

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii

SESSION 1, March 21, 1990

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

 Forbes's return to California--Southern
 California Music Company--Small businesses in
 Los Angeles in the 1950s and 1960s.

[Tape 1, Side B] 27

 Forbes's social activities and organizations--
 Political orientation--UCLA ties while on the
 east coast--UCLA Alumni Association--Pauley
 Pavilion--Recruiting Franklin D. Murphy.

[Tape 2, Side A] 54

 Franklin Murphy--Issues before the University of
 California Board of Regents--Robert Gordon
 Sproul.

SESSION 2, April 5, 1990

[Tape 3, Side A] 67

 Attending regents' meetings--Clark Kerr--Regent-
 alumni relations--Robert E. Alshuler--Forbes's
 appointment to the board of regents--Composition
 of the board.

[Tape 3, Side B] 92

 Regent committees--California governors on the
 board--Issues meriting closed sessions--Pre-
 session discussions--University funding sources--
 Master Plan for Higher Education.

SESSION 3, April 17, 1990

[Tape 4, Side A] 119

Bonding initiatives--Campus architects--
Acquiring land for the University of California,
San Diego (UCSD).

[Tape 4, Side B] 146

Controversies in the founding of UCSD--UCSD
architecture--Grounds and Buildings Committee--
Administrating campus grounds.

[Tape 5, Side A] 173

State executive and legislative influence upon
administration of campus grounds and buildings--
Robert E. Alexander--Obtaining land for the
University of California, Irvine (UCI) campus.

SESSION 4, May 2, 1990

[Tape 6, Side A] 191

Conflicts of interest regarding UCI site--
Student housing--Planning residence halls.

[Tape 6, Side B] 215

Raising funds to build Pauley Pavilion--Planning
the University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC)
campus--University of California, Santa Barbara
(UCSB) campus needs.

SESSION 5, May 8, 1990

[Tape 7, Side A] 238

University of California, Davis (UCD) campus
housing--Fraternities and sororities--Private
housing--More on Pauley Pavilion--Acquiring land
for UCSB--Thomas M. Storke.

[Tape 7, Side B]	263
<p>Regents meet with Soviet officials--Angela Davis--Eldridge Cleaver--Developing UCSB campus--Expansion at UCLA--Constraints upon expansion--Plan to buy Marymount High School property.</p>	
[Tape 8, Side A]	289
<p>Married student housing--University acreage--Special Forbes Committee--UCLA Extension.</p>	
<p>SESSION 6, May 24, 1990</p>	
[Tape 9, Side A]	312
<p>University of California, Riverside (UCR)--UCD--University of California, Berkeley (UCB) expansion--Radiation laboratories--University's role in military research and development.</p>	
[Tape 9, Side B]	337
<p>Resolving budget problems--Need for health sciences facilities--University takes over struggling county hospitals--Medical facility funding problems--Legislative demands.</p>	
[Tape 10, Side A]	363
<p>More on funding--Education Aboard Program--Charter Day--Notable Charter Day speakers.</p>	
[Tape 10, Side B]	389
<p>Other Charter Day speakers.</p>	
<p>SESSION 7, June 7, 1990</p>	
[Tape 11, Side A]	393
<p>First rumblings of student rebellion in 1964--Regents' response--Special Forbes Committee.</p>	
[Tape 11, Side B]	419
<p>Challenges in administering Forbes Committee--Byrne Report--Relations among students, faculty, chancellors, and regents.</p>	

[Tape 12, Side A] 443

Reactions to the Byrne Report--President Kerr--
Roles played by Governors Edmund G. "Pat" Brown,
Sr., and Ronald W. Reagan--Chancellor Murphy's
ultimatum--Kerr and the chancellors--Kerr's vote
of confidence.

SESSION 8, June 7, 1990

[Tape 13, Side A] 469

Selecting a new chancellor--Concessions to the
students--Members of the board of regents--
Reagan as a regent.

[Tape 13, Side B] 494

Angela Davis controversy--Administrative
meddling by regents--Governor Edmund G. "Jerry"
Brown, Jr., as a regent.

[Tape 14, Side A] 518

Tuition--University expenditures--University
employees--University investment policy--
Affirmative action and quotas.

[Tape 14, Side B] 544

Developing equal opportunity--Financial
disclosure.

SESSION 9, June 13, 1990

[Tape 15, Side A] 548

Impersonal nature of large campuses--Relations
between regents and presidents--Byrne Report.

[Tape 15, Side B] 573

Impressions of individual regents--Chancellor
Charles E. Young and UCLA--Fund-raising at UCLA.

[Tape 16, Side A] 600

Murphy Sculpture Garden--Associated Students
UCLA--Coordinating Council for Higher Education--
Norton Simon--Controversy over property
acquisition for UCI--Simon's bid for United
States Senate.

[Tape 16, Side B] 625

More on the Simon campaign--Norton Simon Museum
of Art--University laboratories--Medical
education and health services--College
athletics--Lobbying for funds.

[Tape 17, Side A] 649

University reserve funds--Changes in the board
of regents--Working with illiterate people--
Service Corps of Retired Executives--Forbes
family.

[Session 7, June 7, 1990]

[Begin Tape 11, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's June 7.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And I'm back with William Forbes in Pasadena.

Last time we discussed a number of areas including memorable Charter Days and Education Abroad Program. We left off about where you had recalled that on return from one trip to the South Pacific--this would be in September of '64 --upon return protests at UC Berkeley had begun. I guess that was a start of a situation that would absorb much of the time and energies of you and other regents for many months and, I guess, even years. But I wonder if we can begin at the beginning. What was happening at Berkeley when you returned from the South Pacific?

FORBES: Well, the date was September '64, and some of us had been out to Hong Kong for the inauguration of the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: President Kerr, Vern Cheadle, and we arrived back in the United States mid-September, about the time school was--university enrollment was beginning for the fall at various campuses. Although I think it started a little earlier at Berkeley. From tranquility on our trip to bedlam when we returned. Now, you ask what was happening? Well, there was all sorts of noise. As I recall, the essence of it was the fact that students wanted free speech outside Sather Gate, and there were certain restrictions put on that by Chancellor Ed Strong. We plunged into a very unhappy several months, and actually, a couple of years of what developed into the Free Speech Movement.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And I . . .

FORBES: And later became the "filthy speech movement."

TRELEVEN: Right, which we are going to get to . . .

FORBES: And we had as leading characters Mario Savio.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And Jackie Goldberg and Art Goldberg as leaders, let's say, of student activity.

TRELEVEN: As I understand it the whole issue began over a

piece of property that was 23' x 39' at Bancroft Way and Telegraph Avenue. And it had to do with card tables being set up and literature and buttons being distributed and sign-ups being made for several organizations. About September 14, Kathryn [A.] Towle, who was the dean of students, issued notice that this would no longer be tolerated because it was UC property.

FORBES: Was that spot that you talk about near or just outside Sather Gate?

TRELEVEN: Yes. Right.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: South.

FORBES: Essentially, that was where some of the ruckuses took place.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now, up to that time--that means up to September '64--were you aware of any sort of student uneasiness going on?

FORBES: No, I wasn't. And I don't think any of the campuses were. It was reasonably tranquil. We have to remember, though, that Vietnam was there. We were having. . . . We had an unhappy conflict in Vietnam. There was growing student unrest, although I wasn't aware of it prior to

September '64.

TRELEVEN: What you mean is that the war was escalating.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: In other words, more American troops were being involved in Vietnam.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And there still was a draft.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And college students are draft eligible.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: So, in terms of. . . . What you are saying, then also, is that there just weren't any warning signals up to that point. Is that accurate?

FORBES: I would say that's correct. Now, about that time things began to happen. You mentioned the problems between the students and the university administration there at Sather Gate. But there was a troop train that was routed through Oakland, and some people sat down on the tracks as a protest. I can't give you the exact date of that.

