I had a very fruitful and interesting talk with SKP. As advertised by JM and EFD, Padover turned out to be a personally delightful and intellectually stimulating individual. It was a pleasure to be able almost literally for the first time in some years to indulge in historical shop talk, during which SKP had a number of interesting comments. Among other things he mentioned his proposal (declined about a year ago by the RF) to do a sort of Farrington-like study of American political thought. I thought it was quite an interesting project as SKP outlined it and I was inclined to cluck sympathetically over the intransigence of my colleagues. SKP, however, assured me that he quite understood and sympathized with the reasons for the declination.

Also during the course of our general conversation, SKP independently offered his opinion of the low state to which the History Department at the University of Chicago has descended. According to him Gottschalk is the only historian at the University who is worthy of the name. In SKP's opinion, Walter Johnson is more politician than historian.

At this point I briefly explained the proposal which Chicago has placed before us for a grant of $100,000 toward approximately $265,000 for the editing and publishing of Madison's Papers. SKP was immediately and vigorously enthusiastic in pointing out that Madison was the single remaining individual among the Founding Fathers group whose papers have not been published. In response to my specific question, SKP insisted on the importance of this project to present-day teaching and study of constitutional law and legal theory in our law schools. He assured me that there were at least a thousand research libraries and law libraries which would buy this set and that therefore at a price of $125 a set, the project would easily return a minimum of $100,000 in sales. Incidentally, SKP observed that the cost of this job is just about a third of the three-fourths million dollars which it will take to complete Julian Boyd's work on Jefferson's papers.

When I mentioned personnel involved in this proposal, SKP was much less enthusiastic. He knows both Leonard White and William Hutchinson. White, he considers an able man in his field, but does not see the relevance of White's field (contemporary public administration) to the job at hand. Hutchinson is characterized by SKP as a competent albeit somewhat pedestrian historian. Since Hutchinson's field of specialization is the history of the West, there is some doubt here, too, in SKP's mind as to Hutchinson's qualifications for this particular work. In SKP's judgment, the outstanding candidate for a job of this sort is Irving Brant, who has spent the past 20 years...
in Washington working on Madison and who almost literally lives in the Library of Congress, where he is pressing forward with his multi-volume life of Madison. SKP feels that Brant should be at least an associate editor of this project, or a very close advisor. He feels, moreover, that Julian Boyd should be enlisted in an advisory capacity. In sum, therefore, it is SKP's judgment that a distinguished editing job can only be done by an individual of deep experience, for without this experience there can be none of the sense of direction and purpose which is so necessary to avoid aimless floundering in a sea of manuscript.

In addition to urging me to talk this matter over with Brant, SKP also suggested that I write both to Edward Corwin at Princeton and to Professor Edmond Cahn regarding the present usefulness of this project to current-day teaching and research in constitutional law. Cahn is a distinguished professor of Jurisprudence at NYU.