January 28, 1942

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building - Berkeley
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

May I be relieved of my membership in the Heller Committee? I have participated in their activities long enough to be reasonably sure: (a) that their procedures are thoroughly grooved, and (b) that my interests and abilities lie outside these grooves. I am sure that I can be of greater service to the University by concentrating on the other committees of which I am at present a member, and by assisting in the further assignments which the present emergency will inevitably bring. I am convinced that the Heller Committee will be served more usefully by people from the field of social welfare than by those from sociology.

Respectfully yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas
Professor of Rural Sociology

DST/dr

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 10, 1942

Dr. Dorothy S. Thomas
Division of Agricultural Economics
Giannini Hall, Campus

Dear Dr. Thomas:

Your letter of January 28 convinces me, not that you should be relieved of membership in the Heller Committee, but that you should be encouraged to continue. If the procedures of the Committee are thoroughly grooved, perhaps the greatest service you or I could render to the University would be to get them out of the groove. At least I'd like to raise that question with you, in conference, and to that end I am suggesting that we have a talk before I act upon your resignation. I have told my secretary to put you on my appointment list.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

RGS:KWH

November 14, 1942

Dr. Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

This is a confidential note to ask your advice on procedure in a rather delicate situation.

Three of my Japanese-American field workers would, under normal conditions, be graduate students in sociology at the University this year. One graduated here as an honor student in Social Institutions; the second, also an honor student, took the general curriculum; the third was the ranking student at San Francisco State a year or so ago and had an A average here in the Social Welfare Department. All are doing research of the highest quality for me at present in the Relocation Centers. Their productivity equals or surpasses that of my best Caucasian students. And they actually get more "instruction" and guidance and criticism from me than do the students who are registered here for research with me under Agricultural Economics 203 (my research course).

These students want to prepare for a long-range graduate program. And I certainly hope that they will eventually be able to get their degrees at this University, for they are of the calibre that we seek in our graduate program. Whether or not this will be possible depends, of course, upon many factors entirely beyond our control. However, I see no valid reason why they cannot get credit for the work they are now doing under my direction.

I took the question up with my good friend, Dean Lipman, and received a surprisingly unsympathetic response, although he offered to present the question to the Graduate Council. I did not press the matter, for I was afraid that Dean Lipman might make an adverse recommendation and I felt that "no decision" was decidedly better than an adverse decision at this point.

I believe, however, that the principle involved is important enough to be pushed to a decision. My "Caucasian" field workers and research assistants are getting graduate credit for exactly the same sort of work as is being done by these Japanese-Americans. I feel that a refusal to give credit to the latter is contrary to the stand the University has taken in regard to the status of our Japanese-American students in general.

Dr. Sproul
11-14-42

I should welcome your advice about further procedure in this matter. I hesitate to do anything that would disturb my cordial relations with Dean Lipman, to whom I am indebted for many kindnesses and great encouragement during the difficult times when sociology was being established as a field for graduate study. But I feel very strongly that the point at issue is an important one and should be pressed, so that something may be done before the opening of the next semester.

Any help you can give me in this matter will be deeply appreciated.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas
Professor of Rural Sociology

DST/vp

January 25, 1943

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I am badly in need of some advice, in order not to be caught unaware if and when the Congressional Investigation of the Japanese Relocation Centers gets under way. It is possible that not only I, but also my collaborators, may be called to testify, and some of my collaborators believe that our records might be impounded.

There could be very serious consequences to the University group, and particularly to our Japanese-American collaborators, if the records we have obtained fell into the hands of persons motivated by other than scientific considerations. We have so much that will be of value from the long-range standpoint and so little that can do any good (but that might on the contrary do a great deal of harm) if released now, that protection of the material is of extreme importance. These records have been made available to us because of the faith of our collaborators in the integrity of the University of California.

I should welcome an opportunity to talk this matter over with you, or perhaps with the legal advisor of the University (or with both of you) in order that I may be prepared to meet the situation realistically if I am called by the Investigating Committee.

I am enclosing a proposed draft of a letter to our collaborators. I shall, of course, not send this without your approval.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

DST:mw

Enclosure

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 2, 1943

Dr. Dorothy Swaine Thomas
Evacuation and Resettlement Study
207 Giannini Hall
Berkeley campus

Dear Dr. Thomas:

Your letter of January 25, discussing possible impounding of the records of your Committee, present a situation pregnant with alarming possibilities. I agree that you should have advice before you are called upon to parley with the Congressional Investigating Committee, assuming that you will be so called. Since I am not available until next week, and since the problem confronting us can be solved only in the light of a full understanding of our legal position, I suggest that you arrange immediately for a meeting with Mr. Ashley H. Conard, attorney of the Regents, to whom I am sending a copy of this letter. I wish particularly that you would discuss with Mr. Conard the letter which you propose to send "to all members of the evacuation and resettlement study". After he has been over this letter with you, I should be glad to pass upon the amended draft, if it is decided that the letter should be sent at all.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

RGS:ch

February 9, 1943

Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul
University of California
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

In accordance with the suggestion in your letter of February 2, I saw Mr. Conard, Attorney of the Regents, in San Francisco yesterday. Mr. Conard reviewed the situation, and reached a decision that is not very reassuring, namely, that we have no legal rights in the matter. If an Investigating Committee calls me, I am required to testify and to make our material available to them. If they wish, they can impound the material. To suppress part of the material would make us subject to severe penalties. On the other hand, I can keep copies of the records in some other place than the office. This is, of course, small comfort, for although loss of the material would be a serious blow, misuse of the records would prove very embarrassing to all of us.

Mr. Conard informed me that I am not the only person in the University facing this difficulty. The Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice has made some preliminary gestures towards Dean Grether's confidential records. It is quite clear that we social scientists generally are on the spot. Because of our University connections, we are able to get material that government agencies cannot themselves obtain. They have the power to take these records from us, and apparently will not hesitate to use that power, with utter disregard of the long-run consequences to the University.

Mr. Conard's advice was to use all the personal influence we can muster to prevent the records being examined, and to avoid antagonizing the various agencies.

Mr. Conard approved the letter I had drafted to send to members of the Evacuation and Resettlement Study, with one minor change, namely that point (a) be revised to read "to inform them that, as is the case, all material has been sent to the central office." This means that, if the Investigating Committee visits one of the projects where our field assistants are working, I must be sure that all working copies of the records have been sent to the office before the inquiry begins. Mr. Conard agreed that we should avoid decentralization of inquiries and that Mr. Grodzins and I should be the only persons called, if this can be arranged.

I am hoping, of course, that this particular investigation will never occur. There is reason to believe that the Committee may have been satisfied in the course of the closed hearings in Washington. I recognize, however, that even if this turns out to be so, we shall continue to face, for the duration of the war, the danger of various "interested groups" becoming too much interested in our material. In fact, this is not the first time we have had to face the danger in regard to this particular study, but we have been fortunate in being able to satisfy the inquirers without having to bother you in these other instances.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

Revised Draft, after consultation with Ashley Conard

To All Members of the Evacuation and Resettlement Study:

As you know, there have been several items in the newspapers during the last week relative to a Senate Investigating Committee inquiring into the conditions of the Relocation Centers. We have no indication whatsoever that this Committee is interested in the data we have. Several collaborators, however, have raised questions about the possibility of our research data being examined and sections subjected to interpretations out of their context. This note is being written for two purposes.

In the first place, I want to assure you that I will continue to do my utmost to protect our material from non-scientific use. In this effort we shall have the full backing of the University.

In the second place, you are instructed to refer all inquiries about your work to this office. If Senate Committee members, or members of other investigating groups, examine the Relocation Centers, it is not unlikely that collaborators of this study will be questioned. You are instructed to show the utmost courtesy and cooperation to these questioners, but (a) to inform them that, as is the case, all material has been sent to the central office; (b) that as one of a group of collaborators, you are in no position to discuss the significant larger aspects of the study; and (c) that Dr. Dorothy Thomas, Director of the Study, and Morton Grodzins, her administrative assistant, are the only persons to whom inquiries may profitably be directed.

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

February 12, 1943

CONFIDENTIAL

Professor Dorothy S. Thomas
207 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Professor Thomas:

Your letter of November 14, discussing credit for work being done by Japanese Americans under your direction, has been unanswered but not neglected. I have given the problem which it discusses a good deal of thought, and have conferred with others upon it. All tend to sympathize with your views, but seem to feel that unless Dean Lipman is won over there is little hope of affirmative action by the Graduate Council. Moreover, it is the consensus that Dean Lipman would resent it if I took the matter up with him, for he would know, of course, that you must have talked with me about it.

However, if you could, in some way, bring about a three-cornered discussion by Dean Lipman, yourself, and myself, I should be pleased to participate, and to give you aid and comfort.

Sincerely yours,

Robert G. Sproul

RGS:KWH

CR.

March 6,1943

Dr. Monroe E. Deutsch,
Vice-President and Provost,
Administration Building.

Dear D r. Deutsch,

I am enclosing a letter from Dean Lipman, dated March 3 and received March 6, in reply to my letter of February 24.

In this letter, Dean Lipman discusses the "other much more serious grounds" mentioned in his letter of February 20, for denying my request to register three Japanese American students in absentia for graduate work. He raisese the questions of (a) whether it is possible for students in the social sciences to study problems of which they are a part, and (b) whether competent guidance can be given to students carrying on research in the field. Dean Lipman answers both of these questions negatively.

In regard to the question of bias, it seems to me that Dean Lipman misses one of the main points of social science research, namely, that competent social scientists have given a large part of their attention to the matter of observer reliability. Detection of bias and devising means of overcoming bias are technical probelms that are not new to us. We train our students in methods of objective recording. We devise means of evaluating bias where it cannot be overcome. We check and cross check. We do not, of-course, achieve perfection, but we do know how to allow for imperfections in our data and in our tools of analysis. And, further, we consider that "bias", or the matter of how given people view a given situation is in itself an important part of the data of the social sciences.

Dean L ipman overlooks another important point about the nature of bias, i.e., that, irrespective of the observers, it varies with the topic under consideration. In the Evacuation and Resettlement Study, bias has had to be guarded against in analyses of pressure groups, of anti-administration riots, of the issues involved in strikes. We have found, however, that it plays a minor role in analyses such as the following, which have been made by our Japanese American assistants: forms of collective behavior; structure of the family; types of private enterprise; the development of cooperatives; food, clothing, and shelter; communications; educational organization; and a long list of other topics on which we have had reports.