TRELEVEN: No. I remember the incident. Yeah.

FORBES: But it was symbolic. And as the situation developed, there was an underground newspaper

that was published.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I think that's the Berkeley Barb, if I have it right.

FORBES: That doesn't ring the bell as the one.

TRELEVEN: Oh, this wouldn't be the newspaper put out by SLATE.

FORBES: Might have been. I can not be too definite on that. But there was this newspaper that began to lay out the attitude of the younger people, students and nonstudents, about the war in Vietnam, which they opposed. We have to remember that, really, they were three years ahead of Lyndon Johnson who, in '68, said that he wouldn't run again and stepped aside.

TRELEVEN: That's right. That's right.

FORBES: But the students, in my view, were on the right side in their discussions about the war. And they were way ahead of the general public. That was a central issue in my view.

TRELEVEN: I think along with the war, if I remember right, some students in cases would--and this ties into Sather Gate--were recruiting people to join things like demonstrations, I think one at the Sheraton[-Palace Hotel], another one along "auto

row."

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: The Lucky [food] Stores . . .

FORBES: There were all manner of demonstrations, and
. . .

TRELEVEN: And this got to an issue of antagonism from the larger community saying, "What are you, the university, going to do about these students who are launching these civil rights-related campaigns from the campus?"

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall that?

FORBES: Yes. The problems weren't confined to the campus. During a board of regents' meeting on the Berkeley campus, students surrounded University Hall to a point where the police suggested that when we adjourn our meeting, we not leave through the ordinary exit, but go down to the basement and go out an exit that took us onto another street. Some of us who were staying at the Claremont Hotel were picked up by university cars there, and then we had to make a big circular trip to get to the Claremont. And as we passed--I guess it's Bancroft, but I'm not

sure, the street leading up to Sather Gate, down two or three blocks--we could see bonfires blazing in the middle of the streets. There was a whole lot of unhappiness. And it developed into more student demands for this and that. To a point where, in our December meeting of the board, the regents decided that the board would investigate the causes. That led to the appointment of a special committee, and Ed Carter appointed me as chairman.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Now, I'm going ahead, but shall I just proceed with this a bit? Or do you want to ask . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Well, let me back up to one more question . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . leading up to '64. I know that President Kerr would come to meetings in the early sixties and he seemed to make it a point to let the regents know of the success or lack of success of this group called SLATE. He almost seemed to be obsessed with letting the regents know what was going on with this particular group, ostensibly filled with radicals. Now, I guess what I wanted to ask you is, well, do you have any idea why he

did that? Were there regents who were insisting that he report on this organization? It just strikes me as being kind of peculiar.

FORBES: Not that I know of. It would simply be normal for the president to inform the regents, who, at that time, met once a month, with certain activities that had transpired since the previous meeting. I can't be too helpful on that specific question.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, the literature tables on university property, what was wrong with that?

FORBES: Well, as we sit here now, I'm not sure that anything was wrong with that. We have to remember the First Amendment [of the United States Constitution] and the right of free speech. Nothing. It might depend on the type of literature. But, again, people are certainly privileged to write what they wish. That's part of the First Amendment rights.

TRELEVEN: Well, at the time, when Kathryn Towle made the announcement, right around registration time, the rationale was that it was regent policy going back to the constitution of the state of California, that the university shall be entirely

independent of all political and sectarian influence. That seemed to be the rationale at the time.

FORBES: Okay. All right. So did Chancellor Strong support her notion of that?

TRELEVEN: Well, I was going to . . .

FORBES: It probably was a campus directive, and she was the one who issued it. Then I think there was a bit of a problem between Chancellor Strong and President Kerr, but I can't recite precisely the problems. I know that Ed Strong was terribly distraught about the general situation. I can't pinpoint it in time, but at one time he called and made an appointment and came down to see me in Los Angeles. And he was under great stress at that time.

TRELEVEN: I suppose what I am trying to get at and what I'm trying to ask you is this: the literature tables are set up, there are sign-up sheets, there are buttons, and it is a presidential year. It's an election year. [United States Senator Barry] Goldwater, Johnson. What emerged in the Free Speech Movement, which we tend to forget now, is that it was across the spectrum. I mean, it

wasn't just radical left-wing students, but also those who were supporters of Goldwater.

FORBES: Right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And everyone was sort of affected by this regulation.

FORBES: Right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: But, in view of the constitution, in view of the regents having presumably to adhere to that constitutional clause, or did any of the regents express to the president that he was expected to, through the chancellors, enforce this policy? In other words, was there pressure by some regents to get rid of the literature tables?

FORBES: I can't speak for other members of the board. I don't know what they might have done individually. I don't recall any regental request. But we had great debate about the whole situation through that fall, before the election and after the election.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And as late as December. . . . Not as late as, but in December we decided that the regents wanted to dig into the cause of the problem.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And we proceeded.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And again, leading up to that point--and there is an outline of this in the Byrne Report, kind of an overview of the events that took place--and to make a long story short, four students were arrested initially. They were going to be suspended for varying periods of time. Were you in communication, say, on a regular basis with other regents and the president's office as these events began to unfold? First the arrests and then the student respo. . . . Well, the police . . .

FORBES: Do you have the dates on the arrests?

TRELEVEN: Well, it was in that . . .

FORBES: In the fall?

TRELEVEN: It was in the fall, and by. . . . Then there were sit-ins at the end of September and eight suspensions resulting from that. October 1, beginning for two days, there was the police car incident where the students surrounded the car.

FORBES: Yes. Surrounded the police car. Right.

TRELEVEN: Then further repercussions that came from that.

FORBES: I can't be specific on my recollections of these student "violations"--put the violations in

quotes--or their arrests or suspension. I recall it generally, but I can't be helpful on that.

TRELEVEN: During that period, from September to December of '64, when you would meet in Berkeley, were students--I suppose unlike in the past--were students showing up outside the building?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Beginning to show up, and were they beginning to taunt and scream? Or hand out literature to you individual regents as . . . ?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. We had that for such a period of time, not only on the Berkeley campus, but wherever we met, that we finally decided to forgo meetings on the campuses, on the various campuses.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But that comes a little later on.

TRELEVEN: That comes later I think.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I think you toughed it out until '69 or thereabouts.

FORBES: Right. But we had cars for the regents surrounded by sit-down and lay-down people in Santa Cruz. We had some very unhappy incidents

at Los Angeles.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: At the UCLA campus.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Finally we decided to go off campus for our meetings, north and south.

TRELEVEN: Right. Yeah, I think at that point you began meeting at extension centers in San Francisco and Los Angeles.

FORBES: Los Angeles. Eleventh [Street] and Grand [Avenue]. Right.

TRELEVEN: Los Angeles Convention Center.

FORBES: Yes. First at Eleventh and Grand in an old structure, and then later at the Convention Center.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. Now, again, leading up to December, did you attempt to discuss what was going on with any of the students or radical student leaders? As they would . . .

FORBES: No, not officially. But . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, even unofficially.

FORBES: You mean with the radical leaders? I never met Savio or either of the Goldbergs.

TRELEVEN: Oh, you've never met them?

FORBES: No. I met Jackie Goldberg much later. She is in the school system here in Los Angeles.

TRELEVEN: President of the school board right now.

FORBES: For quite some time a great friend of my late daughter [Allison]. But during that time I never met with them, no.

TRELEVEN: I guess what I am asking is, up to the time the [Special] Forbes Committee was created in December, and you'd go to a regents' meeting and there would be students there, did you attempt to talk to them and get some kind of perspective, their perspective on what was going on?

