



Excerpts from the Minutes of the Regents of the University of California, Regular Session, December 14, 1951

TRANSCRIBER NOTE:

This excerpt from the meeting minutes includes a list of attendees and only those sections that pertain to the loyalty oath controversy. Page numbers reflect those of the original source. Missing words, misspellings, and other typographical errors found in the original are followed by bracketed notes.

— 407 —

[Excerpts from Minutes of December 14, 1951]

Los Angeles
December 14, 1951

A meeting of The Regents of the University of California was held this dat [sic] at 2:00 p.m. in Kerckhoff Hall.

Present: Regents Ahlport, Collins, Dickson, Ehrman, Fenston, Hagar, Haggerty, Hansen, Heller, Jordan, Knight, McFadden, McLaughlin, Merchant, Neylan, Nimitz, Olson, Sprague, Sproul, Steinhart and Toll (21).

In attendance: Mr. Warren Crowell, Secretary and Treasurer Underhill, Vice-President - Business Affairs Corley, Attorney Calkins, Controller Lundberg, Assistant Secretary Woolman, Assistant Secretary Taylor, Engineer Weaver, Architect Evans, Dean Warren, Dean Dodd, Budget Officer Groff, Mr. Roy Ploss, Mr. H. H. Benedict, and Messrs. Morris and Hamilton of the Office of Public Information, and newspaper representatives and guests.

Regent Dickson in the Chair.

— 448 —

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO CONSIDER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION BETWEEN FACULTY AND REGENTS:

December 11, 1951
Mr. Robert M. Underhill
Secretary of the Regents
University of California
Berkeley, California.
Dear Mr. Underhill:

9. At the request of Regent Neylan, Regent McLaughlin reported on the activities of the Special Committee to Consider Means of Communication Between the Faculty and the Regents. He stated that two meetings had been held, and an agenda agreed upon; that a committee of the faculty would be appointed by the Academic

Senate at a meeting to be held in December; and that soon thereafter a meeting of that committee and the Regents' Special Committee would be called. He added that the Special Committee at its meeting that day had noted the following letter addressed to the Secretary by Regent Neylan:

Will you please record my resignation from the special committee appointed to consider the matter of communication between the faculty and the Regents.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely

/s/ John Francis Neylan

JOHN FRANCIS NEYLAN

In explanation, Regent Neylan advised that he had attended the first meeting of the Special Committee and was discouraged because the views expressed seemed to be to the effect that the present formal method of communication between the faculty and the Regents would have to prevail. This was in spite of the fact that the Committee had not carried out the purpose for which it was appointed, namely, a meeting with a special committee of the faculty to explore the matter. He thought that had there been a proper channel of communication between the Board and the faculty, there would have been no misunderstanding over the loyalty oath, and he believed that men serving in a position of honor should not be penalized by failure of a mechanism which has proven to be unsatisfactory. He felt that it was most important for the Special Committee to meet with representatives of the faculty and was hopeful that this could be done without delay. He wanted his resignation accepted, believing that he could be of greater assistance as a constructive critic than a member of the Special Committee. Another point he mentioned was the fact that no reference had been made of the matter in the "Faculty Bulletin", which led him to believe that there was no disposition to bring it to the attention of the faculty.

Regent Dickson felt that Regent Neylan could be of real service to the Special Committee and, as Chairman of the Board, asked that his resignation be withdrawn. In response, Regent Neylan stated that he would serve on the Committee if it was agreed that an invitation would be extended to the faculty. In this connection, Regent McLaughlin advised that as soon as the faculty committee had been appointed, which he understood would be during the month of December, a joint meeting would be called. He also expressed the hope that Regent Neylan would reconsider his resignation.

Regent Steinhart thought that in justice to Regent Neylan it should be pointed out that at the meeting of the Special Committee that day it was determined that the traditional policy of the Board that all communications between the faculty and the Regents must clear through the office of the President should be continued. He called attention to the minutes of the meeting of October 19, 1951, at which meeting Regent Neylan's proposal was first presented, and read the following statement contained therein:

Regent Toll asked if the motion committed the Board to the purpose outlined in the proposed amendment, and if the Special Committee was to discuss only the means of implementation. In reply Regent Neylan stated that there was nothing compelling in his motion except the broadest purpose, namely, to see if a constructive solution could be brought about to what he considered to be a most distressing situation.

