5. The main reason for the high separation rate for research assistants and analysts is not their lack of adaptability, as p. 22 seems to imply, but rather the fact that the job is and should be, inherently temporary for most of them. For the few for whom the job is not temporary, and who are capable, the rate of involuntary separation is minute, and almost entirely confined to short-term employees.

6. Do you wish to say anything about the APC meeting, the committee that was set up, or the fact that a memo on the meeting will be forthcoming?

7. I am returning my copy of your letter with some detailed notes and suggestions pencilled in.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: July 3, 1970
RE: Dun & Bradstreet establishment data

Michael Gort called to say that GE had never followed up our suggestion to press D. & B. on the incompleteness of their establishment employment data, and suggested that we bring these discrepancies to D.&B.'s attention ourselves. In only about half the companies was the sum of employment listed by establishment within 10% of the corporate total, and the agreement was no better in the top 100 companies than in the smaller ones. The most frequent error, he thought, was the failure to connect subsidiaries properly to parent companies.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: July 3, 1970
RE: Dun & Bradstreet establishment data

Michael Solt called to say that GE had never followed up our suggestion to press D. & B. on the incompleteness of their establishment employment data, and suggested that we bring these discrepancies to D.&B.'s attention ourselves. In only about half the companies was the sum of employment listed by establishment within 10% of the corporate total, and the agreement was no better in the top 100 companies than in the smaller ones. The most frequent error, he thought, was the failure to connect subsidiaries properly to parent companies.
MEMORANDUM

TO: All National Bureau Personnel
FROM: John R. Meyer
DATE: June 30, 1970
SUBJECT:

Because of the rapidly expanding scale of activities in the areas of fund raising, occasions requiring the participation of senior Bureau personnel away from the Bureau (e.g., a matter such as the recent tax reform bill which vitally affects the Bureau) and the general increase in size of all Bureau activities, it appears necessary to realign the duties and responsibilities of the senior administrative staff.

Doug Eldridge has had, and continues to have, the primary responsibility next to my own, for the external relations of the Bureau. He has the prime responsibility for day to day relations with the Directors, for contributions and subscriptions, and for dealings with the many organizations who support the Bureau in numerous ways. Over the past year these duties and responsibilities have grown to the point where they constitute a full-time work load. Therefore, in order to allow him to devote the time and energy necessary to successfully meet the demands imposed upon him, responsibility for accounting (other than that related to the Bureau's investment accounts) and related personnel functions shall now be the responsibility of Edward Smith, a new Vice President who has just joined the Bureau. In addition, and most importantly, Dr. Smith will be the senior budget officer of the Bureau. He will also be responsible for coordinating, in my stead, tax studies and regional studies.

As you all know, Bob Lipsey and Hal Lary were recently made Vice Presidents-Research. Mr. Lary will continue to have the primary responsibility for National Bureau programs in International Studies. In addition, he will continue to be in charge of coordinating the annual report and staff progress reports, and will take over the responsibility for coordinating staff review of manuscripts.

Dr. Lipsey in addition to his own research interests in the International area, will have primary responsibility for National Bureau programs in the areas of "Financial Institutions and Processes" and "Economic Growth".
In keeping with this realignment of responsibilities it is also my expectation that Doug Eldridge will continue to serve, as he did during March of last year, as Acting President whenever I am away from the Bureau for a protracted period of time.

I hope that all individuals who are directly affected by these changes will assist Doug Eldridge and Ed Smith in meeting their new duties and responsibilities.
MEMORANDUM

TO: All National Bureau Personnel
FROM: John R. Meyer
DATE: June 30, 1970
SUBJECT:

Because of the rapidly expanding scale of activities in the areas of fund raising, occasions requiring the participation of senior Bureau personnel away from the Bureau (e.g., a matter such as the recent tax reform bill which vitally affects the Bureau) and the general increase in size of all Bureau activities, it appears necessary to realign the duties and responsibilities of the senior administrative staff.