FORBES: Well, I'd say that I had always an open mind about student opinion. If they were someone who was reasonably courteous, I'd visit with her or him and talk about situations. But that wasn't unusual for anyone really interested in the university. A good many years later when Jerry Brown was governor, I recall a time on the Berkeley campus when there was a student comment about our investments in South Africa.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I would talk to students if they wanted to talk and tell them about our policies. And also what

some of the companies, such as IBM, were doing for all people in South Africa. I want to . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay, we'll pause.

[Interruption]

How about faculty? The reason I am asking this is I am wondering if you as an individual regent, in addition to the reports you were getting from the administration, whether you made attempts to try to talk to students and talk to some faculty and try and get their viewpoints on what was going on?

FORBES: I'd say that as a member of the board I was interested in visiting with students, with members of the faculty, but at no time did I attempt to solve anything or become operational. The board is a policy-making entity.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Not administrative. I think that the members of the board watched that separation carefully. But we would meet in the course of general regental duties with members of the faculty. And as time went on, we must remember that as a board we became much more aware of student participation.

In those days, there wasn't a student member of the regents.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But that developed. That is one of the things that came out of this. Because we needed better communication.

TRELEVEN: At the same time as the situation developed, from September through December, was there developing a division of opinion amongst the regents about how the situation should be handled?

FORBES: Oh, I rather think so. In a group of twenty-four, there's bound to be a variety of points of view. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And I know that it's a long time ago to . . .

FORBES: What are you driving at?

TRELEVEN: Well, something I may put really in the context of the Byrne Report. But what I was going to ask next, though, is do you recall, in that period, what you personally felt should be the proper response to what I guess we could call the growing rebellion at Berkeley?

FORBES: Well, I think I realized this rebellion was an extremely complex matter and not subject to quick or easy solution. There were so many

crosscurrents. There's a matter of free speech and there's a matter of obscenity. There's a matter of free speech and there's a matter of respect. Now, just so you'll have a picture of what I mean by that, and this happened. . . . This is an incident that happened later when Roger [W.] Heyns was chancellor.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But there was a program in the Greek Theatre, Berkeley, one afternoon, and there were a number of speakers. One was the mayor of New York, John [V.] Lindsay. I think he was the mayor at that time, or . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And Roger Heyns had difficulty in getting the audience to be quiet. And up on the hill were hecklers. There were hecklers for every speaker that afternoon, except Jacques Cousteau. He was being awarded something. And it was as quiet as a tomb for Jacques Cousteau. But he was the only one that had that kind of control over the audience. The audience. . . . The people generally were--a lot of them, I won't say all of them at all--but there was an awful lot of noise

for everyone else. Well, what is free speech, you know? Does a person have a right to be heard? Or should he be heckled so that he has to retire? It has to be a debate. Where is the line?

TRELEVEN: Finally, leading up to December, do you have any sense of what your understanding was about the agreement reached between Kerr and Strong and the students, and that the students would claim that they reneged on, after . . . ?

FORBES: No. I know there was controversy there and a problem. And I know that Ed Strong, as I've told you before, was distraught. But I can't go beyond that. There was a difference of opinion between the statewide administration and the campus administration. I can't give you the details.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: They could.

TRELEVEN: Finally, leading up to December, had you had any contact, or do you recall seeing at that time Alex [C.] Sherriffs, who was at that time the student affairs vice chancellor?

FORBES: Yes. I had no personal conversations with him of

any importance. But he was around.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, and you'd see him, later, at regents' meetings, I know.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: We'll get back to that. Now, the regents' meeting which you've mentioned, December 18, '64, the chairman of the board, Ed Carter, decided to form not just one but two committees--one headed by [Theodore R.] Meyer and the other by you. Why two committees?

FORBES: Well, didn't . . . ? I don't think that both were formed at the same time. Or were they? I thought my committee to investigate the causes of the problem was first, and then Ted Meyer had a committee having to do with. . . . I guess I'd better be silent on the precise charge to the Meyer committee, but it had to do with administrative procedures, I believe.

TRELEVEN: I have a note here that says something about reviewing university policies on speech and political activity. Your recollection is the Meyer committee was created a little earlier than the Forbes committee.

FORBES: No, later.

TRELEVEN: Later.

FORBES: Later, I believe.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Now, let me just amplify that by saying that from December until May, when the Forbes--for the Byrne Report was issued . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: . . . that covers almost half a year. During that time the Meyer committee might have been charged and working, too. I can't be sure of that. But we worked for five months from the time that the committee was set up in December until the Byrne Report came out. It was a long and difficult and tedious and unpleasant time.

TRELEVEN: Which I want to return to in some detail. Do you have a sense that your committee and perhaps the Meyer committee both were formed because of some pretty shrill noises coming out of the state house? Like, there is [Senator] Hugh [M.] Burns, for instance. Senator Burns, who of course was chair of what we call the "little HUAC Committee" [California State Legislature Joint Fact-Finding Committee on Un-American Activities].

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Was there that kind of pressure growing in the state house on the regents to do something?

FORBES: I don't know. I don't know about that. I didn't feel it myself. But I think that the regents determined on their own that they wanted an investigation.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So, leading up to that meeting, did Carter talk to you, like, before the meeting took place . . .

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: . . . and indicate that he'd like you to chair a committee?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Well, then . . .

FORBES: And he didn't appoint me at that committee, at that meeting in December.

TRELEVEN: He didn't?

FORBES: No. He was charged by the regents, as I recall it, to form a committee, to appoint a committee. And he called me at home and said . . .

TRELEVEN: After the meeting.

FORBES: After the meeting.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: And I can't tell you precisely when. And said,
"You're it."

TRELEVEN: Oh, he didn't ask you whether you wanted to be?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: He appointed you.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Now, who selected the other members of the
committee?

FORBES: I would say that he did. But I. . . . He
appointed me, so I would think he appointed the
others.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You probably don't know the answer to
this, but Simon was kind of notorious for not
wanting to serve on committees, as I understand
it. How did Simon get convinced to serve on this
committee?

FORBES: I don't know. I'm delighted that he was on the
committee. I think I've said before, or I'll say
it now, that Norton and Buff Chandler were most
helpful in getting something of a consensus on
the committee and getting a report out. I've
said that if it hadn't have been for those two,
it would have been difficult ever to finish a
report.

TRELEVEN: Is there any particular reason why the committee was made up primarily of southerners? Of southern California regents?

FORBES: No. Not that I know. [William K.] Bill Coblentz from up north was on the committee. But, no, I don't know of any reason. It was up to the chairman to name the committee.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So Carter selected the individuals?

FORBES: I would think so. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: It wasn't you?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: No?

FORBES: No, no. No, I . . .

TRELEVEN: But by the time he called you he must have said . . .

FORBES: He didn't . . .

TRELEVEN: ". . . You're going to chair this committee and here are the . . ."

FORBES: As far as I recall the conversation when he called me to appoint me as chairman, about the only thing we talked about is that. We didn't talk about. . . . To my knowledge we didn't talk about other members of the committee.

TRELEVEN: Did he establish for you--that is, Carter--a time

line?

FORBES: No. No. We didn't have a budget, we didn't have a plan, we didn't have anything with which to work. We were a committee, and I was the chairman to investigate the causes of the rebellion. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess to read into the record the official title of what's called the Byrne Report: "Report on the University of California and Recommendations to the Special Committee of the Regents of the University of California by Jerome C. Byrne, Special Counsel." Byrne transmitted this to you under cover of a letter May 7, 1965: William Forbes, chairman; Phil Boyd, vice chairman; other members of the committee, Pauley, Chandler, Simon, [Jesse W.] Tapp, and Coblentz. That is quite a committee.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: In terms of the diversity of the individuals.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Now, who is Byrne?