Dean Lipman's argument implies that no social scientist can make an unbiassed study of a social group of which he is a member. Swedes studying Swedes, Jews studying Jews, women studying women are presumably ruled out because of "bias". We, of-course, would never claim that a Swede is the only person who should study Swedes; The approach of the scientist from another culture is vitally important, but the study of the Swedes by outsiders alone, without the cooperative efforts of

Swedes would probably bias the results in terms of the "outsider's" cultural equipment. We have found, on the Evacuation and Resettlement Study, that the outsider-insider bias is by no means always in the expected direction. I have had some trouble in devising means of overcoming the strong anti-Japanese bias of two of my Japanese American assistants. I have also had to guard against the tendency of one of my Caucasian American assistants to develop what might be called the "evacuee attitude." Bias has unquestionably been one of our big problems, but we have been constantly aware of it, and have a considerable body of data on its manifestations. In fact, one of the most interesting chapters in our methodological volume will be the one, now in preparation, called "An Analysis of Bias in Participant Observation."

The preceding paragrpphs have, I believe, shown that we have the factor of bias well under control, both for our "outsiders", i.e. our Caucasian American assistants, and fon our "insiders", i.e. our Japanese American assistants. The point at issue, then, is whether, as is now the case, only the former are to be permitted to register and receive graduate credit for the work they are doing. That the latter are not permitted registration or credit is plainly an unreasonable discrimination.

In regard to the type of field training received by my assistants, I should like to call your attention to an important discrepancy between my letter of February 16 to Dean Lipman, and Dean Lipman's reference to my letter in his reply of March 3. I said "Training has been carried through both by personal contact and seminar sessions in the Relocation Centers by myself and by constant supervision by a Research Assistant resident in the Relocation Center." In referring to this Dean Lipmmn says " It is not engugh that they [the students] be visited occasionally by a research assistant." As Dean Lipman knows, I give practically full time to the direction of the study, in consultation with Professor Lowie and others of our senior staff, ~~xxxxxxx~~ My Caucasian American assistants fulfill dual roles of trainee and trainer. They are supervised, and, in turn supervise others. This is the procedure I follow, in advanced graduate instruction, not only in the field but on the campus, and it is, I believe, good educational technique.

I know you will understand that I am quite disturbed at the implications of Dean Lipman's letter, for both the students and the study itself are now under attack.

Regarding the students, I have an appointment to see Dr. Woods on Tuesday, March 9. I shall then explore the possibilit of credit through the Extension Division. The outlook is not promising, since the deadline for late registration is March 15.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

"The test of a free country is the security it gives its minorities"

Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul

President of the University of California

Honorary Chairman Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play

Excerpts from a talk given by Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul at the California Club in Los Angeles, California, June 29, 1944.

● For full text of speech, write Committee on American Principles and Fair Play Executive Office, 2234 Telegraph Avenue, Berkeley 4, California.

"FIRST AND FOREMOST, above everything else and for all of the time, the concern of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play is for the *integrity of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States.* It believes with fervor, with fanaticism if you will, that whenever and wherever the constitutional guarantees are violated in the treatment of a minority, no matter how unpopular or helpless, the whole fabric of American government is weakened, its whole effectiveness impaired. Each such violation establishes an evil precedent which is inevitably turned against another minority later, and eventually against the very principle on which our Nation is founded, namely, the dignity and worth of the human individual.

★

". . . the *right* of loyal Japanese to come back if they so elect, cannot be denied without a denial of all that America has hitherto meant to racial and religious minorities, of all that it has symbolized for the hopes of humanity. The dream of America will be over when the color of men's skins or other physical characteristics determines the communities in which they may live.

★

". . . the Committee continues to combat the idea, now being advanced, that evacuation is proof of disloyalty. Moreover, the Committee contends that, since the Army ordered the evacuation, on grounds of military necessity, the Army should likewise decide when the process is to be reversed, and the evacuees allowed to recover gradually their civil rights. When the Army decides that the time has come to take this step, and issues a proclamation as clear as the original orders for the evacuation, the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play will once again cooperate to the limit with the military authorities and the War Department. And it believes that every patriot who prizes his own civil liberties should do the same.

★

". . . The Committee meets *sweeping generalizations* and *wholly unsupported* charges with documented facts. For example it confronts those who say that the only good Jap is a dead Jap with the extraordinary combat record of the 100th Battalion in Italy, a battalion composed entirely of Nisei privates, with half its officers Nisei, and all of them volunteers. That battalion came out of Salerno and Cassino with three Distinguished Service Crosses, 21 Bronze Stars, 36 Silver Stars, and 900 Purple Hearts—900 out of 1400 wounded in action . . ."

★

". . . The Committee endorses these statesman-like sentences of Commander Wm. P. Haughton, of the American Legion, Department of California:

> "We salute all men and women who love this country enough to fight and, if needs be, die for it. Every person good enough to fight for us is entitled to our respect and equal protection under the Constitution."

"These words are a stinging rebuke to those patrioteers who, Nazi-like, would have us substitute a caste system based on race and color for the democratic principles of human worth and equality under the law."

★ ★

Talk given by Dr. Robert G. Sproul, President of the University of California, at the California Club in Los Angeles on June 29, 1944, at a luncheon meeting of a group interested in the Pacific Coast Committee on American Principles and Fair Play

The Committee on American Principles and Fair Play, of which I am Honorary Chairman, came into existence at a critical moment in American history, and to afford a means for the expression of views of all but unspeakable importance. It did not come into existence to protect, much less to coddle or glorify, the Japanese, but to champion and help to safeguard American democracy. It is not an organization of starry-eyed Utopians, of intemperate lovers of strange peoples, but of hard headed believers in the virtues of the American form of government as expressed by the Founding Fathers in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Its leadership in such persons as Dr. Millikan, Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, and myself may be drawn from the lunatic fringe of American life, but it is not a leadership unacquainted with responsibility or unaware of the score. Many of its less cultured members have demonstrated considerable capacity to make their way in the competition of the market place, amidst the harsh realities of life, and not a few have even shown ability to meet a payroll. I make these preliminary assertions because the opposition to the Committee and its works has consisted almost exclusively of direct misstatements concerning its policies and practices, and intemperate assertions that its members were either traitors to America or fools in their own right.

Nevertheless, in spite of storms of abuse from certain quarters, the Committee has been most successful. Up and down the Pacific Coast, it has attracted a very considerable part of those who are universally respected as leaders in their communities to participate in its activities and to speak out for its cause. On the larger stage of the Nation, its influence has been even more notable, continuous and effective. In the face of honest hysteria and dishonest demagogy, it has affected the policies of our government both in the legislative and executive branches. With the judicial branch its cause is secure because, to put it simply, it is just. The chain of American Principles and Fair Play is growing stronger day by day, but its weakest link is here in the City of Los Angeles, in spite of the many able, public spirited men and women who have here declared themselves in favor of the Committee's activities and lent their names to its organization. Indeed, I must confess sadly that this City has been at times a powerhouse of race baiting opposition to the Committee's efforts. Many people who, like myself, have a stake in the community, and are proud of its progressive character, its forward look in most matters of public concern, deplore this situation deeply. We believe it represents not the true temper of the community but merely accidents of organization, timing, and of strategy and tactics. So we have called this luncheon with the hope and the purpose to change the picture, to organize here an active chapter of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play, and thus to make the voice of Americans who try to think with their minds heard amidst the din of those who feel with their blood. To that end I should like to tell you, briefly and factually, what the Committee is and is not, how it works and what it seeks to accomplish, and why it is important that you should make it part of the community life of Los Angeles.

First and foremost, above everything else and for all of the time, the concern of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play is for the integrity of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States. It believes with fervor, with fanaticism if you will, that whenever and wherever the constitutional guarantees are violated in the treatment of a minority, no matter how unpopular or helpless, the whole fabric of American government is weakened, its whole effectiveness impaired. Each such violation establishes an evil precedent which is inevitably turned against another minority later, and eventually against the very principle on which our Nation is founded, namely, the dignity and worth of the human individual.

Even on this fundamental tenet of its faith, however, the position of the Committee is not doctrinaire or academic. It has recognized from the beginning, and under considerable heckling from its own more intemperate members, that the exigencies of war demand some sacrifice of the ordinary rights of all citizens, often considerable sacrifice, and that concerning certain groups of citizens under certain dangerous conditions extraordinary caution and special treatment are necessary and defensible if not desirable. But the Committee believes firmly that the guarantees of the Bill of Rights should be yielded only in extremity, only by deliberate and conscious act, and only in the cases of dangerous or subversive individuals or groups. All others should have its protection until there is proven need for martial law. As Acton, the great historian of human freedom has said, "The test of a free country is the security it gives to minorities."

The second rock upon which the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play establishes its firm foundation, is the assumption, documented by the experience of man over the centuries, that in time of war, the military organization of a nation, in this country the War Department, deserves ungrudging, unstinted, unfailing support in all matters of military concern. The Committee has followed that policy unswervingly ever since it was established, and has found it sound, although it has always reserved the liberty to question any Government action. For example, when the Army decided that evacuation of the Japanese from the Pacific Coast was required by military necessity, the Committee dropped immediately the important questions it had been raising, and properly raising, as to whether such treatment of American citizens or even loyal aliens squared with American ideals. But the Committee continues to combat the idea, now being advanced, that evacuation is proof of disloyalty. Moreover, the Committee contends that, since the Army ordered the evacuation, on grounds of military necessity, the Army should likewise decide when the process is to be reversed, and the evacuees allowed to recover gradually their civil rights. When the Army decides that the time has come to take this step, and issues a proclamation as clear as the original orders for the evacuation, the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play will once again coöperate to the limit with the military authorities and the War Department. And it believes that every patriot who prizes his own civil liberties should do the same.