Doug Eldridge has had, and continues to have, the primary responsibility next to my own, for the external relations of the Bureau. He has the prime responsibility for day to day relations with the Directors, for contributions and subscriptions, and for dealings with the many organizations who support the Bureau in numerous ways. Over the past year these duties and responsibilities have grown to the point where they constitute a full-time work load. Therefore, in order to allow him to devote the time and energy necessary to successfully meet the demands imposed upon him, responsibility for accounting (other than that related to the Bureau's investment accounts) and related personnel functions shall now be the responsibility of Edward Smith, a new Vice President who has just joined the Bureau. In addition, and most importantly, Dr. Smith will be the senior budget officer of the Bureau. He will also be responsible for coordinating, in my stead, tax studies and regional studies.

As you all know, Bob Lipsey and Hal Lary were recently made Vice Presidents-Research. Mr. Lary will continue to have the primary responsibility for National Bureau programs in International Studies. In addition, he will continue to be in charge of coordinating the annual report and staff progress reports, and will take over the responsibility for coordinating staff review of manuscripts.

Dr. Lipsey in addition to his own research interests in the International area, will have primary responsibility for National Bureau programs in the areas of "Financial Institutions and Processes" and "Economic Growth".
In keeping with this realignment of responsibilities it is also my expectation that Doug Eldridge will continue to serve, as he did during March of last year, as Acting President whenever I am away from the Bureau for a protracted period of time.

I hope that all individuals who are directly affected by these changes will assist Doug Eldridge and Ed Smith in meeting their new duties and responsibilities.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: June 16, 1970
SUBJECT: Kresge Progress Report

I have not seen Kresge's original research proposal and I may not, therefore, be judging him fairly, but my impression from this report, by itself, is that he is somewhat at sea. Very little sense of purpose comes out of the report and he sounds a bit like someone who has a large body of data that looks very useful but doesn't quite know what he wants to use it for. He seems to be confining himself completely to these data and not asking whether he is using the best available information on particular questions. Some of the analysis of the "descriptive" part of the report seems to invite a look at a longer period, and I have the feeling that at least some of this longer look can be obtained from aggregate data.

The Regression Analysis section seems mechanical, as if the results had been quickly put together right off the machine runs. There is, again, too much detail on the mechanics, and not enough explanation of purpose or direction. The whole section seems undigested.

Perhaps it would be a good idea if he gave a seminar here.
MEMORANDUM

TO: NBER Personnel
FROM: John R. Meyer
DATE: May 5, 1970
SUBJECT:

Apparently the gravity of the budgetary situation of the Bureau is not fully realized by all involved. Therefore, I feel it necessary to reaffirm the freeze on all new purchases of office equipment as well as all hiring of new personnel.

In order to make this freeze more effective, I have today given instructions to the Accounting Department that no payments shall be authorized to any new personnel or for any acquisition of office equipment without my written approval. In other words, any new addition to the Bureau's payroll, the purchase of new equipment for the Bureau, any overtime at the Bureau or any parttime or summer help at the Bureau, shall, effective this date, require my approval before hand.
MEMORANDUM

TO: NBER PERSONNEL
FROM: John R. Meyer
DATE: March 23, 1970
SUBJECT: PERSONNEL AND RESPONSIBILITY CHANGES IN SUPPORT SERVICES

As most of you probably know, Martha Hoopman will be shortly leaving us -- a development which we stoutly regret but nevertheless on which we wish her the best of luck and good fortune.

Fortunately, Ruth LaPan has agreed to assume Martha's position of Coordinator of Support Services. The effective date for the transition will be April 1. With this change it also seemed appropriate to slightly realign the duties involved in this position, primarily because Mrs. LaPan will retain many of her responsibilities in relation to the typing pool.

Specifically, Mrs. LaPan will continue to have responsibility of the typing department (MT/ST and related equipment) but Miss Betty Nielsen will be supervisor of the typing department and report to Mrs. LaPan.

In addition, the following areas will be part of Mrs. LaPan's overall responsibility:

Personnel problems and recruitment; secretarial and clerical;

Bureau Mail/Checks, e.g., logging of bureau mail and checks;

Repairs and maintenance;

Furniture and equipment;

Inventory records;

Xeroxing and related copying activities;

Liaison between New Haven and the Bureau regarding the computerization of Bureau mailing and personnel lists.