FORBES: Well, when I called a meeting of the committee, we determined how we would proceed.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: We decided that we would get a staff, and names were put out for the person to head that staff. Among them was an attorney with Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher by the name of Jerome C. Byrne. As the committee moved toward determining who the person should be, I asked Mrs. Chandler to investigate and check on Jerome Byrne. She did a thorough check as far as I'm concerned, because she called late one night, called me at home, and said, "I think he's our man." And he was appointed to head the committee. Naturally, we had discussions with him and we had discussions on who we might get to round out his staff. But he did that. Then I, naturally, met with each person.

TRELEVEN: Each staff person?

FORBES: Each staff person.

TRELEVEN: Okay. There are six of them listed in the report itself.

FORBES: Right. Right. So I got acquainted with them. And they met with the committee and then went to work.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you laid out a game plan?

FORBES: We didn't tell them how to do it. We told them

what our charge was, to investigate this and to investigate all aspects of it. Then they proceeded, members of the staff, to investigate by interviews. Then Jerry would frequently check with me, and I would seek reports from him. We would be back and forth and with other members of the committee. Finally, we got to a position where we got his report together.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And . . .

TRELEVEN: I wanted to ask--I think I still have room on the tape--listed as consultants are Bryant Cushing & Associates and John Mechem. What did they have to do with the committee? They are listed as consultants . . .

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . but what does that mean?

FORBES: Well, it means that Bryant Cushing checked on certain matters that I can't now recall. Advisers. Advisers, maybe interviewing people. But I can't be precise on exactly what they did.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So Byrne and staff are going to be out gathering data.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Now that's going to be . . .

FORBES: And reporting to our committee from time to time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And I know that . . .

FORBES: Then I'm reporting to the regents from time to time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. That initial data gathering includes written material which is included in a bibliography at the end of the report.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: So it wasn't just interviewing people, but also surveying the literature relating to students and higher education.

FORBES: That's right. That's correct.

TRELEVEN: I'm going to pause for a minute and turn this over.

FORBES: Okay.

[End Tape 11, Side A]

[Begin Tape 11, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back.

FORBES: Now, I want to report that there was a feeling on the part of a number of people that there was communist causes, communist direction of this rebellion.

TRELEVEN: Okay, by a number of people . . .

FORBES: By a number of people, whether they'd be. . . .
By a number of people, let's just put it that way.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so this could include regents, it could include citizens . . .

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . it could include newspaper publishers, or whatever?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: So I felt that even though Byrne and his staff were covering this whole situation, that I personally wanted to get into the communist issue to the point where I called the FBI, made a date with the head man in San Francisco to visit with him, and to determine what his point of view, what his thoughts were, and what he knew of it. Of any communist activity. And I was reassured by him that as far as they could determine it was not led by any communist group or persons, that there might be communists around--of course they're around--but that there was no communist group running the rebellion or taking an active part in it. But I wanted to find out personally

on that basis.

TRELEVEN: Based on FBI information, and they sure as hell had a lot of it at that time.

FORBES: That's right. They were . . .

TRELEVEN: You received confirmation from that individual that the leadership of the student rebellion at Berkeley was not communist.

FORBES: Right. Correct.

TRELEVEN: That's interesting. You mentioned the charge to the committee, and I should read this into the record, I think, also, because when you first met with Mr. Byrne, you relayed this to him: "The Special Forbes Committee, appointed by the chairman of the board of regents, is charged to research basic factors contributing to the recent unrest within the University of California, giving particular attention to the disturbances on the Berkeley campus. The committee will render findings and recommendations to the board of regents." That's the official charge. You said that you wanted Byrne thoroughly looked into. Why did you want Mrs. Chandler to do this kind of research on Byrne? What were you looking for? Or what did you want to . . . ?

FORBES: I wanted to find an intelligent, practical, capable person with whom I could work, with whom the committee could work, who would take the charge seriously, and dig into whatever depths were necessary to come up with the truth.

TRELEVEN: Were you concerned about his ideology?

FORBES: No, I wasn't. I know, as I recall, I would rate him at that time--I don't know about Jerry now--but I would rate him as a rather moderate or a liberal Democrat. And I don't think that Mrs. Chandler would be described as such.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: When she came up with him with strong approval, I liked it.

TRELEVEN: Let me re-ask that a little different way. Were you concerned about avoiding somebody too far on the right, you know, like a rabid anticommunist?

FORBES: No. We were looking for a good person. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. After we had stopped taping last time, we were off tape, and you alluded to Byrne coming to you with a draft report. Could you pick it up there? He presented you with a draft report, and you were quite disturbed by it.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Tell me why.

FORBES: I didn't think that it was prepared in a fashion that the special committee should accept and take to the board. I didn't like some of the material in it. As chairman I felt I had the duty and the right to tell him so and ask for a rewrite of certain parts of it. Now . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I don't have his draft, and so I can't tell you precisely what it was that I didn't like. But when it was redrafted and redone and put into its form that we sent onto the board, I felt it was all right. Now, if we are talking about the Byrne Report now . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, before we leave the draft . . .

FORBES: Okay. All right.

TRELEVEN: Chances are there are no copies of the draft in existence before it was rewritten.

FORBES: Jerry might have it.

TRELEVEN: Something that might not ever be publicly accessible. That's why, even though you've told me what you've told me, I want to ask again, can you remember even in general some things that you objected to you because you felt they wouldn't

fly, say, with other members of the committee?

FORBES: I can't be specific on any of the language, but I was unhappy with it, and said so, and asked for a rewrite.

TRELEVEN: By language you mean what? The overall tone of the report? Or it had more to do with specific sections?

FORBES: It had to do somewhat with content, somewhat with style, some of each. Jerry took my comments quite willingly and came up with what I thought was a better prepared document. But I can't be precise on what I didn't like.

TRELEVEN: Okay. As this work is being done, how often would the Forbes Committee meet?

FORBES: As often as necessary and as often as we needed. Yeah, as often as necessary, and as often as I could get them together. I couldn't get the full group together very often. As a matter of fact, Jesse Tapp was on the committee and, as I recall, I think he was only at one meeting.

TRELEVEN: Yes, he was on the committee.

FORBES: But. . . . And I'd do a whole lot by telephone. I had to. Phil Boyd was very active on the committee, and Norton and Buff Chandler. Bill

Coblentz, being up north, was harder to get to, but I could always reach him by phone, and we talked a good deal.

TRELEVEN: Pauley.

FORBES: Pauley, yes. As I recall, Pauley didn't attend all the meetings. It's hard to get people together. We did everything we could to keep informed and moving ahead, helping to direct the staff, and still give the staff the freedom to discuss. . . . To discern anything that's pertinent concerning the problem. We wanted to do as thorough a job as we could.

TRELEVEN: And in terms of process, as materials were being drafted for consideration, would you be mailing materials to various members of the committee for review, or was the procedure that Byrne would submit the draft to you as chairman, and then you would look at it, advise him to make changes, and he would come back to you with another draft, and then, finally, that document would then go to all the committee members? Or how did that work?

FORBES: I would just say that during the operations, as material would come available, I kept my committee informed and asked for any comments.

And I'd have comments back from them. They might not like this, or might like this. Or what about this? But bear in mind that we had regents' meetings, we had committee meetings, we had a staff office out on Wilshire Boulevard where Jerry and his group worked. We had a whole lot of balls in the air. We did it as painstakingly as we knew how to do it.

TRELEVEN: No, and I . . .

FORBES: But it was five months of digging, contacting, phoning, and I filled two notebooks with my notes. I may still have them, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: It'd be great if you did. But we can talk about that later.

FORBES: I would say that the Byrne Report in its totality suggested a number of structural changes concerning the administration, central administration.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And the campuses.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which I want to . . .

FORBES: . . . get to later?

TRELEVEN: I want to turn to in just a minute. But I don't want to lose the thread that I forgot for a

minute. The thread is almost your opening comment, when we turned to the Byrne Report, and that was, in effect--if I can paraphrase you--you never could have done it without Mrs. Chandler and Norton Simon. Why?