There are a number of minor facets of Committee policy, of course, but none which runs counter to the two major principles which I have discussed here today. Of these minor policies, I shall refer only to one, because you are busy men and women who do not have the time for a

mass of detail, and that one only because it is a fertile source of misrepresentation as to the Committee's attitude. The Committee does not believe that all Japanese who have been evacuated from California should be returned to their homes. On the contrary, it favors the policy of dispersed relocation, which is the policy of the War Relocation Authority. It holds with all sensible Californians that the swarming of persons of one race in a Ghetto or a Little Mexico or Little Tokio, the separation of a minority physically and culturally from the rest of the population is a profound social and political error and a potent breeder of social and political ills. Moreover, it is convinced that there will never be a mass return of evacuees to the West Coast. Half of them, approximately, have already been located elsewhere, or are likely to be by the end of 1944. In many instances, there is nothing for the others to return to here. Among the Nisei, there is a strong and understandable current of feeling against this area, and many of them have no intention of coming back if they can avoid it. But the right of loyal Japanese to come back, if they so elect, cannot be denied without a denial of all that America has hitherto meant to racial and religious minorities, of all that it has symbolized for the hopes of humanity. The dream of America will be over when the color of men's skins or other physical characteristics determines the communities in which they may live.

On this most significant issue, the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play stands four square with the President of the United States, in his official statement of federal policy on relocation:

> "With the segregation of the disloyal evacuees in a separate center, the War Relocation Authority proposes now to redouble its efforts to accomplish the relocation into normal homes and jobs in communities throughout the United States, but outside the evacuated area, of those Americans of Japanese ancestry whose loyalty to this country has remained unshaken through the hardships of the evacuation which military necessity made unavoidable. We shall restore to the loyal evacuees the right to return to the evacuated area as soon as the military situation will make such restoration feasible. Americans of Japanese Ancestry, like those of many other ancestries, have shown that they can, and want to, accept our institutions and work loyally with the rest of us, making their own valuable contribution to the national wealth and well-being. In vindication of the very ideals for which we are fighting this war, it is important to us to maintain a high standard of fair, considerate, and equal treatment for the people of this minority, as of all other minorities."

This statement, we believe, is to be construed as a solemn pledge spoken by the President in the name of the American people.

So much for the policies of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play, and now for a word or two on how it sets about to implement those policies. The sole weapon of the Committee is the truth, and the Light of Truth it tries to keep shining before our people, and especially those who determine the acts of our government, brightly and continuously. It seeks to promote cool, clear thinking, especially by the West Coast public, in spite of the distortions of fact and excesses of passion and prejudice which are inevitable in wartime. It helps the public to draw a line sharply between our enemies in Japan, the military

criminals for whom no fate is too harsh, no punishment too cruel, and persons of Japanese extraction in the United States, two thirds of whom are free from any blemish of disloyalty, even under the stress of most discriminatory treatment.

The committee meets swooping generalizations and wholly unsupported charges with documented facts. For example, it confronts those who say that the only good Jap is a dead Jap with the extraordinary combat record of the 100th Battalion in Italy, a battalion composed entirely of Nisei privates, with half its officers Nisei, and all of them volunteers. That battalion came out of Salerno and Cassino with 3 Distinguished Service Crosses, 21 Bronze Stars, 36 Silver Stars, and 900 Purple Hearts - 900 out of 1400 wounded in action. Again, for example, it answers the threat that returned white service men would murder persons of Japanese stock if they remained in the United States, by publishing hundreds of letters from men in the fighting forces, saying, in the words of one of them "Have no fear that returning soldiers would desire to slit the throats of loyal Japanese at home.....We'll do our fighting on the battlefields against our country's enemies, and not on the streets at home against our country's friends."

Finally, the Committee backs every group and every individual that speaks out for sound Americanism and against the evil doctrine that justice and power are synonymous. It supports Seth Millington, Past Grand President of the Native Sons of the Golden West, and former State Commander of the American Legion, when he says to the Commonwealth Club, "I would have all known disloyal Japs sent to the land of the rising sun .... by the first ship leaving San Francisco. Those who have volunteered for our armed forces I would keep here as part of our population." And the Committee is sympathetic with Mr. Millington's dilemma (but probably not with his solution of it) when he says further, "As to those that cannot be classified as either loyal or disloyal there is a most difficult problem. Under the law they are citizens and have rights."

The Committee endorses even more heartily these statesmanlike sentences of Commander Wm. P. Houghton, of the American Legion, Department of California:

"Numerous persons of Japanese ancestry are now serving with the armed forces of our country on the battle fronts, and according to all reports, are serving valiantly and well. We salute all men and women who love this country enough to fight and, if needs be, die for it. Every person good enough to fight for us is entitled to our respect and equal protection under the Constitution." These words are a stinging rebuke to those patrioteers who, Nazi-like, would have us substitute a caste system based on race and color for the democratic principles of human worth and equality under the law. We cannot interpret them, or the word of Mr. Millington, as justifying the exclusion of loyal Japanese from California.

Finally, to bring us completely up-to-date, the Committee endorses the plank of the recently adopted Republican party platform which says: "We unreservedly condemn the injection into American life of appeals to racial or religious prejudice."

On the basis of the policies and activities I have laid before you almost diagrammatically, in the brief time available at this luncheon, I hope that you ladies and gentlemen will be moved to set up in this City of Los Angeles, an active chapter of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play. The barometer of tolerance toward the evacuees is still too low on this Coast, and the opposition is still vehement and unscrupulous. We need your help to expedite the program of the United States Government, and to create an acceptance by the California public of the enlightened American way of dealing with law-abiding persons even though they are members of an unpopular minority.

In your lifetime and mine, Western civilization has twice drifted into a major catastrophe, due to lack of wisdom and understanding on the part of men. We shall do so again, and we shall lose the values for which we fight, unless we understand the implications of those values for the kind of complex world in which we live today. Basically, what men are seeking the world over is a decent security, an opportunity for a larger share of the good things of the earth, and above all a sense of meaning and dignity in their own lives. The only answer that can be given to these deep, perpetual hungers of men lies in the American concept of democracy, in the ideal of the common humanity of all men. Let us fight to preserve that concept no less vigorously than we fight to destroy the Germans and the Japs in Europe and the Pacific.

August 7, 1944

President Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

In connection with the post-war plans for the Giannini Foundation, Dr. Wellman has asked me to lay out a program for the further development of Rural Sociology. I find it difficult to proceed realistically under present conditions where the University offers no basic, systematized program in Sociology which should serve as the background for specialized training in Rural Sociology.

I conceive Rural Sociology to be a field for research training and specialization, with particular reference to the social structure of rural communities and the dynamics of population change, including such problems as rural-urban migration, differential fertility, race relations, social aspects of family versus large-scale farming, etc. It is almost impossible to proceed with a program of research training in this field with students who are trained either in economics or in agricultural economics, both of which emphasize prices, market structure, commodities, etc., with little attention to social structure or social behavior, which properly form the subject matter of sociology. Until the University has a Department of Sociology, I shall be unable properly to develop the work that was anticipated when a professorship in Rural Sociology was created in the College of Agriculture.

I face exactly the same problem in connection with my chairmanship of the Committee on Sociology, which was appointed by the Graduate Council. In this capacity, I am supposed to work out a program leading to the Ph.D. degree for students specializing in sociological research. The Committee has been in existence for three years, and has had a fairly large number of applications from students whose interests lie within this field. Of these applicants, only one, who had his training in another University, has been encouraged to proceed. The reason for our conservatism is our inability to provide the training we consider basic to the specialization which we are in a position to offer.

Finally, I face the same problem as Chairman of the so-called group major in Sociology at the undergraduate

level. Here I am forced to work out programs for students who wish to major in this field, and who will not be diverted to other fields in spite of the thin program the University offers. The resulting major consists of a combination of History, Statistics, Social Institutions, Psychology, Economics, and Agricultural Economics--which, added together, do not equal Sociology. In my opinion, it does not add to the prestige of this University to turn out majors in Sociology under these conditions.

For these reasons, therefore, I urgently request that the post-war plans of the University include a Department of Sociology. Without such a department, plans already under way for an undergraduate major in Sociology, for a Ph.D. in Sociology, and for research specialization in Rural Sociology will continue to lead to very meagre results.

As I understand it, the same need is felt by certain other departments and schools in the University which cannot function properly until a basic department of sociology is built up. Among these, the most striking instance is the School of Social Welfare. Social Welfare is, after all, just applied Sociology. To try to apply the principles of a discipline which is at present non-existent on this campus leads to both logical and practical difficulties. Dr. Cassidy has consulted me several times in his efforts to find a way out of the dilemma. Finally, and much against his will, he found it necessary to add a few courses which do not properly belong in his School but which he considered essential for the preliminary training of his students, namely, courses on the social structure of the community, on community organization, on the family, on race relations, and on crime causation. The necessity of giving courses of this sort in the School of Social Welfare not only represents an immediate wastefulness of effort which could better be expended on the applied, specialized aspects of social problems, but also represents a potential future danger in regard to the development of a vested interest in these courses which might be difficult to overcome when a department of sociology is finally developed.

Similarly, the Psychology Department has made several experiments in developing work in Social Psychology. Their present attitude is that the major part of this branch of study belongs more properly in a Department of Sociology than in their own department.

It is apparent, therefore, that there is a definite need

for a Department of Sociology in this University. It is my hope that such a Department can be developed in the very near future, in order that the plans for specialization which I and others have in mind may be built up realistically.

Dr. Wellman has read this letter. He and I would welcome an opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

October 17, 1944

President Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

At the last meeting of the Heller Committee, it was unanimously agreed to recommend sponsorship of the Committee by the Department of Economics. Pending your decision on this matter, I withdrew a proposal I had made last year, and which had been accepted by the Committee, for an intensive examination of the logical and factual basis of the budgets <u>before</u> any further publications are issued.

Since the budgets for the current year will be prepared and published on the old basis, without any critical examination of this basis, and since I have grave doubts about the validity of the procedures, I should like to resign from the Committee, with your permission. Continuance as a member would involve agreement to have my name used on the publications, and would imply an approval that I cannot honestly give.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

November 1,1944 File under Sproul

Mr. F.C.Stevens,
President's Office,
Administration Building

Dear Mr. Stevens,

In my opinion, Professor Bloom's proposal in its present form does not warrant a favorable recommendation. This is because of the lack of concreteness in the formulation of the project. Neither the objectives nor the methods of investigation are at all clear to me, although I have studied the letter to President Sproul carefully, and have read over the preliminary articles to which Dr. Bloom refers.

