

Hall, Calvin S, 1919-1985

Letter to Edward C. Tolman from Calvin S. Hall, September 29, 1950  
Part of Papers relating to the loyalty oath controversy, University of  
California, 1949-1956., BANC MSS C-B 1036  
BANC MSS C-B 1036, Box 1, Folder: Hall

The Bancroft Library  
University of California, Berkeley  
Berkeley, California 94720-6000



---

## Letter to Edward C. Tolman from Calvin S. Hall, September 29, 1950

---

### [Letter, September 29, 1950]

Western Reserve University  
Cleveland 6, Ohio  
Psychological Laboratory  
September 29, 1950  
Dear Edward

I haven't written to you before this because I didn't know what to say, other than what you must know I have been feeling, namely, a great sorrow and great admiration. The latter I have always felt for you, except that admiration is too weak a word to use to describe my sentiments. Whatever you have done has been right, and this that you are doing now is right, so right that it seems hard to believe that there are so few of you left. I have read everything on the case that I could lay hands on and talked with everyone that had any information. What one heard at the meetings was so confusing, and Else convinced me that the loyalty oath issue was only a smokescreen for other more vital internal dissensions within the Regents. I suggested that we wire you and urge you to sign on the basis of this knowledge, for why should you be a scapegoat, a sacrificial offering on the Neylan altar? That was what I thought and believed then, basing it, as I say, on the best information I could secure. I knew that people whom I admired had signed—a whole lot of people. Why should they sign and not you? I knew that you were willing to bear the brunt of the fight for those who felt with you but sinned, but I didn't feel quite right about the reasoning. I saw Krech was very confusing and I wished many times that you had been at Penn State to tell us what only you could tell. Then tonight I read Max Rabin's article which is reprinted in the current AAUP Bulletin and I knew that what you were doing, apart from any other considerations, was right, and that were you the one who had not sinned, you would be right and the other thousands wrong. For Max made it not a matter of politics, but a matter of integrity and dignity and self-respect, and that the faculty in retreating from its earlier impregnable position had been dead wrong (also pointed out by the New Republic). One consolation is that good men and women, and I judge there are many on the California faculty, cannot continue to do the wrong to do the wrong without feeling guilty, and that sooner or later they will expunge the mistake. The spirit of Max Radin (bless him) will haunt them, until they expiate their sin. The faculty could have prevented this from happening and they will undo what they have done, of that I am sure. I now think that I was duped by Else, even as she has been duped by permitting herself to believe that it is not a matter of self-respect but one of power politics. Regents like Neylan have no self-respect to lose—they are hollow men—they are hollow men—and to obey them is to become hollow like them. How few there are left of you (Bless Nevitt and the others) is a measure of the mass aberration that has fallen over the faculty, but they will throw it off.

We will watch from afar admiringly. If Max is right you will win the court action, and the University of California will once more be a free institution.

Sandy joins me in sending our affectionate regards to you and Kathleen.

With deep affection

P.S. Cute pictures of you in the current Life. You are really very photogenic, and no one will believe that you

are 64.