— 449 —

He said it was on the strength of Regent Neylan's statement that he seconded the motion, it being his understanding that the Special Committee was to deal not only with communications between the faculty and the Regents but was to consider ways and means by which the relations between the faculty and the Regents could be more strongly solidified [sic]. Regent Dickson stated, further, that the Special Committee was striving earnestly to bring about better accord between the faculty and the Regents and he felt that Regent Neylan could

be most helpful in this respect. Regent McLaughlin added that while the Special Committee had expressed an opinion that it did not favor any method of communication that would by-pass the Office of the President, that matter would be discussed with the faculty committee.

With the understanding that the Special Committee would be at liberty to consider the views of the faculty committee with regard to communications, Regent Neylan withdrew his resignation.

— 451 —

RELEASE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION MINUTES AND TRANSCRIPTS:

15. Concerning the controversy over the Regent's [sic] loyalty oath and declaration, Regent Neylan stated that he thought the public was entitled to a full record of the proceedings. He recalled that there have been numerous publications attacking the University and the Regents and he believed that a response should be made by making the Board and Committee minutes pertaining to the subject available to all who might want them. He, therefore, moved that all minutes and records of all kinds in relation to the anti-Communist oath and declaration be made available to the public. The motion was seconded by Regent Knight.

Regent Hansen stated that while he did not object to making the minutes available, he doubted the wisdom of stimulating further discussion on the matter unless there were specific requests for the minutes. In this connection, the Secretary stated that so far eight requests had been received, some of them for transcripts as well as minutes. He pointed out that the transcripts were exceedingly long and that duplicating them would be an expensive undertaking. He wondered if the release of the minutes would not be sufficient. Regent Neylan thought not, stating that the verbatim records of some of the meetings were of supreme importance as they reflected exactly what had taken place.

The Regents then voted to authorize the Secretary to release all minutes and pertinent transcripts relative to the anti-Communist oath and declaration to those who request them; Regents Ahlport, Collins, Dickson, Ehrman, Fenston, Hagar, Haggerty, Hansen, Heller, Jordan, Knight, McFadden, McLaughlin, Merchant, Neylan, Nimitz, Olson, Sprague, Sproul, Steinhart, and Toll (21) voting "Aye"; voting "No", none.

PROPOSAL THAT DR. MONORE [sic] E. DEUTSCH ATTEND REGENTS' MEETINGS:

December 12, 1951

The Regents of the University of California

Kerckhoff Hall

University of California

Los Angeles, California.

Gentlemen:

16. At the request of Regent Neylan, there appeared on the agenda for the meeting a notice that he intended presenting a resolution inviting Vice-President and Provost Emeritus Monroe E. Deutsch to attend the monthly meetings of the Regents and participate as an advisor in matters affecting the faculty. In this connection the Secretary read the following letter from Dr. Deutsch:

Information has reached me that there is an item on the agenda of today's meeting of the Regents, proposing that I be invited to attend all meetings of the Board and serve as liaison between the Regents and the faculty of the University. It has never been my habit to refuse University service, out [sic] I wish to make clear that I cannot possibly accept such an appointment. It is wholly out of harmony with my entire theory of University administration.

May I ask therefore that such a post not be assigned to me?

Regent Neylan felt it extraordinary that Dr. Deutsch would devote his time to speaking engagements in which he made charges that academic freedom and tenure had been destroyed at the University and still refuse to sit with the Board and give the members the benefit of his advise [sic]. He suggested that if he was not willing to sit with the Board it would be appropriate for him to discontinue the attacks he has made. In view of the fact, however, that Dr. Deutsch had declined to accept the invitation Regent Neylan withdrew his proposal.

Respectfully yours

/s/ Monroe E. Deutsch

Vice-President and Provost Emeritus

University of California