The proposal seems to have three aspects (1) continuation of case analyses of Japanese families in America (2) statistical analysis of Army data on evacuees, and (3) collection of family cases in Hawaii.

In regard to (1), the basic cases have apparently already been collected, but it is planned to continue observations. No where is it specified what sort of selection of cases was made or whqt sorts of data comprised the observations. The cases are said to have formed the basis of the articles listed, the second of which is described as "the foundation and ground plan of a continuous study." In this article, however, there is no indication of the nature of the concrete case material. Instead, the hypothesis is stated that " interms of familial integration the adjustment will be found to be bi-polar rather than modal" (Italics mine). I don't know what Dr. Bloom means by these terms.

In regard to (2), he speaks of statistical analysis of Army data "to discover the modal types of familial organization " and of manipulating these data in terms of "space, time, and structure." It should be pointed out, in the first place, that the Army data are not entirely suitable for determining family types, since they refer to households registering together for purposes of evacuation. In some instances, 30 or more people--often unrelated--so registered to assure being together after evacuation. In the second place, it is not clear what is meant by "modal types" nor how they can be manipulated " in terms of space, time, and structure."

In regard to (3), it is difficult to see just how the collection of a series of Hawaiian family histories are going to be "equated with exactness" to the ill-defined set of "modal family types" to introduce "external controls". There are obviously many differences in addition to the fact of evacuation between the Hawaiian and the continental cultural situation. These differences would have to be taken into account if "control" were to be achieved.

It would be possible to ask Dr. Bloom to elaborate his proposal in more concrete terms and to clarify his objectives. Specifically, what sorts of data is he planning to obtain? How is he determining "modal types" and in what terms? How far along is he with the analysis of the American material, and what are some of the preliminary, concrete findings? How would he go about getting the Hawaiian data, and in what terms? In what terms and by what techniques would he "equate with exactness" his American and his Hawaiian data? In his general hypothesis, what does he mean by "bi-polar adjustment"?

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

November 4,1944

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building

Dear President Sproul,

I discovered two days ago that the Columbia Foundation will not continue its support of the Evacuation and Resettlement Study beyond the present fiscal year. The discovery, which is a serious blow to our plans, came about almost accidently. Mrs. Elkus had asked me to come to her office to explain an obscure point in regard to our budget. This point was clarified to her satisfaction, but, in the course of subsequent conversation, the fact that the present grant is a terminal grant was brought out.

The overt reasons for the termination seem to be two: (1) Mrs. Elkus' belief that the Study would be completed and presumably published within three years from its inception, and (2) a shift in the policy of the Foundation against long-term grants for research to short-term grants apparently not exceeding one year. I have no reason to believe that either Mrs. Elkus or her Board members are in any way dissatisfied with the Study itself. I do have some reason (I say this in strictest confidence) to believe that there is an underlying dissatisfaction with this University, with University projects in general, and with the technical as contrasted with the ameliorative aspects of social research.

Point (1), of-course, has no basis in fact. Your files, mine, and Mrs. Elkus' all contain evidence that the Study was planned on a "duration" basis. In the original memorandum submitted to you on March 26,1942, it was stated, "The investigators are willing to devote the major part of their research effort to this program provided essential assistance can be obtained. They are applying [for Foundation s upport] on the understanding that the grant will be renewed on the basis of a revised budget, after the first year, and for the duration of the war." A nd, in the <u>formal application to the Columbia Foundation</u>, included in my letter to you of July 2,1942, it is stated on p.3, "The study should continue for the duration of the war. Approximately six months after the end of the war will be required for the preparation of manuscripts." This formal application was drawn up with Mrs. Elkus' advice, and, as I remarked in this same letter to you, "The material follow s an outline suggested by Mrs. Elkus, who has seen it and spoken favorably of form and contents. "

The way in which the "three-year-plan" was introduced was the following: In April 1942, I went to New York, on Mr. Willits' invitation, to discuss the project with him. At that time, I sought approval of a "duration" project, in principle, with a budget of some $40,000 for the first year, on the understanding that subsequent budgets would be submitted (by implication with a marked downward revision) year by year. Mr. Willits was, at that time, very skeptical about the chances of our obtaining the sort of data we needed for the study, because of government restrictions, which he felt could not be circumvented, and because of his belief that the evacuees would not cooperate. He was, however, willing to recommend a modest grant of $7500 for an exploratory study of one year. Naturally, I took what I could get. When the Columbia Foundation was later approached for further support, the period of three years was first introduced in the negotiations as a crude estimate, presumably, of the duration of the war. You generously pledged University support for the same period. Thereupon, the Rockefeller Foundation a greed to extend their exploratory grant for two additional years, as Mr. Willits was by this time convinced that his original fears were groundless .

I had not planned to approach you for advice and help in respect to financing beyond the three year period until next spring. In view of the Columbia situation, however, and the fact that we have also no assurance regarding continuation of the Rockefeller grant, it seems necessary to draw up immediate plans for the continuation of the Study. Otherwise, it will be impossible for me to keep the minimum essential personnel that will be needed for the last stages of the analysis .

As explained in my annual report for 1943-44, retrenchment is already well under way. The political and administrative segments are conceived as complete as of January 1945. Observations on midwestern resettlers are now being curtailed. Observations in the camps themselves will be stopped at the earliest possible moment. This "earliest possible moment", however, cannot yet be dated, for it depends on a military decision, not yet made, to remove restrictions against the return of evacuees to their former homes. Until that point is reached, no estimate can be made of the effects of evacuation in dispersing the Japanese minority. There are still some 57,000 evacuees in camps, excluding Tule Lake, as against some 33,000 who have relocated or entered the armed forces. There are still eight camps from which a relatively inert population must be moved, against one which it has been possible to close, and one (Tule Lake) from which relocation is impossible. In other words, the observational aspect of the study cannot be completed until the evacuation cycle itself is completed.

I plan to bring the observational phase of the present Study to completion as soon as feasible after the military restrictions are removed. The immediate problem is to take steps that will assure the necessary assistance in analyzing and synthesizing the mass of observations that will have been collected by that time.

Assuming that the main observational material will be in hand by July 1,1945, the minimum personnel requirement for the year beginning July 1,1945 is two full-time analysts(selected, of-course, from existing personnel), for one year after the observations in the camps are completed; the equivalent of one other full-time analyst(possibly two analysts for six months each rather than one for a full year) for "tapering-off" and filling in gaps; some allowance for travelling, stenographic assistance, and supplies. I should appreciate having a little time to prepare a detailed budget. My present estimate, however, is between $9000 and $10,000, exclusive of the Giannini donation.

I shall be deeply appreciative if you will advise me about procedures that should be undertaken to assure refinancing for the year beginning July 1,1945.

There is another aspect of the project which I think should be brought up at this point. It is evident that some of the most important aspects of the results of the evacuation can appear only after the lapse of a considerable period of time following the completion of the present study, e.g, the extent to which the Nisei stay dispersed or tend to resegregate; the extent to which the resettlers achieve a superior economic and social organization or, conversely, the extent to which they become economically and socially disorganized(as manifested by relief, crime and delinquency); the nature and extent of the inevitable human spoilage, including the possibility of a permanent reservation population. These and other important questions cannot be answered fully by the present study, and a follow-up study of the long-term effects of mass migration is desirable. My conception of this is that it should take the form of monographic studies, determined by the trend of events. I and my students would participate, as well as individuals from any or all of the social sciences and agencies interested in the formation of social policies. For this long-term study, I am not at present asking any financial provision.

Finally, I should point out that eventually financial provision will probably have to be made for the publication of the results of the present study.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

November 11, 1944

Dr. Dorothy Thomas
338 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Doctor Thomas:

In response to your letter of October 17, and most reluctantly, I release you from the obligation of membership on the Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics. I have become convinced that neither you nor I, nor both of us together, can reform the Heller Committee.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

Robert G. Sproul

RGS:cw

Confidential

November 24, 1944

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

Your committee on the appointment of a Dean of the School of Social Welfare has considered the possibilities listed in your letter of October 9, along with some other names. A number of the persons discussed were known to its members; the committee has also collected other routine information and has made some outside inquiries.

The President's list with committee supplements contains the names of many distinguished individuals. Any one of a number of these would be personally acceptable, if he could be persuaded to accept appointment. The committee observes, however, that these persons differ in type as well as in individual reputation and demonstrated capacity, and that selection between them must be influenced by the policy with respect to the School of Social Welfare that the University desires to pursue. The committee therefore takes the liberty of discussing briefly the broader aspects of the present problem.

Your committee feels that there are two general directions in which training in schools of social welfare can be oriented. On the one hand, such training can be purely professional, with the objective of filling the needs of public and private agencies for case workers, supervisors, etc. On the other hand, training can be given on a broader basis, with the objective of integrating the subject matter of social welfare with that of the social sciences in general.

It is clear enough that the University should interest itself in the professional training of social workers. This is a proper development, and it will be a special contribution, by the University, toward the solution of post-war problems. The emphasis of the School of Social Welfare, as presently constituted, is primarily in the direction of professional training, and further progress along these lines will be cordially welcomed by its staff.

The committee is of the opinion, however, that it will be a mistake to make the social work sponsored by the University exclusively or narrowly professional. The broader basis is one which the University insists upon in other fields, and it seems probable that, in the long run, it will also be of most advantage to the profession itself. Possibly there is no need to argue this point at length.

What this means in the concrete situation is not so certain. There are persons in the list of names before the committee who would be able to set up and direct a staff within the School of Social Welfare which would offer instruction in basic and allied disciplines which relate to social welfare. The committee here mentions the names of Ewan Clague, Assistant Director, Social Security Board, Washington, D. C., Robert T. Lansdale, of the New York School of Social Work, and William Haber, of the University of

Michigan, whom it ranks in the order given. Mr. Clague has been described to the committee as the best man in the country for a position as Dean of a School of Social Welfare. He has personality, some administrative experience, and a reasonable record of research. Mr. Lansdale has been active and successful in the New York School of Social Work, and Mr. Haber, of the University of Michigan, is reported to be an exceptionally vigorous organizer, director, writer, and teacher in the welfare field.

Whether Messrs. Clague, Lansdale, or Haber should be offered the Deanship of the School of Social Welfare at this University probably depends upon two things.