In these activities, Nancy Scotton will be Mrs. LaPan's assistant.
Bill Kennedy will continue to be responsible for the mailroom and U.P.S. and will coordinate with Mrs. LaPan, Mrs. Tron and Mr. Forman regarding priorities for xeroxing manuscripts and use of outside offset services, if required.

Office space assignments and certain special projects which Miss Hoopman handled will now be handled by my office and will be the responsibility of Miss Vivian Batts. In this connection, Miss Batts will have custody of the master file of keys and the distribution of keys to Bureau personnel.
MEMO

To: John Meyer
From: R. Lipsey
Re: Census Bureau processing of data for Direct Investment study
Date: January 9, 1970

As Hal may have mentioned to you, our negotiations with the Census Bureau resulted in a reduction from about $49,000 to $38,000 in their estimate of the cost of processing data for the direct investment study. We are, of course, a captive market for them because of confidentiality requirements.

I have held off signing the contract for two reasons: the lack of a written commitment from one of the government agencies to provide all the data promised, and the lack of a commitment from either NSF or Ford to supply the funds for the study. We are negotiating for the commitment of data, but I have not been able to get a clear answer from Blackman even as to how soon we will hear from NSF. Would you be willing to have us sign a contract with the Census Bureau in advance of word from NSF or Ford? If we signed an agreement we could get at least part of the data processing under way quickly.
December 23, 1969

To: All National Bureau Personnel
From: John R. Meyer

I have recently been told by Donald S. Shoup that he has accepted an offer from the Social Science Research Council to join their staff here in New York. I understand that he will be leaving the Bureau on or about January 16, 1970. The Bureau is making arrangements for the transfer of his duties and responsibilities to various individuals and you will be kept informed as they take place.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Robert Lipsey
FROM: John R. Meyer
DATE: December 5, 1969
SUBJECT:

Dear Bob:

I just wanted to let you know that the Executive Committee unanimously and enthusiastically endorsed the idea of your returning to the Bureau in a full time capacity, or something closely akin to that, as Vice President - Research at the salary level we have previously discussed.

Sincerely yours,

John

/vb
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: R. Lipsey
DATE: November 10, 1969
SUBJECT: Price-Quantity Study

Hal Lax suggested that, in view of the imminent (or already past) exhaustion of the Ford grant, I should raise with you the question of hiring an assistant for Irving Kravis and me on our price-quantity study. Doris Preston, who was to work on the new study, is still tied up on the old one, mainly checking text and tables and other final preparation of the manuscript, and will continue to be for several months. As a result, Irv and I are without help on the new work, on which we are to report at the Income and Wealth Conference in May. I would like to hire an assistant to work on this project for about six months. After that, if he is good, I would transfer him to the direct investment study, assuming we get money for it from some source. We have used a part of the budget allocated to the price-quantity work, but almost all of that has actually been spent on preparing the manuscript for the earlier study.

I wanted to ask also whether you thought it might be sensible for me to renew my efforts to get financing for this price-quantity work. I had some discussions along this line with a group at the Department of Commerce and I could try to awaken their interest. However, the price-quantity project is already included in the proposed international studies program, and I wondered whether you felt it was advisable to pursue other sources at the same time.
TO: National Bureau Personnel
FROM: John R. Meyer, President
DATE: February 19, 1969

By action of the Executive Committee of the Board on February 17, 1969, Dr. F. Thomas Juster was appointed a Vice President - Research of the National Bureau. Dr. Juster will assume many of the responsibilities for the conduct of the research program that were formerly carried by Dr. Geoffrey H. Moore, who is now on extended leave.

The Executive Committee also approved the appointment of Dr. Donald S. Shoup to the position of Director of Research Services and Planning. The responsibilities of this post were outlined in my memorandum of December 30, 1968 to National Bureau Personnel, in which I noted that in order to assume and to concentrate on realigned duties Dr. Shoup would no longer serve as Director of Administration.

The position of Director of Administration and that of Administrative Assistant to the President, in which Dr. Shoup formerly served, have not been refilled. Decisions about replacements for these positions will depend upon the manner in which the Bureau's organizational needs develop.
MEMORANDUM

TO: John Meyer
FROM: Robert Lipsey
DATE: December 7, 1968
SUBJECT: Proposal from Werner Baer on Role of Non-price Competition in Trade.