FORBES: Because, let's say, and I don't want to be critical of people, but for whatever reason, Regent Tapp, and let's say, to a lesser degree, Coblentz and Pauley weren't as available, somehow, and to keep moving ahead on things. With Phil Boyd, he was extremely available and at times difficult. He was extremely cautious and careful. A wonderful friend, and just a great guy . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah, we've . . .

FORBES: . . . but he made it quite difficult at times.

TRELEVEN: So given the infrequency of Tapp, Pauley, of their availability, Boyd was very available, so he was a bit of a thorn?

FORBES: No. No, I could never call Phil a thorn.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Great guy. No. A slight pain, you know, just maybe. For example, he might say to me, "Well, Bill, maybe this is something that the whole

committee ought to discuss." When I knew from a practical standpoint that time was flying and it was hard to get a committee together. And maybe I'd say, "What if I contacted them individually?" "Well, okay, but it would be good to have a meeting." Well, that's an example of that. Just difficult. Not impossible, just difficult.

TRELEVEN: Well, I take it that your response in suggesting a committee meeting was. . . . Would it be wrong in saying that was your way of perhaps resolving a disagreement that you had with Boyd over one issue or another?

FORBES: Oh, I wouldn't say it was necessarily a disagreement. A different approach to some detail.

TRELEVEN: So, in terms of participation, to get back to the original question, Simon was willing to put in the time and effort that he needed to? And Chandler was?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. And as we would move ahead on different matters, they were supportive. "That's good," they'd say. "Do it, that's fine." They were supportive.

TRELEVEN: And overall . . .

FORBES: Mind you that the staff members were all on leave from their regular work. We wanted to finish the report as soon as we could to discharge the request of the chairman of the board for a report. We wanted to get finished with it. They wanted to get back to their regular work. And we had no actual budget set up. Sometimes when I'd bring in expenses, why, some members of the board would say, what about this and that? This is the way it is. We had to fly blind a good deal. We had no notion that we'd have a report in March or April or May or August. We just worked as long as there was something to do. When it was finished, it was finished.

TRELEVEN: So a motivating factor was never someone like Hugh Burns continuing to put a lot of pressure, make a lot of noises about the regents: what are the regents going to do about the mess at Berkeley? That kind of thing?

FORBES: I don't know quite your question.

TRELEVEN: Well, you're operating, I think, in an overall environment where there are certain legislators. I keep picking on Hugh Burns for

obvious reasons. Because he saw a communist behind every bush, I guess you might say. Legislative pressure for the regents to do something ultimately ties up with money, right? You know, at budget time. So I assume the regents were sensitive to the fact that there were legislators calling for you, the regents, to do something about the situation. And at least perhaps some implied threat that if you don't do something, we are going to take care of you at budget time. Now that's an oversimplification, but . . .

FORBES: Well, there might have been noises made by whomsoever to President Kerr and to Ed Carter as chairman of the board prior to December when we discussed this and decided that the regents would have an investigation. It might have been. But I don't know about that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. What impact, if any, did the filthy speech movement have on the writing of this report? I'm asking this because this report seems extremely well balanced in terms of student issues and student concerns.

FORBES: Well, it's interesting for your comment to say

that it has balance in that. I think the thrust of our investigation was student and faculty related. A good deal of space and time and words are given in the Byrne Report on decentralization of the university administration.

TRELEVEN: Right, right.

FORBES: But to me the heart of the matter was what caused students and the environment in the faculty to act the way they did? And what could we do? What was the reason for it? And maybe some solutions. That was my thrust. That was the heart of it.

TRELEVEN: As you're thinking along those lines, did the fact that there was a filthy speech movement make you want to change your mind in any way? Because it was almost like. . . . First it was free speech.

FORBES: Then filthy speech.

TRELEVEN: Then filthy speech.

FORBES: That's right. No, no.

TRELEVEN: I suppose what I'm asking is did you feel less sympathetic to the students after or in the midst of and after the filthy speech movement?

FORBES: No. There might have been some disgust with the

rampant obscenity. But the free speech movement moved into the filthy speech movement in the winter, '64 into '65.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: In that spring.

TRELEVEN: That's right. Right around March.

FORBES: But that didn't. . . . No, that didn't phase the committee or me or anyone from the charge of just getting the facts. No. No, we didn't. . . . I didn't like the filthy speech movement, but I have to say that, and repeat that, during that time, they kept the filthy speech publication--whatever it was--kept hammering at Vietnam in '65. And as you reflect back, it was telling society something that society should hear. We were wrong.

TRELEVEN: Is that hindsight, or is that the way you felt at the time?

FORBES: Oh, a good deal hindsight. I didn't see it, but as time moved on, the reality of that attitude told me that there was a good deal that we should be listening to from the younger people.

TRELEVEN: To what extent were you in a somewhat unique position about student thought by having a

daughter attending the University of California at that time?

FORBES: Maybe a little. But . . .

TRELEVEN: Because you obviously talked to her about what was going on.

FORBES: Oh, not that much . . .

TRELEVEN: Not that much?

FORBES: . . . because she was away at Santa Barbara for two years and Bordeaux for a year and Berkeley for two. No.

TRELEVEN: Oh, so she was not at Berkeley during the FSM, '64-'65? She would have been there later?

FORBES: She was not there. I think she was there just a little later, but I'd have to check back to see the exact years.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, the reason I asked that is I was wondering whether you personally were in a position to have a perspective that maybe many other regents would not have because they didn't have a son or daughter actually attending the university at that time.

FORBES: Maybe. Maybe to some degree, but not a whole lot. The experience on the board. . . . This does not relate to what we are talking about

here, but just as an example. I recall a regents' meeting at Riverside. Some kind of a do. It might have been a regents' meeting, and it might have been something else. But a number of us were on the Riverside campus. The chancellor was telling about some students and their scholarship and their activities and how some of them, in order to pay their bills, had to work a good deal. One gal was talking about her experiences and mentioned how much she earned. And I asked, "And do you pay taxes on that?" And she said, "Oh, yes, of course." So you get acquainted with students in a variety of ways and have more and more respect for them.

TRELEVEN: Okay . . .

FORBES: Now, back to what?

TRELEVEN: Turning to the recommendations. "We recommend the regents separately charter each campus in an autonomous university within the system of higher learning within regental jurisdiction." Sounds like a pretty radical recommendation.

FORBES: Yes. And that part of the report, as I've indicated earlier, was from the staff, was their view of what. . . . And, of course, the Forbes

Committee has to take responsibility for it. But it was the staff's view that that was necessary for improving the administration of an organization that gets to be very, very big. Here, for example, is a--you may have that--but it's a chart of the university from top to bottom.

TRELEVEN: Right. Organizational.

FORBES: A very big and involved operation. As an example, at that time--at that time!--in the sixties, let's say, there were 169 different faculty committees on the Berkeley campus. Now, that's pretty involved. But in the months that the staff members, the Byrne group looked at it in its entirety, this was their recommendations. And we accepted that as part of the report. As I've told you, I was more interested in other aspects. I was directing my thoughts essentially on the pertinent causes of the apparent lack of communication between the various segments of the university: the administration, the faculty, and the students. And repetitive. . . . From these years came the addition of a student as a member of the board of regents so that we had continuing

and intelligent and thoughtful communication between the students and the board and the administration. I was involved with selecting the first student regent [Carol Mack]. I can't tell you exactly when this fine young lady came on the board, but she was selected.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I should indicate that what you handed me was the administrative organization of the University of California, dated February 1, 1972.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: As an illustration of how complex . . .

FORBES: It is.

TRELEVEN: . . . how complex it is.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: At the same time, and I know what you are saying about your special interest about student involvement, but I take it you took more than a passing interest in the relationship of the various chancellors to the president.

FORBES: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Which is . . .

FORBES: We all did, because the chancellors were present at every regents' meeting. Their problems were

our problems. And, yeah, that followed.