The first of these is whether the University is now prepared to undertake a major expansion in the work of the School. This expansion would necessarily take the form of a high salary to the Dean, because all three of the men mentioned are well placed, and probably also have outside connections. But it would also imply a considerable addition to the operating budget of the School. The committee does not think that either Clague, Lansdale, or Haber would be content within the limitations of the present school, and if they were, the Committee believes that the expenditure of the funds necessary to secure them would be unwarranted in light of the present requirements of the position.

The other determining matter in this connection is whether the broad basis thought desirable for the work of the School of Social Welfare should be provided within the school itself, or by close coordination with other departments of the University that are now operating. The committee would expect that an energetic man, nationally known, of the type of the gentlemen referred to, would prefer a development within the School which he could control to a development in other departments which he could not control. This tendency was already evident under Dean Cassidy.

The committee has already said that it was opposed to making the social work sponsored by the University exclusively or narrowly professional. The appointment of a dean of the Clague-Lansdale-Haber type would avoid this danger. The committee believes, however, that it would also be an error to build up a substantial non-professional program within the School of Social Welfare by expanding the staff therein to include persons trained in various of the allied social service fields. This practice would duplicate existing facilities, involve heavy financial commitments, and in the end probably result in instruction of a lower quality than is now available through existing departments. The committee prefers to secure the desired breadth of training by drawing upon present or increased offerings of various University departments--e.g., psychology, history, political science, economics--and possibly also by establishing a Department of Sociology, ~~an~~ a ~~improvement~~ change which appears to be overdue. This way of providing breadth of training would require relatively small additional financial commitments, and it would strengthen the work of the School by making available the facilities of well-established departments staffed by a personnel competent in the fields which impinge upon social welfare.

If the University desires to maintain the work of the School of Social Welfare, at least for the time being, upon a relatively moderate level, securing competent professional training within the School and basic non-professional training by coordination with other departments, then the committee recommends the names of Martha Chickering, Arlien Johnson, and Leonard Mayo in the order mentioned. Miss Johnson is now Dean of the Graduate School of Social Work, University of Southern California, and was, before, Dean of the School of Social Work of the University of Washington. Mr. Mayo is now Dean of the School of Applied Social Service at Western Reserve University. The committee desires to call especial attention to Miss Chickering. The attached letter from Miss Stebbins, endorsing Miss Chickering, is self-explanatory. In the committee's opinion this possibility is outstanding. All three are well known to the profession. While it is true that candidates like these, who are professionally trained and who are not at the same time of the stature of Mr. Clague are often only mildly interested in general training, the committee thinks that the recommended persons, and especially Miss Chickering, could be counted upon to cooperate cordially in the sort of program which the committee would itself desire.

Respectfully submitted,

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

File under Sproul

December 13, 1944

Miss A. R. Robb
President's Office
Administration Building
Campus

Dear Miss Robb:

In reply to President Sproul's request to you to obtain further confidential comment from me on Professor Bloom's letter of November 15, I feel that the research project as outlined in this letter is still too defective to warrant a favorable recommendation.

(1) The project is too ambitious to be covered by one investigator with the tools and within the time he proposes. The general questions Dr. Bloom raises and hopes to answer range from (a) an investigation of the nature of Japanese family organization before, during, and after the war and of the extent of assimilation of the generations, as influenced by the whole relocation program, to (b) an investigation of the relation between "adjustment" and war tensions of this minority in the United States as contrasted with Hawaii, to (c) practical proposals for a "solution" of the problem of "rehabilitating continental Japanese Americans."

(2) The specific questions raised are too loosely defined. In some cases, language appropriate only to statistics is used, although it is perfectly clear that the data in question cannot be quantified, e.g., the whole matter of "bi-polar adjustment" in which it is assumed that "adjustment" can be expressed in terms of relatively exact quantities and scaled reliably. In other cases, statistical terms do not follow accepted usage, and it is therefore difficult to follow the details of the planned procedure, e.g., "modal types." Since "mode" is by definition "type," and since a multimodal distribution is not only rare but also usually attributable to classificatory errors, I suspect Dr. Bloom is merely planning to use all his "frequencies" in his several distributions. In still other cases, I find the use of words like "individuation" not too clear without further elaboration.

(3) The data at hand, and to be collected, are meagre. It is difficult to see how 100 Nisei case histories (selected, according to a statement in one of his articles, primarily from students at

UCLA) plus 3,000 records of groups (not always "families") by name, age, sex, etc., from the Western Defense Command, plus cases collected during a short stay in Hawaii, could possibly provide a basis for valid answers to the questions raised. This objection would be less serious if Dr. Bloom showed evidence of awareness of the nature and extent of the unreliability and unrepresentativeness of these data.

(4) The data so far collected have apparently not been worked up thoroughly. This I infer from the fact that they are not used to any extent in the articles cited as well as from Dr. Bloom's failure to answer President Sproul's request for "preliminary concrete findings" in terms other than "hypotheses to be tested."

(5) Several of the "hypotheses to be tested" are highly unrealistic, e.g., Nos. 6 and 7. In respect to 6, by what reasoning can Nisei "detachment" from the traditional family be shown by an abnormally high rate of marriage and reproduction? On the contrary, the "traditional" Japanese-American immigrant group was noted for its high marriage and reproduction rates. In respect to 7, the basis for the generalization that the younger Nisei will be "far more familiar with and oriented to Japanese culture" than the older Nisei were, is open to very serious question, and should be subject to intensive investigation. The effects of the disappearance of Japanese language schools, of the impossibility of carrying on the Kibei-practice, and of the deliberate educational efforts being made towards Americanization in the camp schools must certainly be evaluated.

You will realize that, in a sense, this request of President Sproul seems to put me "on the spot," since I am directing an extensive investigation in the same general field as the one proposed by Dr. Bloom. But in fact one of the aims of my study is to stimulate and encourage the development of further studies of the Japanese and other minorities in California not only by our own staff but by other interested individuals and agencies as well. I believe, however, that studies of this sort should be encouraged only if they are so carefully thought out and realistically planned that there is a reasonable chance that the results will add data of importance to the great mass of material we have already collected, or will represent an innovation in respect to technique, or will lead to superior insights. If Dr. Bloom would narrow his project down and think it out more carefully, he ought to be able to fulfill one or more of these three requirements. In its present form, I do not feel that it satisfies any of them.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

February 3, 1945

President Robert G. Sproul
250 Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

Your committee strongly recommends that, effective July 1, 1945, S. V. Wantrup, be promoted from the rank of:

Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics
Associate Agricultural Economist in the Experiment Station
Associate Agricultural Economist on the Giannini Foundation

to:

Professor of Agricultural Economics
Agricultural Economist in the Experiment Station
Agricultural Economist on the Giannini Foundation

Although this recommendation proposes more rapid promotion than "normal", your committee believes that Professor Wantrup's record and performance amply justify its recommendation.

1) Professor Wantrup's research activities have been consistently of a high order. They have dealt with topics of major importance in a manner indicating marked skill and genuine originality. The published record is substantial (as indicated by the attached bibliography) and of a quality that has enhanced the reputation of the University and the Giannini Foundation. His Agrarkrisen und Stockungsspannen (1936) received favorable reviews[1] for its thoroughness and broad focus, and is commonly cited by important writers in economics.[2] It was made the basis of a seminar discussion by an important group

---

1. For example, E. Altschul (Journal of Farm Economics, May, 1938) "His monograph, nevertheless, is a remarkable piece of work. It is full of historical and statistical information and challenging ideas which are certain to stimulate further investigation." V. P. Timoshenko in a long review (Journal of Political Economy, December, 1937) wrote, "The above criticism of some of the conclusions of the author must not be regarded as a derogation of the book under review. On the contrary, in the opinion of the writer, von Ciriacy-Wantrup has made an important contribution to the explanation of the agricultural crises and we recommend his book to all

interested in the problem. His explanation of the periods of general economic stagnation is particularly interesting."

2. For example, Alvin H. Hansen, Fiscal Policy and Business Cycles (New York, 1941), pp. 34-35; Frank G. Dickinson, American Economic Review (Supplement) March, 1940, p. 338.

---

of economists at the Brookings Institution in Washington D. C. in 1938.

Since 1938 Dr. Wantrup has published a number of papers dealing with the economic and public policy aspects of conservation. These efforts will soon take their most comprehensive and integrated expression in book form under the title, Economic Theory and Public Policy of Conservation. This manuscript, which is now being read by qualified critics, has been examined by the Committee. It appears to be an excellent piece of original work which is nearly ready for publication. Dr. Wantrup's studies on conservation (cf. bibliography) are broad in scope and break new ground in an endeavor to find a solid basis for defensible public policy in such matters. It seems fair to state that Dr. Wantrup's intensive and original work on conservation has already established him as perhaps the leading scholar in the country in this field.

Your Committee would also emphasize the worth of two other recent papers of Dr. Wantrup: "The Relation of War Economics to Agriculture...", and "Economics of Joint Costs in Agriculture". The first was a distinct contribution to war-time economic problems at the American Economic Association Annual Meeting in 1940. The second is a contribution to an important but hitherto neglected branch of economic theory.

To summarize, your Committee believes that Dr. Wantrup's scholarly efforts, as evidenced by published works and those in manuscript, emminently justify his promotion as recommended.

2) Dr. Wantrup's appointment is primarily a research appointment. For this reason and because of the war-time decline in registration in Agricultural Economics, he has not been called upon to carry the customary teaching assignments. So far as your Committee can ascertain, however, his teaching has been effective. Dr. Wantrup conducted a joint seminar with Professor Sauer of the Geography department with which performance Professor Sauer is reported to have been very pleased.

3) Dr. Wantrup appears to have had little or no responsibility for University administration, as a committee member or otherwise. He was mainly instrumental, however, in forming an informal faculty seminar on the theory and practice of conservation. This seminar group, which included Professors Lipman, Hoaglund, Kotok, Alsberg, Knight, Radin, Mosk, and Sauer as regular attendants and others on occasion, met for more than two years (1937-39) to discuss conservation problems, Dr. Wantrup's major scientific interest, from the point of view of a variety of disciplines. Reliable reports reaching the Committee indicate that this informal seminar was one of the most fruitful exchanges between related fields of knowledge that has occurred on the Berkeley campus in some time.

Hence in view of the criteria established for promotion and Dr. Wantrup's performance as summarized above, your Committee strongly urges the promotion recommended in the first paragraph of this letter.