The importance of non-price competition in international trade is something we constantly hear discussed, and I have no doubt it could be the subject of empirical research. The difficulty has always been in quantifying what are often vague notions about differences in product design, service, credit terms, and so on. Even elements easier to quantify in theoretical terms, such as delivery, have been hard to collect data on.

The advantage of a cooperative study, such as Baer and Islam are suggesting, is that it is probably the only way to enlist the cooperation of foreign buyers, who are probably the best sources of information. I think, therefore, that he should be asked to suggest something a little more concrete, in terms of the kinds of non-price competition he has in mind, the range of products he would think of covering, what kind of information he plans to collect, and how he proposes to collect it. I think we could then judge the proposal better.

cc: Larry
June 20, 1968

To: The Staff of the National Bureau
From: John Meyer, Geoffrey Moore, Victor Fuchs
Re: Administration of Research Program

The reorganization plan adopted in April called for the establishment of a Research Policy Committee of the staff. The committee will include the President and Vice Presidents for Research and several other members of the staff. It is expected that the membership of the committee will vary from time to time depending upon the interests and availability of different individuals. The present members are:

John Meyer
Geoffrey Moore
Victor Fuchs
Douglas Eldridge
Hal Lary
Gary Becker
Phillip Cagan
Thomas Juster

Several members of the staff have accepted appointment as program coordinators or directors. The following listing of current studies indicates their responsibilities as well as the division of program responsibilities among the President and Vice Presidents for Research. It is recognized, of course, that many studies fit almost equally well under more than one program and that the assignment, therefore, is in some degree arbitrary. Individual studies are identified by the manuscripts that have been prepared or seem likely to result. The listing distinguishes proposed studies (P), ongoing studies (O), and studies in manuscript (M).
Meyer

Urban Economics (Program coordinators: Meyer and Kain)
  P Industrial Location within Urban Areas: Kain, et al.
  P Adaptation of the Housing Stock: Kain, et al.

International Relations (Program director: Lary)
  P Export Expansion of Developing Countries: Naya
  P Comparisons of Transport Technologies: Roberts, Shoup, et al.
  O Diffusion of Industrial Technology: Conrad and Shoup
  O U.S. Manufacturing Abroad and U.S. Exports: Lipsey and Yahr
  O International Comparisons of Real Product: Conference (Daly)
  O International Price Comparisons - Summary: Kravis and Lipsey
  O U.S. Trade in International Competition: Georgiadis
  O Balance-of-Payments Adjustment Policies - Summary Report: Michaely
  O Technology and International Trade: Conference (Vernon)
  M Foreign Dollar Holdings in U.S.: Furth
  M International Capital Movements: Michael
  M Regression Methods in International Price Comparisons: Kravis and Lipsey

Tax Studies (Program director: Ture)
  Tax Policies for Economic Growth
  O Summary Report: Ture
  O Tax Treatment of Capital Gains: Miller
  O Taxation and Personal Effort: Holland
  O Averaging Income for Tax Purposes: Kahn
  M Corporate Taxes and Economic Growth: Hall
  M Tax Treatment - Textiles: Stanback
  M Executive Compensation: Lewellen
  M Tax Treatment of Employment Income: Kahn
  M Personal Exemptions: Seltzer

Unclassified
  P Computer Utility Project
  P Economic Growth Models: Kresge
  O Economics of Public Output: Conference (Margolis)
Moore

Business Cycles (Program director: Moore)

- Econometric Model of Business Cycles: Chow
- Econometric Models of Cyclical Behavior: Conference (Hickman)
- European Business Cycle Turning Points: Mintz
- Finance Companies and Monetary Policy: Selden
- Quality of Credit Studies (project director: Earley)