TRELEVEN: Now, that recommendation, I take it, was not really followed out. Each campus was not separately chartered.

FORBES: No, no.

TRELEVEN: But were there changes made administratively in some of these areas like the relationship between the president and the chancellors? And I guess, specifically what I'm asking, partly as a result of this report, were chancellors given more authority and power on their own campuses?

FORBES: I have the feeling that they were. Others can respond to that question better than I can. Individual chancellors would recall specifically. But I would think the answer is yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Second recommendation: "That the regents and the president undertake complete revision of the form and substance of all existing documents of governance of the university," which stem from discussion in an earlier part of this report how at a time when the university was quite small

. . .

FORBES: Right. Take a look at ourselves. That's

right. Take a good look.

TRELEVEN: Was this done?

FORBES: I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But I would. . . . I don't know that one. I can't answer that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. This has to do with bylaws, standing orders, that . . .

FORBES: Marge Woolman would know in a minute.

TRELEVEN: "Third, we recommend that the office of the president be constituted to give leadership to the entire university system." And then I want to go on from that, "that the presidency and the chairmanship of the regents be merged into one, with the president serving as ex officio chairman of the regents and having the powers now vested in the chairman."

FORBES: That was. . . . No, of course that hasn't come to pass. And that's an approach that could be studied and either dismissed or followed.

TRELEVEN: But I take it you and the consensus of the committee members really felt . . .

FORBES: We accepted that, yeah. We accepted that. But I will say that that stemmed essentially from the

staff. It was my view that if we hired a staff of six people and told them to go out and take a good look and report it, that it was incumbent on us to pass it along. We didn't. . . . I didn't accept adoption of all that's in there.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But it was an opportunity for the regents to get an outsider's look at what our structure is like and what maybe it ought to be.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I should add that the recommendation follows information earlier in the report that talks about the kind of confusion and mishmash that exist between the regents, the president, the chancellors, in terms of who has what power, authority, and so on. So this recommendation seems to follow that in the sense of, well, how do we structure things differently? So it clarifies these relationships more so than they are now. That's what I make of it.

FORBES: Yeah. Well, let's let it be said that while some of us on the board realized that we were a policy-making entity and that we should have nothing to do with operations and administration, from time to time there would be regents who

would want to get into administration and operations. There was that.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And they had to be kind of knocked down.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But it continued to happen.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which we are going to talk about probably later today. Some specific instances.

FORBES: All right. It will be interesting to see what you have.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] "Fourthly, we recommend that the regents reformulate their role in the government of the university." I think this relates to exactly what you were just talking about. The regents being a policy-making body.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: To concentrate on building a better system and to let the day-to-day operations be delegated to the president and the chancellors. Early in this report there is a section called, "What Is At Stake?" This has to do with the relationship between the university, the growth of commerce and industry, and the quality of work done by professionals, the cultural life of California.

Was this section largely your idea? In other words . . .

FORBES: No, I don't recall any particular authorship of that. No.

TRELEVEN: Well, I'm wondering, because I think it was in the minutes at one point. You were recorded as emphasizing the importance of the public knowing what the university does for the state of California. And it struck me that . . .

FORBES: No, no. No, I . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . this section made me think of that.

FORBES: No, I take no claim to authorship of that.

TRELEVEN: There was one other thing I wanted to ask you about. In the midst of writing this report, the president of the student body at Riverside resigned. He resigned because the student government had passed a resolution supporting the civil rights workers in Selma, Alabama. The Riverside chancellor indicated that this was a violation of regent policy. What I'm leading into is this--getting back to the student end here--what seems to be the very muddy relationship between the regents, the chancellors, student government, organized

student government like the Associated Students [of UC Berkeley]. I suppose what I'm trying to ask here is what bothered you the most about how student voices seemed not to be heard at that time? Through student government.

FORBES: Well, you say "at that time." Are we still talking about the rebellion?

TRELEVEN: 'Sixty-four, '65. Yes.

FORBES: Yeah. I wasn't that bothered about students not being heard at that time. During the height of the rebellion I didn't like the obscenity and I didn't like the unreasonableness of students. I didn't like the discourtesy. There were a whole lot of things that I was negative about. I wasn't on a pedestal saying, "These people should be heard," because some of these people were raucous and discourteous and maybe unreasonable. But we did pursue the notion that people had a right to express themselves and speak. But it needed to be orderly, in my view.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Of the recommendations that were made, as you recall, of those recommendations, were there recommendations that the committee had a hard time agreeing on?

FORBES: If there were, I don't recall them. I think that. . . . I think that. . . . No, there was no dispute about the report as it came out among members of the committee. Now, some might not have been as enthusiastic as others. But nothing surfaced.

TRELEVEN: So the report represented a consensus?

FORBES: Well, I would say so. I would say so, yeah.

TRELEVEN: No member of the committee felt strong enough to want to issue, say, a minority report?

FORBES: Correct. That's right. There was none.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I think when we had the press conference and distributed it, I think that the attitude of the board was, "Well, this is finished." Some were enthusiastic about it, and some were less so.

[End Tape 11, Side B]

[Begin Tape 12, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Before I changed the tape I was trying to recapture that you finished the report, presented it to the regents, then, what? There was a press conference after the. . . . Or did you have copies to release to the press?

FORBES: Yeah. We had a press conference. As I recall it

was at the Statler Hotel. Now, I don't think it was in connection with a board meeting, but it was an issuance of the report. Whether the board had it before or after I can't tell you. But they wouldn't have had it before or the news would have broken. But there was a press conference, and questions were asked about it. Bill Trombley of the Times, I have a reprint of what he said about it. Then, out of the Los Angeles Times, editorialized about it. And then the report itself.

TRELEVEN: Right. I think you told me before that the Times had reprinted it in its entirety.

FORBES: They printed it the next day as part of the paper. Then, surprisingly, two weeks later, they had an insert in the Times, a little booklet, and printed it again. Right.

TRELEVEN: So you indicated that by and large the report was received favorably by the full board?

FORBES: I would say so. I would say so, but others can judge.

TRELEVEN: How did Kerr react to it, to you personally?

FORBES: I have no recollection of how he reacted. Nor do I of a good many others, other people. It was

done. We were onto other things, such as the Meyer committee, such as all manner of university affairs.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But I didn't get a whole lot of thank-you letters.

TRELEVEN: You didn't?

FORBES: I did not.

TRELEVEN: Well, I ask about Kerr because one can interpret the report as recommending that the president release some power and authority to chancellors.

FORBES: Yes. But I had no comment from Clark.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, is there anything else you'd like to say about the Byrne Report, its recommendations, the stress and strain it produced on you personally, or whatever else you might like to add about?

FORBES: Well, you're nice to ask. I don't think there is anything more. I think we've dissected it . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: . . . pretty much in detail. I was extremely glad when it was finished. It was a difficult A very trying time.

TRELEVEN: Well, Mrs. Heller's oral history¹ is on the shelf, and somewhere in her oral history, she suggested that the story of the Byrne Report would be an interesting one to learn. She was not that close to it, of course, herself. What she wondered out loud is how you ever managed to work with the individuals on that committee, being as dissimilar as they were. It must have taken a lot of . . .

FORBES: Not easy. Not easy. Very difficult.

TRELEVEN: . . . a lot of patience. I found a reference to something called the Tapp Report--and it didn't ring a bell with me at all--issued in June, '66.

FORBES: A year later. No, I can't help on that.

TRELEVEN: A year later. Okay. Okay.

Well, meantime, Strong had resigned from the UC Berkeley chancellorship. How did that resignation come about?