August 23, 1945

President Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

Now that the war has ended, I am ready to proceed with plans for publication of the results of the Evacuation and Resettlement Study. I am enclosing, for your consideration, a proposed schedule of publication. The first volume in the main series can be ready in manuscript form by December first. Data for the second volume are completely in hand, and I shall proceed with its preparation as soon as the first goes to press. The third volume cannot be planned completely yet, for the actual expulsion from camps, which should be its climax, has not yet taken place. If the government agencies reverse their plans again (which they may well do), I shall correspondingly have to reorganize our third volume. Data for this are, of course, still being collected. Manuscripts for several of the technical monographs are either completed or near completion. These can be submitted for publication concurrently with the main volumes.

As to a publisher, my preference is the University of California Press. Pending your decision on the matter, I talked to Mr. Farquhar, and enclose copies of correspondence with him.

Re financing, I assume that Dr. Willits will recommend a grant-in-aid for publication, in accordance with his statement in a letter to you dated January 25, 1945. If you decide that we should use the University Press and accept Mr. Farquhar's proposition, we need approximately $6,250.00 as an outright donation from the Foundation for the three main volumes, with matching funds from the Press rather than from the University proper.

It is impossible, at this time, to estimate the total cost of publishing the technical monographs. Two of them should be ready to go to press soon after the first of the main volumes, and the others should follow during the course of the next two years.

These monographs will be rather expensive to publish, since they will be heavily documented and will include some statistical data. If you consider it desirable to ask the Rockefeller Foundation for a single grant covering main

volumes and monographs, I shall try to prepare an estimate. If possible, this estimate should be subject to revision by July 1, 1946, at which time total costs can be more reliably estimated.

It is good to know that you are, or soon will be, with us again.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

Enclosures

September 17, 1945

Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I am deeply appreciative of your prompt action in applying for a publication grant to the Rockefeller Foundation. Thank you, also, for sending a copy of Dr. Willit's telegram giving the good news about the approval of the grant. Now it is clearly up to me to meet that deadline.

You asked me last year to keep you informed in regard to Mrs. Elkus and the Columbia Foundation. I have reason to believe that her irritation with the University, and with the Accounting Office, has diminished greatly. I think it would be a good time to do a little "public relations work" on her, since one of the causes of friction seems to have been failure on her part to understand the fact that, when her Foundation gives a grant, it is given to the University for support of approved research projects and not to the individual research worker. She believes that she is supporting individuals rather than programs. On this basis, she has always asked for an individual accounting of expenditures from me, although I have pointed out repeatedly that I am subject to all sorts of controls from the Accounting Office and am not a free agent. I have never been able to make the situation clear to her.

We have now fully expended the Columbia grant. It will obviously be several months before the Accounting Office is ready to give Mrs. Elkus a complete statement of expenditures. In the meantime, could some sort of statement be sent her, outlining the general uses to which Columbia funds have been put and explaining University policies and controls? I shall, if you wish, be glad to work with Mr. Lundberg on this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

Sproul

September 28, 1945

The Honorable Tom C. Clark
Attorney General
Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Clark:

On September 22, the Associated Press carried the story from Washington, D. C. that Representative Clarence Cannon, Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, has recommended a cut of $5,000,000. from the budget of the War Relocation Authority. This cut, according to the story, was recommended as a means of halting the "dilly-dallying" of that agency in the liquidation of its program, particularly in the deportation of those Japanese who were slated to return to the "land of their ancestors."

Informed persons are well aware that such deportations are solely the responsibility of the Justice Department, and that discretionary power has been delegated to you, as Attorney General, in determining the basis for deportation.

While most of the energy of the Committee on American Principles and Fair Play has been devoted to dissemination of accurate information concerning the Nisei and securing their statutory rights, the Committee's purpose covers the "support of the Constitutional Rights of law-abiding persons of Japanese ancestry", whether aliens or citizens.

We feel that the policy of the Justice Department has been and continues to be, just and fair. We also know that there are and will continue to be strong pressures upon the Department to rush the deportation of all alien Japanese, and particularly of all those who have been at any time apprehended by the Justice Department.

We beg leave to draw your attention to certain individual cases which might well receive specific attention.

1. Aliens should not be deported <u>solely</u> upon grounds of

suspicion raised by membership in organizations whose headquarters were in Japan.

2. Account should be taken of leadership in Americanization activities prior to the war.

3. Consideration should be given as to whether or not an alien has indicated his desire to remain in this country or to be repatriated to Japan.

4. Consideration should be given to the following questions:

a) As to whether his pro-Japan organizational and/or educational activities were the result of orders from Japan or were in connection with programs similar to those of other nationality groups.

b) As to whether his activities were definitely pro-Japan or sincerely designed to better understanding between the United States and Japan.

c) As to whether the alien has children in the armed forces.

d) As to whether the alien has himself either through established War agencies (O. W. I., F. C. C., etc.) or in war production, contributed to the war effort.

We feel confident that a liberal attitude towards those aliens whose actions have not been un-American, and who are strong in their desire to remain in this country where their sons and daughters have made, and wish to continue to make, a valuable contribution to American life, will be in harmony with the spirit of those who have fought this war.

On the other hand, persons who are known by you to have intentionally aided in any type of espionage work should be placed in a category apart from those mentioned in the preceding paragraphs. We do not ask lenient treatment or special consideration for them.

May we once again express our confidence in the Department of Justice, and in you, as its chief. We hope that our suggestions, respectfully submitted, may prove helpful in your considerations and decisions.

Copies to: Secretary of the Interior,
Harold L. Ickes
Mr. Dillon S. Myer
Dr. Dorothy Thomas

Very sincerely yours,
Robert G. Sproul

Dr. Robert G. Sproul, Honorary Chairman
Pacific Coast Committee on American
Principles and Fair Play

September 28, 1945

Mr. Clarence Cannon, Chairman
House Appropriations Committee
House Office Building
Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. Cannon:

We have noted in an Associated Press dispatch from Washington, dated September 22, 1945, that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended that $5,000,000. be withdrawn from the War Relocation Authority budget. The report reads that the "Committee feels that liquidation should proceed more rapidly and that those responsible therefore, are not proceeding to liquidate as speedily as they could; that there is too much of a disposition to confer and dilly-daily. Many of those under detention are elated to be returned to their native land or the land of their ancestors. They should be segregated and returned with all possible dispatch. There is no justification for a protracted delay and the responsible officers should work out such details incident to repatriation at the earliest possible moment practicable..."

May we respectfully suggest that in all probability liquidation of the War Relocation Authority would be greatly facilitated if additional, rather than less, funds were made available for the purpose?

As you know, while deportation cases are solely the responsibility of the Department of Justice, the resettlement of the great majority of the Americans of Japanese ancestry is in the hands of the War Relocation Authority. The War Relocation Authority, as the federal agency charged with the task of caring for and returning to normal community life the tens of thousands of American citizens and their alien parents evacuated from their West Coast homes, has tried to stay within the bounds of Constitutional limitations and the American principles of justice and decency.

May we also suggest that from the vantage point of the Pacific Coast, where employment and housing for returning evacuees must be found, we can see no indication that the War Relocation Authority is "dilly-dallying" in its program of self-liquidation? On the contrary, in support of our feeling that it is progressing too rapidly, may we call your attention to the following:

1. Relocation is already proceeding so rapidly that it is impossible for adequate plans to be made for individual families. The erroneous impression still persists that all of the evacuees have an agricultural background. Over half of them were small business men, professional people, or urban workers. A great portion of their assets has been wiped out and under present conditions (public attitudes, legal restrictions, boycotts, etc.) it is impossible for them to reestablish themselves on a self-supporting basis immediately upon their return. Funds must be available for at least subsistence living. Any arrangements between the War Relocation Authority and Social Security are totally inadequate to provide assistance commensurate with the losses of the evacuees, war-victims held guiltless by both the Supreme Court and the War Department.

2. Relocation is already proceeding so rapidly that adequate housing is unavailable to the majority of those evacuees who are arriving or will arrive on the Pacific Coast. A limited amount of housing for returnees is (properly) being provided by the Army, some temporary housing is available in makeshift hostels, but the greater part of that provided in urban communities is sub-standard, often subject to objections of health authorities. Much of the rural housing is located in areas where employment cannot be secured because of antagonism to persons of Japanese ancestry, even to veterans. Within the past month, both San Francisco and Los Angeles, (San Francisco Council for Civic Unity, see San Francisco Chronicle, August 31, 1945; Los Angeles Board of Supervisors, see San Francisco Chronicle, September 28, 1945.) have sent strong recommendations that relocation to their communities be halted until housing is made available.

3. During the past three months many other protests have been addressed to Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, or to Mr. Dillon S. Myer, Director of the War Relocation Authority. Civic, religious, housing, welfare and other community groups have urged that the War Relocation Authority relocation program be retarded or modified to permit more adequate solution of evacuee-community problems involving not only housing, but labor, inter-racial and other social factors. In this, we feel that our West Coast Congressmen strongly concur.

None of these problems are insurmountable, but solutions will require time. The present rate of evacuee return, necessitated by the War Relocation Authority's desire for an early self-liquidation, is rapidly crystallizing the type of attitude which brought about evacuation--not in the minds of the evacuees, but among those of their fellow Americans who are ready to seize upon any pretext to manufacture a "Yellow Peril".

Civic groups all up and down the coast, are working to avoid the formation of Little Tokyos and Jap towns. However, this tendency is the inevitable result of the present speed up policy, which is forcing families and individuals into already crowded homes, hostels, basements, garages, and into army shelters. Such congestion is leading the public to blame the evacuees for once again forming sub-standard colonies. The blame should be laid upon the forced pace of resettlement.

Further speed up of the relocation program would prove disastrous.

May we summarize in the following manner:

1. Deportation cases are solely the responsibility of the Department of Justice. Therefore, no portion of the budget of the War Relocation Authority should be rescinded in order to speed up such deportations.

2. Federal responsibility for persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated from the Pacific Coast is clearly established by War Department statements and Supreme Court decisions.

3. Present War Relocation Authority policy, far from "dilly-dallying" is proceeding with speed incompatible with maintenance of sound community relationships in areas to which evacuees are being forced to return, often without adequate plans for housing, employment or dependents.