[-]
- Postwar Quality of State and Local Debt: Hempel
- Postwar Credit Quality - Summary: Earley
- Measures of Credit Quality - A Compendium: Fiedler
- Quality of Direct Placements: Cohan
- Home Mortgage Delinquency and Foreclosure: Herzog and Earley
- Agricultural Credit Quality: Brinegar and Fettig
- Trends in Money, Income and Prices: Friedman and Schwartz
- Cycles in Money, Income and Prices: Friedman and Schwartz
- Monetary Statistics of the U.S.: Friedman and Schwartz
- Cyclical Timing of Consumer Credit: Klein
- Channels of Monetary Effects on Interest Rates: Cagan
- Automobile Finance Rates: Shay
- The Business Cycle in a Changing World: Burns
- Job Vacancies: Boschan
- New Orders: Zarnowitz
- Computer Programs for Business Cycle Analysis: Bry and Boschan

Forecasting (Program coordinator: Zarnowitz)

- Housing Market Forecasts: Page
- Short-Term Predictions of Quarterly Econometric Models: Haitovsky
- The Record of Turning Point Forecasts of GNP and Other Major Aggregates: Zarnowitz
- Accuracy of Econometric Model Forecasts: Cunyngham
- Economic Forecasts and Expectations: Mincer, Zarnowitz, et al.
- Forecasting Business Cycle Turning Points: Fels and Hinshaw
- Errors in Provisional Estimates of GNP: Cole

Productivity, Employment and Price Levels (Program coordinator: Cagan)

- Price Expectations and Term Structure of Interest Rates: Wallace
- Prices and Interest Rates, and the Term Structure: Sargent
- Effect of Prices and Utilization Rates on Employment: Nadiri
- Price and Wage Behavior: Nordhaus
- Employment and Hours Variations in Manufacturing: Rosen
- Trends in Agricultural Productivity - Wheat: Fisher and Temin
- Price Trends and Economic Growth: Fabricant
- Employment and Productivity in Individual Industries: Fabricant
- Trends and Cycles in Wages, Prices and Output: Cagan
- Industrial Price Behavior: Stigler and Kindahl
- Recent Productivity Trends: Kendrick

Unclassified

- Agriculture and Economic Development: Conference (Thorbecke)
- Size Distribution of Income: Conference (Soltow)
- Philanthropy in America: Dickinson
- Seasonal Variations in Interest Rates: Diller
- Mortgage Yields: Guttenzag and Beck
- Economics of Pensions: Murray
- Pension Plans - Multiemployer, Union and Nonprofit: Bartell and Simpson
Fuchs

Human Resources (Program coordinator: Becker)
P Education and Income Distribution: Levhari
P Economics of Accidents: Landes
O Effects of Human Capital on Consumption: Becker and Michael
O Education and Income: Conference (Hansen)
O Labor Force Participation and Unemployment: Mincer
O Human Capital and Distribution of Income: Becker, Mincer, and Chiswick
O Education and Negro-White Unemployment Rate Differentials: O'Neill
O Demand and Supply in Development of American Education: Fishlow
M Long Swings in Population and Labor Force: Easterlin

National Income, Consumption and Capital Formation (Program coordinator: Juster)
O Measurement of Capital: Gordon
O Investment and Nonmarket Activity in the National Accounts: Kendrick
O Consumer Savings and Investment: Juster

Industrial Organization (Program director: Fuchs)
O Industrial Diversification and Integration: Gort
Banking Structure and Performance
O Business Loans: Jacobs
O Consumer Credit: Smith
O Executive Stock Ownership: Lewellen
M Corporate Giving: Nelson
M Demand for Air Transportation: Gronau
M Productivity in Distribution: Schwartzman
M Industrial Composition of Income and Product: Conference (Kendrick)
M The Service Economy: Fuchs
M Production and Productivity in the Service Industries: Conference (Fuchs)
Economics of Health (project director: Fuchs)
O Mortality Differentials by Race and Sex: Silver
O Determinants of Hospital Use: Ro
O Consumer Demand for Health: Grossman
M Production of Health: Auster, Leveson, and Sarachek
To: The Staff of the National Bureau
From: John R. Meyer

Reorganization of the National Bureau

As you are aware, a proposed plan of reorganization of the Bureau was submitted at the Annual Meeting of the Board on March 20. At that time a committee of the Board was appointed to examine the reorganization proposals and report back to the full Board in approximately thirty days. On April 20, the meeting of the full Board took place, and the specially appointed committee recommended passage of the new By-Laws and resolutions pertaining to the reorganization of the National Bureau. The By-Laws and resolutions were passed with a unanimous vote.