FORBES: Oh, I can not recollect the detail on that. Maybe you can be helpful in recalling for me some

1. Elinor Raas Heller, Oral History Interview, "A Volunteer Career in Politics and Higher Education and on Governing Boards," conducted 1974-80 by Malca Chall, Regional Oral History Office, University of California, Berkeley.

of it. I did tell you that while Ed Strong was chancellor, he was quite distraught about some things, details I can't say precisely, but I believe it was the relationship between the chancellor and the president. But he was troubled to the point that he called one day, and would I see him if he flew down. And I said I would, which I did. But again, I know I said this to him, that as a member of the board of regents, I cannot get in between a chancellor and the president. I just. . . . I won't. . . . That's a matter between them.

TRELEVEN: Well, I suppose the key question is whether Kerr took it upon himself to pressure him to resign
. . .

FORBES: I don't know.

TRELEVEN: . . . or whether the regents pressured Kerr to pressure Strong to resign. Or whether Strong was just fed up at that point.

FORBES: I don't know.

TRELEVEN: For some of the reasons.

FORBES: I don't think that the regents pushed him out, or I would recall it. A very decent, sensitive person.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I had a little calendar that will help

substantiate that while things had quieted down by the time the Byrne Report came out, the rest of the decade: Vietnam Committee Rally of '66, students disciplined; Peace Rights organizing committee protest, March of '66, seventeen students disciplined; Federation of Teachers incident, October of '66; Navy Table and strike, November-December of '66; Stop the Draft Week, October, '67; a Dow Chemical Company-CIA protest, November, '67. . . . All of these. . . . Most of these result in students being disciplined. Sproul Hall sit-in in October of '68; the Third World Liberation Front Strike, '69; and to round out the decade, People's Park, in '69. So things hardly quieted down.

FORBES: That's right. It took a long time. It took into 1968 when Lyndon Johnson decided not to run. But as I recall the war stayed on for a lot longer than that.

TRELEVEN: It did. Nineteen seventy was the invasion of Cambodia . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Which caused some other . . .

FORBES: Let's say we did an "incursion."

TRELEVEN: Yes. Incursion.

FORBES: That's right. I think that was the word that [President Richard M.] Nixon used. That gets me into a night when Norton was running for the Senate in 1970. And it was announced on the radio about this incursion.

TRELEVEN: Yes, this occurred leading up to that primary. It was . . .

FORBES: That's right. We were at a little . . . Not a fund-raiser, but we were just . . . We had fifty or so people for a Norton Simon party in San Francisco. And how should Norton react to this group about the president's announcement of the incursion? We decided to "waffle it." In other words, no comment at this time about it.

TRELEVEN: Need some more information before we can make a . . .

FORBES: Comment intelligently.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, also during this period, to get back to the mid-sixties, Strong resigned, Heyns became the new chancellor. This is the fall of '65. So this is not long after the release of the Byrne Report.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: How would you compare and contrast maybe Strong and Heyns in terms of their dealing with the student protests that continued?

FORBES: I don't know how I would. I considered and consider Roger Heyns a very good administrator and a good person as a chancellor. A strong person. To give you an example of the times that he served in as chancellor, I recall his comment to the board one day. This was when drugs were taken and what was it that was popular then? A chemical that . . .

TRELEVEN: LSD [lysergic acid diethylamide]?

FORBES: LSD.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: One student was in a tree, high on LSD, fell out and killed himself. And Roger said, "I had to be the one to tell his parents." These are difficult times. But I recall Roger Heyns as a very good administrator.

TRELEVEN: Did Kerr meddle less with Heyns than he had with Strong?

FORBES: I do not know.

TRELEVEN: Don't know?

FORBES: I would not know.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Another election coming up, a little later, November '66, and Ronald Reagan emerges. Were you close enough to any leading Republican--bad question--to any Republican leaders to know anything about how, in their opinion, Ronald Reagan emerged as the--let's face it--the head of the Republican party?

FORBES: You mean how he developed into a candidate for governor?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I suppose what I'm trying to get at here is I think you at least had been, perhaps up to that time, a self-described moderate Republican. As I understand it, Reagan more represents the conservative wing of the Republican party.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: In that context, how did Reagan emerge?

FORBES: Well, Reagan emerged by the speech, by the speech. And you've heard that referred to. But Reagan had a speech that he would deliver, such as to the Rotary Club of Los Angeles, to Rotary Clubs anyplace. It was the canned speech on his philosophy. And he would pretty invariably get a standing ovation. He is a good communicator, and

he makes a good speech. That's what catapulted him into statewide and national prominence. I was not active in the Republican party. I haven't been. I've been--this is just a personal political comment--but I became terribly distraught that the Republican party did not speak out against the John Birch Society, which I thought was just dreadful. Maybe I wrote to somebody sometime that I didn't want to be helpful in the party until they did. But because I think the John Birch Society was just pretty bad. But I had. . . . Back to Mr. Reagan, I had no contacts with him, really, until he became governor and became a member of the board.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Of course, one of his campaign promises was to clean up the mess at Berkeley.

FORBES: Yeah. Right.

TRELEVEN: Kerr supposedly had made some remarks supporting Pat Brown.

FORBES: He might have. I'd just throw in that Pat Brown, as a member of our board, was extremely helpful and supportive of the university. I can see where Clark would speak highly of Pat Brown. And I would agree with that. But I don't know

politically, I don't know what he said about Pat Brown.

TRELEVEN: Reagan won by a landslide. It was 57 percent to 43 percent I think. Or 42 percent. What's your judgment as to why it was such a landslide? Because here is Pat Brown, who has been an extremely effective governor in many ways during his period of service. But what happened?

FORBES: Well, I think that Reagan, the great communicator, had this ability to sell himself and speak of his description of the American scene, and it was overwhelmingly effective. I saw it take place at Rotary Number 5, in downtown Los Angeles, with a room full of people, and a rousing, standing ovation. Well, that's tough to beat. But Pat Brown was a hard-working governor who did a great number of good things for the state, including effort on water.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: He was responsible for very good legislation.

TRELEVEN: Education.

FORBES: As I have said before, he was very supportive of the university.

TRELEVEN: Well, so Reagan was a very positive communicator,

very good campaigner. Were there some negatives, though, that had developed in terms of Pat Brown?

FORBES: Perhaps, but I don't recall them.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Maybe negatives relating to what he did or didn't do relating to the University of California student protests, things like that?

FORBES: I don't think he would be criticized for his relations with the university. He was consistently supportive. I don't recall anything negative.

TRELEVEN: One more question on Brown. Ultimately he had to. . . . He had to call on the police to carry demonstrators out of Sproul Hall.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: That's the first big sit-in. Did you agree with that? Or how did you feel about it?

FORBES: Well, I don't think I. . . . I don't think I objected to it, to his action. As I recall there was a long telegram sent to members of the board explaining his action and why. But I can't be more helpful than that. But I. . . . If he as governor needed to pull some people out, okay.

TRELEVEN: Well, some interesting things have been written about the whole incident. During the sit-in, one

of the campus policeman shown his light in a window, in a particular office in Sproul Hall, and it looked like it had been trashed. He reported this to Alex Sherriffs, who called up [Edwin] Ed Meese [III], and anyway, the word got to Pat Brown that we better bring in the police because they are trashing Sproul Hall. Well, it turned out that the flashlight was shown into the office of former president Sproul, whose office always looked like a mess. [Laughter] And that the whole thing was a bit of a setup.

FORBES: I don't know.

TRELEVEN: So it's kind of interesting. Well, I want to go on to, then, after Reagan's election, I want to get into this issue of Kerr. I think there's a popular perception that since Reagan had made a campaign promise that if he was elected, one of the things he was going to do was get rid of Kerr, that Reagan went to the first regents' meeting and, by god, he got rid of Kerr. But what . . .

FORBES: Which wasn't true.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Certainly Mrs. Heller in her oral history really has a little different view, because she

perceives that along the way various regents were becoming somewhat alienated from Kerr. Or Kerr was falling out of favor with various regents. At what point did Kerr fall out of your favor?