4. It is unfortunate that the House Appropriation Committee is suggesting a curtailment of a budget which already precludes the development of really adequate, and just solution of problems of all law-abiding persons of Japanese ancestry evacuated from their homes on the Pacific Coast.

May we further respectfully submit the suggestion that perhaps the time has come when the Congress should frankly consider the full responsibility of the Federal Government in an equitable solution of this problem? The entire American philosophy of justice, and constitutionality is involved. This is not a sectional problem, nor is it simply the problem of an unwanted racial minority.

copies to: President Truman
Secretary of the Interior
Harold L. Ickes
Mr. Dillon S, Myer
Dr. Dorothy Thomas

Yours sincerely,
Robert G. Sproul

Dr. Robert G. Sproul, Honorary Chairman
Pacific Coast Committee on American
Principles and Fair Play

October 3, 1945

Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I have read with great interest and deep appreciation your letters to Mr. Tom Clark and Mr. Clarence Cannon. These two letters together contain the most penetrating analysis I have seen of the problems connected with the last phases of evacuation and resettlement.

There is one point, which you do not mention in your letter to Mr. Clark, to which I should like to call your attention. The definition of "aliens" subject to deportation has been extended to include some 5,000 Nisei who, under the Denationalization Act, have renounced their American citizenship. Most of them are, of course, from Tule Lake. The bulk of them are very young, have never been to Japan, and do not even speak Japanese. Renunciations were permitted in the case of boys and girls still in the second half of their seventeenth year of age. This means that some of the group were only 14 years old, and most of them under 18, at the time of evacuation. In very many cases, the act of renunciation had nothing whatsoever to do with political allegiance. It was a safeguard against forced relocation to have one person in the family renounce citizenship, since it was assumed that the policy of not separating family groups would continue to operate as it had at the time of segregation, when "loyal" family members were permitted to segregate with a single "disloyal" member. Many of these young Nisei who renounced citizenship to safeguard the whole family, and under great pressure from parents and community, now face deportation while the parents themselves are relocating to California.

As you know, the first volume in our series is called The Spoilage and deals in great detail with the pressures which led to this strange conclusion, and with the distorted values these young people developed as a result of their experiences in a concentration camp for the "disloyal." Because we feel that an understanding of this situation is very important for American policy in regard to minorities, we are making extraordinary efforts to get the volume ready for the press. Meantime, if you think the matter should be called to Attorney General Clark's attention, I shall of course make the materials available to you at any time.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

October 11, 1945

Dr. Dorothy Swaine Thomas
338 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Doctor Thomas:

Thank you for your letter of October 3. The point you make therein is a good one, and I shall see that it is brought to the attention of those with whom I have been corresponding. I must confess, however, that I am pessimistic about the results of this correspondence, for the House seems to have approved the reduction of the WRA budget, with scarcely a negative vote.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

Robert G. Sproul

RGS:mn

508

December 21, 1945

President Robert Gordon Sproul
University of California
Berkeley 4, California

Dear President Sproul:

Dr. Donald Young, the newly appointed National Executive Director of the Social Science Research Council, is planning to meet with the Pacific Coast Regional Committee some time towards the end of January.

The Pacific Coast Committee has, from time to time, been pressing for closer connections with the National organization, in the hope that greater recognition and support of social science research in this area could be achieved. Dr. Young's visit will give us a chance to inform him of our special needs. In formulating these needs, however, I feel strongly that we should have wider representation and stronger local support than are afforded by Regional Committee members alone. Would you consider it appropriate to invite Dr. Young to come here as a guest of the University, and to have the University (in cooperation with the Regional Committee) sponsor one or more informal meetings of interested social scientists with Dr. Young? This suggestion does not imply that the University should take financial responsibility. The Regional Committee has a budget that can be drawn upon to cover all ordinary expenses, including expenses of a very limited number of out-of-town guests.

Dr. Young's visit has additional significance in view of the important role he is playing in efforts to prevent exclusion of the social sciences from benefits under proposed Federal legislation for the establishment of a National Science Foundation.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

University of California

Office of the President

Sproul

December 28, 1945

Dear Doctor Thomas:

It pleased me to learn from your letter of December 21 that Doctor Donald Young, the newly appointed National Executive Director of the Social Science Research Council, will be on the Pacific Coast toward the end of January, and that it may be possible at that time and through him to promote closer connections between the Pacific Coast Committee and the National Council. To that end, I should be glad to have the University share with the Pacific Coast Regional Committee sponsorship of one or more informal meetings of interested social scientists with Doctor Young.

Will you work out the details, calling upon me for such aid as you may wish me to render?

Yours sincerely

Signed Robert G. Sproul

xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

January 28, 1946

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

The undersigned were members of a committee appointed by the Provost to consider the matter of a Department of Sociology on the Berkeley campus. The committee submitted a report on June 14, 1945, which you have, of course, seen. In proposing the establishment of a new department, the committee emphasized the necessity of bringing into the University a new professor "competent in research and in the direction of research, because the solid foundation of a Department of Sociology would be research."

In this connection, the undersigned, who are deeply interested in future developments in ~~sociology,~~ wish to call your attention to the fact that they have recently learned that it might be possible to obtain the services of Professor William F. Ogburn for this projected new department. Professor Ogburn has a distinguished research and administrative record. He was director of President Hoover's Research Committee on Social Trends. He has held many important government positions. He has been president of several learned societies. His publication record is impressive and sound. He is at present head of what is considered the most distinguished Department of Sociology in the country (in the University of Chicago). Professor Ogburn is 59 years old. It seems reasonable to expect that, if he were invited to come here, he could, in the ~~eighteen~~ years before his retirement, establish a Department that would add greatly to the prestige of the social sciences in this University.

The undersigned have not attempted to poll the membership of the Provost's Committee on Sociology. This letter does not necessarily represent the view of the committee, which was not consulted in the matter of personnel. It is a personal recommendation, submitted to you, respectfully, for your consideration.

Very sincerely yours,

May 29, 1946

Dr. Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I have run into difficulties with the University Press in regard to the publication of the Evacuation and Resettlement Study. These difficulties are putting the University (through me) in the embarrassing position of not only failing to meet commitments to the supporting Foundations, but of failing also to fulfill our explicit hope that an analysis of this sort would be of some help in the solution of the postwar problems of displaced peoples.

I submitted the complete manuscript of Volume I to Mr. Farquhar in April, and he agreed upon September publication (with the usual qualifications). One third of the time between April and September has passed, and Mr. Farquhar has done nothing about the volume except to submit it to an outside "expert" for an opinion as to whether or not it is suitable for publication. This whole procedure is, in a sense, a vote of lack of confidence in the judgment of the "experts" working on the study and of myself in particular. Worse still, I am informed that the outside "expert" cannot be hurried, and may not give his opinion for some weeks. Meantime, no steps will be taken to have the Editorial Department go over the manuscript preparatory to setting it in proof.

As you know, Dr. Willits and Mrs. Elkus have both quite naturally shown some impatience that the study has as yet resulted in no publications. I am at least as much concerned about the matter as they are.

Can you do anything to cut the red-tape? I do not believe that the Manager of the Press has a proper appreciation of the issues involved, and I am afraid that, without your intervention, the thing may drag on for a very long period.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

June 3, 1946

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

Accompanying your letter of May 17, 1946, "to Chairmen of Departments and Administrative Officers" was a budget request to be submitted by the Evacuation and Resettlement Study for $10,000.00 per year for the biennium 1947-1949. I am returning this request, unsigned, since I expect to complete the Study, as agreed, within the budget allotment for 1946-1947. I should point out, however, that we have an agreement with the Rockefeller Foundation that financing of the publication costs will be shared by the Rockefeller Foundation and the University and that we cannot yet make an accurate estimate of costs.

The Giannini Foundation has been most cooperative in promoting the sociological aspects of research, but, in order to continue a program broader in scope than the Giannini Foundation should be expected to support, I request, for the period 1947-49, a "departmental budget" of $10,000.00 per year under the title "Population Changes in California" replacing the title "Evacuation and Resettlement Study." This program would emphasize analysis of such problems as the social differentiation and changing composition of the population; its patterns of fertility and survival; the impact of its successive influxes of migrants; its urban-rural differences in community organization; the social conflicts and adjustments produced by the dislocations and relocations of its minority groups.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

Enclosure

President Sproul - file

On December 7, 1941, there were, in the continental United States, about 127,000 persons having common ancestry with the enemy that launched the Pearl Harbor attack. Most of them lived in the Pacific Coast states; almost 94,000 of them were in California. Two out of three were American citizens.

Various restrictions were taken against the group, irrespective of their citizenship status, and these culminated, late in February 1942, in a military decision to evacuate all persons of Japanese ancestry from portions of Washington, Oregon, California and Arizona. Later the evacuation program was extended to cover the entire state of California.

Within a few weeks, the process of moving more than 100,000 persons began, and by July all of them were confined in hastily contructed detention camps(known as assembly centers) and later moved to larger, barbed-wire enclosed projects, designed for the duration of the war, and located in various states from California to Arkansas. Selective release of evacuees to areas outside the zones of exclusion began in 1942. Exclusion orders were rescinded in December 1944, and all camps were closed during the following year.

Realizing the scientific and human implications of this unprecedented forced mass migration, several social scientists in the University of California initiated, early in 1942, a comprehensive study of the evacuation, detention and resettlement of the Japanese minority in the United States. The study was conceptualized on an interdisciplinary basis: (a) viewd as a sociological problem, it was to included analysis of the social demography of forced mass migration and voluntary resettlement with special reference to the dislocation of habits and changes of attitudes produced by the experience; (b) viewed as a study in social anthropology, it would be oriented around the modifications and changes in the two cultures

represented in the group, first under the impact of constant, enforced association, and later in the process of dispersal into the "outside world"; (c) viewed as a study in political science, it would emphasize policy formation and administrative procedures: the interaction of state and national political forces, the part played by local government units in determining both state and national policy, the development of organized pressures and their result; (d) viewed as a problem in social psychology, the primary focus would be on the nature of the collective adjustments made by this population group, following the crisis of evacuation, to the way of life imposed by the government during detention and the extent and kind of institutional reorganization and individual readjustment following resettlement; (e) viewed as an economic problem, it would be concerned with the economic conditions predisposing the formulation of policies, the economic consequences of the program upon the areas of evacuation andupon the evacuees themselves, and the governmental efforts to protect the interests both of the areas and of the classes of population involved.