I do not wish NBER personnel to be unduly concerned or have misapprehensions about changes which are taking place as a consequence of passage of the reorganization. Consequently, I am circulating this memorandum in order to apprise you, insofar as possible, with the basic structural changes which have and will take place as a result of the reorganization of the National Bureau. You will recall that I
acquainted you with the possibility of these changes in my memorandum of February 21, 1968.

The organization chart attached provides a visual outline of the new organization structure. The major changes are as follows:

1. The titles of Director of Research, Executive Director, and Associate Directors of Research have been abolished.

2. The Executive Director has been replaced with a Vice President for Administration. Next in line to him are a Director of Administration and a Director of Publications. The Vice President for Administration is directly responsible for affairs of the corporation, including work with the Board of Directors which previously was handled by the Executive Director. Mr. Eldridge has been elected Vice President for Administration.

3. The present Director of Research and Associate Directors of Research have been replaced by two Vice Presidents for Research. Under each Vice President will be as many Directors of Research Programs as necessary. Each specific research project within a program will have a project head. In some cases, one man will most likely fill more than one position (for example, as both Director of a program and a project head). In addition to his overall responsibilities for a number of research programs, each Vice President for
Research, and some Directors of Research Programs, will have some direct administrative responsibilities for research support programs, such as research assistants, the library, staff manuscript review, data processing, etc., which are vital to the research effort but are not of themselves research projects. Mr. Moore and Mr. Fuchs have been elected Vice Presidents for Research, and it is contemplated that additional Vice Presidents for Research will be elected subsequently. Mr. Moore has been designated Senior Vice President upon whom the duties of the President will devolve in case of any emergency or contingency wherein the President is incapacitated or otherwise unable to perform his duties.

4. Under the reorganization Mr. Lary will continue to be an officer of the National Bureau, will temporarily assume the title of Director of International Studies, and will be responsible directly to the President. This arrangement is dictated by the fact that the International Studies program is currently undergoing a comprehensive review, and until this is completed, it is difficult to ascertain just how it will best fit into the new organizational structure.

5. Mr. Reinsberg will remain a National Bureau officer as Director of Publications. As in the past, it is clear
that his duties will require considerable direct interaction with the Research Staff as well as the President, ergo the dotted line that appears in the organization chart.

6. The position of Director of Administration will be assumed by Mr. Shoup (subject to final approval by the Executive Committee), in addition to his duties as Assistant to the President. Longer run arrangements for a Director of Administration will depend in part upon the results of a current management survey of the feasibility of automating and modifying our system of accounts and record keeping.

The reorganization revisions focus authority and responsibility far more sharply upon the President of the Bureau. However, at the same time, they allow for clearer definition of other responsibilities within the Bureau in terms of the men who must assume them. I hope that we can all now turn to the primary order of business -- the maintenance of the fine record of the Bureau and the enhancement of that record over the next few years.
To: All Members of the Staff

I take pleasure in informing you that Dr. John R. Meyer, Professor of Economics at Harvard University, has been elected to become President of the National Bureau of Economic Research and is expected to assume this responsibility on or about October 1, 1967.

Dr. Meyer was selected by a special committee of the Board of Directors (Joseph H. Willits, Chairman; Frank W. Fetter, Vice Chairman; Crawford H. Greenevult, Robert V. Roosa, Paul A. Samuelson, Theodore W. Schultz, Boris Shishkin), and this selection was unanimously endorsed by the Executive Committee on January 9, 1967.

Following Dr. Meyer's acceptance of the nomination, the Board of Directors have now elected him by mail ballot.

Arthur F. Burns
September 14, 1966

Dr. Joseph H. Willits
Jackson, New Hampshire

Dear Dr. Willits:

I would like very much to reply to your letter of September 8 regarding the selection of a successor to Arthur Burns as president of the National Bureau. However, it would help me to think about the question if you could clarify the duties and responsibilities of the Bureau's president, and the way in which responsibility is divided between the president and the director of research.

