



Letter to Edward C. Tolman from John Walton Caughey, March 11, 1954

[Letter, March 11, 1954]

PACIFIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

March 11, 1954

Professor Edward C. Tolman

1530 La Loma Drive

Berkeley 8, California

Dear Professor Tolman:

This is really in response to Stanley Weigel's recent letter and circular on the legal costs and complexities that are in prospect. I am sending a copy of this letter to him, but I write to you because it is clear that an inquiry from you elicited his communication, and likewise clear that you are of a mind that something ought to be done toward funding these costs.

That is the point on which I would like to begin. It seems to me that we have a primary obligation to see to it that Stanley's hands are upheld financially. I would assume that the expense money posted last year must be used up by this time. Or at least, running low. Should we not build it up toward the \$10,000 figure, which his estimates suggest?

Also, whereas the simple thing last year was to assess each one of us in equal amount, should not those of us who have a larger amount at stake (if we are in position to do so) chip in a larger amount toward this fund? I, for example, have asked Stanley to try to recover for me considerably more than 1/21 of the announced total of about \$290,000. It seems to me only proper that I should meet considerably more than 1/21 of the expense total. I do not really advocate a precise formula; but when there is a call for funds, how would it be to leave the door open for those who wished to do so to forward more than whatever quota might be designated?

Is there thought of a group approach on the matter of the fee? I am not unmindful of Stanley's generosity in offering to leave the fixing of the fees to his individual clients, and I recall one remark that suggested that it might be done on a contingent basis. I haven't the least doubt that he will do his best whatever the arrangement. For myself, however, I would much prefer to achieve at least in part a pay-as-we-go basis, which seems to me more businesslike and preferable on other scores too. Any news or any comment on this matter will be appreciated.

I should have reported to you long ago that, following the last conference in San Francisco, I tried to get the local money-raising group, the Committee on Responsible University Government, to consider vocal and financial support to us in our effort to rebuild tenure through getting restitution from the regents. The executive committee of this group thought that any public statement from the faculty was inadvisable, but did show some willingness to advance some money. My inclination was to scorn any dollars that came sub rosa, though the offer was not made to me and I had no direct occasion to veto it. Presumably this source could still be tapped. Another discouraging turn was when the local Legislative Assembly tabled the mild resolution which the Academic Freedom committee had presented up north last November. Now I am told, that with the printing of Stanley's October letters in the last issue of the University Bulletin, there is some stirring of consciences

again. No results are visible as yet.

My impulse still is that I, or rather, we, should go it pretty much alone, pushing our litigation as best we can, and hoping that if we are successful there will be some belated awareness that it yielded a benefit for the faculty as a whole and for the university.

I could be wrong in this attitude. If you and the others think it would be better to get at least some members of the U.C.L.A. faculty actively enlisted as supporters, I would not stand in the way. If something of the sort arises at Berkeley, there might be a complementary or competitive response here.

With best wishes to one and all

Sincerely;
John Caughey
240 Chadbourne
Los Angeles 49