Sixteen Japanese American and Caucasian research assistants were employed to make continuous observations in several camps, and eventually also in areas of resettlement, and to obtain recordsof the changing governmental regulations and their impact upon the evacuees. Dr. Dorothy Swaine Thomas served as director of the study.

After three and a half years of continuous field observation and data collection, analysis of the effects of evacuation was undertaken. For this purpose, evacuees were divided into three categories, (a) those whose status in America was impaired to the extent that many of the aliens returned voluntarily to defeated Japan and numbers of citizens relinquished their American citizenship ; (b) those whose status in America was improved in the process of settlement to the middle-western and eastern areas; and (c) those who remained in the camps until the relocation projects were liquidated and thereafter returned, in the main, to the Pacific Coast

states, and whose status is still undetermined.

Results of this analysis are to be published in a two-volume work, with supplementary technical monographs. Volume I covers the short-run spoilage resulting from evacuation and detention; the assumpation of status as "disloyal" to the United States by one in every siz of the evacuees; the impact of repressive measures undertaken by government agencies upon this group, including martial law, incarceration and internment; the nature of the protest movements evolving against these repressions, culminating in mass withdrawal from American citizenship. The scope of this volume is wide, and it is presented as what is believed to be a unique reocrd and analysis of the continuing process of interaction between government and governed, through the point-by-point reproduction of states in the process of attitude-formation. Volume II covers the short-run salvage resulting from dispersal and resettlement, involving the entrance of almost one out of three of all the evacuees into new areas as settlers and the direct participation of many of them in war activities. It follows the history of the evacuation from the stage of forced mass migration to selective individual resettlement; and analyses the" push" and "pull" factors(economic, educational, familial) as well as the impediments to and selective factors involved in resettlement. Finally, it includes analysis of the assimilation of this minority group concomitant with its dispersal throughout the country.

The study was financed from the funds of the University of California from its Social Science Institute, from the Giannini Foundation, and from the Columbia and the Rockefeller Foundation.

The Rockefeller Foundation is now contributing additional funds in partial subsidization of the volumes, which will be published by the University of California Press. The first volume--The Spoilage--by Dorothy Swaine Thomas and Richard S. Nishimoto will be released by the Press early in November.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

December 27, 1946

Professor Dorothy S. Thomas
207 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Professor Thomas:

As you probably have learned through announcements in the Faculty Bulletin, a second All-University Faculty Conference has been scheduled for February 8, 9, and 10, 1947, on the Davis campus. I should like to have you serve as a delegate to that conference.

If it is possible for you to accept, which I sincerely hope will be the case, you will be notified later about arrangements for transportation, and a mimeographed statement of the reports of subcommittees will be sent to you in advance of the meeting for study by yourself and such other members of the faculty as you wish to consult.

The number of delegates whom I can invite to the conference is limited by facilities available and the nature of the conference. Therefore, I shall appreciate hearing from you at your earliest convenience as to whether you will be able to accept my invitation.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

December 30, 1946

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I am honored by your invitation to serve as delegate at the All University Faculty Conference at Davis on February 8, 9, and 10, 1947. I accept with pleasure and gratitude.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

January 24, 1947

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

I am submitting herewith a budget of $7,704.00 for the Evacuation and Resettlement Study for 1947-48. Of this amount approximately $3,700.00 will be available on July 1 as unexpended funds allocated by the Rockefeller Foundation for 1946-47. Mr. Lundberg's office will arrange to have these entered on our books as a "reappropriation." New funds needed amount, therefore, to $4,004.00.

Continuation of the Study for another year requires explanation on my part.

(1) The second volume in the series of which I shall be senior author will not be ready for the press until September. This means that I need some secretarial and research assistance during the summer.

(2) We hope to obtain the services of Professor Milton Chernin during the summer months to undertake a thorough revision and rewriting of a manuscript on political aspects of evacuation prepared by Morton Grodzins, who was formerly on our staff. It will not be possible to obtain Chernin's services before the summer. Although he will be able to do the bulk of the revision in July and August, there will remain a considerable amount of checking and collating of data. For this he will need research and secretarial assistance for several months after September 1. Chernin will also have to go to Chicago to consult with Grodzins. For this we have provided an item under "Expense and Equipment."

(3) Richard Nishimoto's time as Research Assistant will be allocated as follows:

a. Assisting me on the second volume in the series until September, 1947.

b. Assisting Chernin on the political monograph until January, 1948.

c. From January 1, 1948 to June 30, 1948 organizing and classifying our extensive source materials (they fill approximately 50 file drawers) to make them available by July 1, 1948 for other research workers in the field. To this end we have also allocated a small item for "General Assistance."

(4) It is recommended that Nishimoto be given a slight increase

in salary ($240.00) in recognition of the excellent work he has done on the Study, which resulted in his appearing as junior author of "The Spoilage."

(5) All items other than Nishimoto's salary are appreciably less than similar amounts allocated in previous years.

Respectfully submitted,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

March 6, 1947

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

In reference to my letter to you of March 3, I am enclosing a letter received today from Professor Strong.

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

Enclosure

Re sociology

March 28, 1947

President Robert G. Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

An informal progress report on the issues raised in my letter of March 3 is probably in order.

The plans of the Department of Sociology and Social Institutions have, as far as I know, not changed since my earlier communication. Therefore, the fundamental issue of what sort of Sociology Department this University is going to support is still unresolved.

My own problem of adjustment to this difficult situation has, however, been eased. Next year I shall, with Dr. Wellman's approval, give an upper division course in the Economics Department (Econ. 188A-B, Population and Migration) and a graduate course in the School of Social Welfare (Social Welfare 265, Social Welfare Research). Although this is undoubtedly only a "short-run" solution, it does relieve a good deal of the immediate tension.

Sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

May 28, 1947

Mrs. Dorothy S. Thomas
207 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Mrs. Thomas:

Long long ago you wrote, expressing the hope that I would stay with the University of California, in the face of an offer from another reputable institution. As you now know, of course, I decided to take your advice. May I thank you for giving it to me? It was the realization that many like you wanted me that had more than anything else to do with my decision.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 18, 1947

Dr. Dorothy S. Thomas
207 Giannini Hall
Campus

Dear Dr. Thomas:

Thank you for the copy of a letter from Professor Lundberg to Professor Strong, which you sent to me with your note of June 12, and which I have read carefully. Naturally, this letter has added to the concern I have felt for some time about the development of our work in Sociology.

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul.

June 24, 1948

Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul
Administration Building
Campus

Dear President Sproul:

There is an item of unfinished business, in connection with the Evacuation and Resettlement Study, for which I shall have to assume some responsibility after I leave the University. This involves general supervision of the preparation of two monographs to which we are committed, and for which the Rockefeller Foundation will presumably grant funds for partial subsidy of publication (cf. your letters of August 30, 1945, to Dr. Willits and to me, and Dr. Willits' reply to you of September 18, 1945).

One of these monographs will be concerned with statistical analysis of the attitude called "disloyalty." Professor George Kuznets is the author. Thanks to Dr. Wellman, Kuznets' work on this monograph will be considered part of his regular duties at Giannini Foundation. There are, therefore, no budgetary complications.

The second monograph covers a major segment of our study--the political aspects of evacuation. This segment was initiated by Professor Charles Aikin, and most of the data were collected, over a period of more than three years, by our research assistant Morton Grodzins, now an Assistant Professor in the University of Chicago. Grodzins prepared a draft of the monograph which is unfortunately neither scholarly nor objective. On the contrary, it is propagandistic and journalistic. Mr. Aikin and I cannot recommend its publication.

In view of the importance of the political aspect of evacuation, and the value of the primary materials which we have collected, the monograph should obviously be reworked by a scholar of competence and unquestioned integrity. We have asked Professor tenBroek to undertake this job and, after careful consideration of the problem, he has consented. He will, however, need some assistance. We have a balance of only $800.00. He will need approximately $1,100.00 more than that, his total budgetary requirements being:

Readers ...	40 hrs. per week for 24 weeks	$960.00
Typing ...	$100.00 per month for 6 months	600.00
Library assistance	... ...	300.00
		$1,860.00
	Funds available ...	800.00
	Deficit ...	$1,060.00

I can attempt to get "outside" financing to complete this project when I go east in September. It would, however, be preferable to have it completed entirely under U.C. auspices. Is there any possibility of obtaining an "emergency appropriation" to enable Mr. tenBroek to finish up this job?

Very sincerely yours,

Dorothy Swaine Thomas

cc. Professor Charles Aikin
Professor George Kuznets
Professor J. tenBroek

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT GORDON SPROUL
President of the University

November 8, 1949

Dr. Dorothy Swaine Thomas
4104 Locust Street
Philadelphia 4, Pennsylvania

Dear Dr. Thomas:

This reply to your personal letter of September 23 would be inexcusably late, even in ordinary circumstances, but I can find no words of condemnation sufficiently strong in the light of your warning that "a very prompt reply is called for." Somehow the papers were placed in the wrong pile, and not rediscovered until this morning. In the circumstances, I cannot do more than to offer you abject apologies, and to dictate this probably useless answer.

You are correct in your statement that I have talked with Mrs. Elkus, and your suspicion that she is upset because the Columbia Foundation was not properly recognized by Mr. Grodzins in his acknowledgments is not without foundation. This is not, however, the only reason for the "slow burn" she is now enduring. Another is the criticisms of the Foundation which have been coming to her because of the unkind things that Grodzins had to say about certain California individuals and organizations. What Mrs. Elkus has stressed most with me is that a Foundation should be given some protection from those who work under its grants, and then antagonize its friends. Indeed, she told me that she and her directors are disposed to stipulate, in connection with future grants, that there shall be no publication unless approval is given by the Foundation in advance. I told her, and I hope convinced her, that it would not be possible to get competent scholars to undertake research under such conditions.

The draft of a letter to Mrs. Elkus, which you sent to me and which I return herewith, along with Mrs. Elkus' letter of September 19 to you, seems to me very good indeed. Certainly, it cannot jeopardize relations between the University of California and the Columbia Foundation.

With continuing regret that you left us for Pennsylvania, I am

Yours sincerely,

Robert G. Sproul

Enclosures