At the time of the discussion of the selection of a new director of research I wrote to Mr. Roberts that it seemed to me an anomaly to have a two-headed organization with both a president and a director of research in a research institution. I argued that under this arrangement the location of the power to make decisions was not at all clear to the members of the staff. There is either a strong president, who then reduces the role of director of research to one similar to that of the associate directors, or a strong director of research, who reduces the role of president to a minor one. Has any consideration been given to returning to the former system in which the director of research was the chief executive and the position of president rotated among the members of the board of directors?

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Lipsey

REL:bg
Dr. Robert E. Lipsey
National Bureau of Economic Research
261 Madison Ave.
New York, New York

Dear Dr. Lipsey,

You may have heard of Arthur F. Burns' request to the Executive Committee on June 20th last, that it search for and nominate a man to succeed him as President. This is no new attitude on Dr. Burns' part. He made clear the same desire to certain members of the Roberts Committee when they were searching for a Director of Research to succeed Dr. Fabricant. Dr. Burns is not retiring from the Bureau; he wishes free time to complete certain books that have been deeply on his mind.

The Executive Committee acceded to Dr. Burns' request with deep regret. I was asked to serve as Chairman of the Committee and Dr. Frank W. Fetter, (Chairman of the Board) as Vice Chairman. The two of us were asked to complete the committee. The membership of the completed committee is as follows:

Frank W. Fetter, representing Northwestern University, Vice Chairman
Crawford H. Greenawalt, Director at large
Robert V. Roosa, Director at large
Paul A. Samuelson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Theodore W. Schultz, University of Chicago
Boris Shiskin, Director at large
Joseph H. Willits, Director at large, Chairman

To be asked to nominate a person to succeed Dr. Arthur F. Burns (and, indirectly, Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell) is a request of the greatest difficulty and importance. It means searching for a person capable of providing a third generation of exceptional leadership for the NBER.

I have attempted to state the qualifications we should desire in such a person in the enclosed "Checklist of Qualifications for a successor to Arthur F. Burns at the NBER." I hope you will feel free to suggest any amendments or supplements to this checklist which you feel desirable.
September 8, 1966

I write to you as a member of the Staff of the NBER to ask two questions:

The Committee members will welcome any suggestions you may care to make of persons, whether within the Bureau or outside, who should be seriously considered.

We would also appreciate the names of any persons of experience, wisdom and judicility whose opinion as to a successor should be sought by the Committee.

I will deeply appreciate your assistance on these points at your earliest convenience. If you prefer to discuss these questions in addition to writing, either Dr. Fetter or I would be glad to meet with you after October 1st.

Sincerely yours,

Joseph H. Willits
Chairman

JHW:AG
Enclosure

P. S. Please mail your reply to me as follows:
Before September 25, 1966:
To - Jackson, New Hampshire

After that date:
To - Box #114A, Bridgetown Pike,
Langhorne, R. D. 1, Pennsylvania

J. H. W.
CHECK LIST OF QUALIFICATIONS FOR A SUCCESSOR TO DR. ARTHUR F. BURNS AT THE N.B.E.R.

The person who will, within the not too distant future, succeed Dr. Arthur F. Burns as President of the National Bureau of Economic Research, as he succeeded Dr. Wesley C. Mitchell, must be an exceptional person. His competence as an economist should be such as to command the respect of discriminating professional economists. His intellect and imagination, including his research imagination and inventiveness, should be first class. His capacity to perceive quality in others, especially in young persons, should be beyond doubt. He should have the faculty of inspiring associates, of giving them challenging freedom but expecting the highest methodological standards and integrity in work. As colleagues prove their quality, he should be able and ready to delegate substantial areas of responsibility. He should be an effective administrator, but a quiet one. His integrity should be such that his dedication to the truth is beyond the doubt of any reasonable person. He should have the faculty to sustain the morale of competent and high-minded colleagues. He should be catholic in his approach to methodological issues but not a partisan for any one. He should be able to meet the public - general and technical - well. He should be able to write clearly. He should have moral courage. He should be in sound physical health. He should be more than an economist.

Submitted for criticism and amendment to the Committee by

JOSEPH H. WILLITS