FORBES: At the time when Franklin Murphy, on a plane trip back from Berkeley to Los Angeles, said to me, "If he doesn't go, I go." Franklin looked me in the eye and he said that to me. Now, I say this in confidence and know that it will be sealed for a while. But that's what he said. I had been developing some misgivings about Clark as an administrator before that a bit. Now, how long before, I can't tell you exactly.

TRELEVEN: Would this have been before the Free Speech Movement?

FORBES: This was prior to Reagan's first meeting of the board.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: So it was before Reagan when Franklin said what he said.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But would it have been before the Free Speech Movement?

FORBES: Oh, no.

TRELEVEN: No.

FORBES: No, no, no. Quite proximate. Quite proximate to the time that Reagan came in.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well. . . . Go ahead.

FORBES: I'll just add that I sensed the situation between Kerr and Franklin, and I felt that Franklin meant what he said. I think that I then judged, I evaluated the two, and I knew what Franklin had done for UCLA and didn't want him to leave. And I chose, then, sides and furthermore discussed this with Dutch Higgs.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: And Buff Chandler. And said, "This is what he said."

TRELEVEN: Why was Murphy frustrated?

FORBES: I didn't ask him.

TRELEVEN: Didn't ask him.

FORBES: I can guess. I could guess, but I don't. . . . I didn't ask specifics. It was a very terse statement. I can just see him right now, saying this to me. He didn't have to say more. I didn't ask him why. But I could guess that it would be friction between, administratively, between the president's office and UCLA. I can guess that. And I think that there were some

comments, generally, about Kay Kerr and some difficulty. And Earl [C.] Bolton, who was in the president's office. But the only thing I know quite for sure is what Franklin told me. And on that I based my judgment as to what I would do.

TRELEVEN: Well, was it apparent that to you . . . ? I mean, you mention talking to Higgs and to Mrs. Chandler. Was it apparent that they as well as other regents, perhaps one by one, were becoming less favorable to Kerr as time went on?

FORBES: Well, I think so. I think the vote indicates that. I think that vote . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, certainly by the time January of '67 came, the vote . . .

FORBES: Yeah. I think the vote indicates that. And I might have helped it. I might have helped them make up their minds. But I mentioned the two people I specifically talked to. I wanted them to know exactly what Franklin had said to me, because each had a healthy regard for Franklin.

TRELEVEN: Now, some other L.A. regents socialized frequently with the Murphys: Pauley, Canaday, Carter. Were you part of that at all?

FORBES: Was I what?

TRELEVEN: Were you a part of that--I guess what one might call--social circle?

FORBES: Well, I think. . . I was at the chancellor's home a good many times, and I played golf with him. But on let's say an intimate dinner with him and Judy with Pauley and Canaday and Carter, I'd say, maybe no. But we were good friends, good, good friends. He was, you know, my late wife Ann and I met Judy and Franklin when they came out to take a look.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I was the guy.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which you have . . .

FORBES: Would I. . . . Clark had called, and would I meet him at 12:30 in the morning and take him to the hotel. So it was a very nice relationship.

TRELEVEN: I mention this because if Dr. Murphy and Pauley, Canaday, and Carter not only socialized but also discussed how to get around some obstacles that Murphy had to deal with in the president's office, you were not . . . ?

FORBES: Was I a part of that? No.

TRELEVEN: You were not a part of that? Okay. Apparently

Norton Simon would not have been a part of that either.

FORBES: I don't know. I do know that Norton and Franklin were great friends.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: They had many things in common.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Their interest in art.

TRELEVEN: Well, is it just an illusion on my part that recommendation number one of the Byrne Report, which has to do with administrative restructuring, and Murphy's problems with Kerr are coincidental?

FORBES: I don't know. You see there was a long period of time between the two. Only Franklin and Clark would know about their relationship and whether Clark was trying to impinge on Franklin. I mentioned Earl Bolton because I think Franklin mentioned to me something about Earl doing this or that. But I have nothing too specific about it. But there was such irritation on something that caused Franklin to say what he did to me. He said, "He's got to go, or I've got to go. It's one or the other." When he said that, I

knew he meant it. That really disturbed me, because he was a tremendous asset to UCLA. He moved it ahead, to use his word, exponentially.

TRELEVEN: Yes. There's no question about it.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Again, the Byrne Report refers to some areas, and it turns out that those were areas that were, as far as I can determine, very much on Murphy's mind. It had to do with the chancellor's ability to run his own campus.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: In terms of appointments and promotions.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: And that's mentioned in the Byrne Report. The budgeting mechanism.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: Does a chancellor have control over his own money, in effect, without having to go through a Berkeley bureaucracy?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: That's mentioned in the Byrne Report.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And the regents, indeed, did, as a result of the Byrne Report . . .

FORBES: Make some changes?

TRELEVEN: . . . make some changes.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: While recognizing that Kerr had begun to decentralize in '58 when he came, which we've talked about before, he never quite carried it beyond a certain point. It became most apparent, perhaps, with Kerr's inability to keep his hands off of Chancellor Strong in the middle of the Free Speech Movement. Now is that fairly accurate?

FORBES: Again, I get back regarding Clark and Ed Strong. I do say this, I repeat that Ed Strong was so distraught and frustrated about conditions that he came to me to talk it out a bit to feel better.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Now, I believe it had to do with Clark Kerr and statewide administration, and that must have been it. But I can't be positive. But I don't know for what other reason he would come to me.

TRELEVEN: Well, Mrs. Heller, in her oral history, refers to From some point up to Kerr leaving the presidency, that it was "the chancellors versus

Kerr."

FORBES: Okay. Well, Ellie and I never discussed this. And although we were on the opposite sides of the vote, we never discussed it. Each one to his own opinion.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I wonder if we could fill in a few facts about the events leading up to the January '67 meeting, which was, of course, the first attended by the newly-elected governor, Ronald Reagan.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: There was a special meeting of the regents December 6 at the Oakland airport.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: This followed the latest round of Sproul Hall's sit-ins. The police had been called in, and I guess these were not just the campus police, they were the Oakland police, who could be pretty rough, and so on. At that meeting Heyns said the police had been called in and he, the chancellor, had not been consulted. Did this have further bearing on what was becoming seemingly clear to the regents, that Kerr had to go?

FORBES: Well, I can't say for sure, but I would guess

that. I don't know. I know that it was in those days, whether it be November or December. I don't know exactly when Franklin made his statement to me, but I know that there was on my part a feeling that proper administration was lacking.

TRELEVEN: Well, if Heyns reported accurately, and there's no reason to believe that he didn't . . .

FORBES: Yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . it meant that there was still an old problem.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: In terms of handling. Something else that seemed to--that may have bothered the regents. I wanted to ask you if you remember this. Reagan was elected, and so Reagan is getting people around him and looking into various matters, including budget. And Kerr refused to meet with him. He took off in a plane, went to Hong Kong, and. . . . Do you remember that?

FORBES: Uh-uh. [Negative]

TRELEVEN: No. Okay. Now, this takes us up to the regents' meeting and the vote. If it was a typical situation, you all would have come up to the

meeting and have gotten there, what, Thursday night?

FORBES: No. Thursday morning. Wednesday night or Thursday morning. We would have two-day meetings.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: So we would fly up either Wednesday night or Thursday morning early, because we would have committee meetings all day Thursday.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So Wednesday night, to your recollection, was there some idea that there was something in the air?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: No?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: So when did it first become known that Kerr was going to ask for a vote of confidence?

FORBES: I don't know. I don't know whether it was that morning or afternoon. I don't know whether it was then or. . . . It was probably that same day. But I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay. If any regent would have talked to Kerr in private and maybe encouraged him to privately resign, you were not involved in any of that?

FORBES: Correct. I was not.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, then came the meeting itself, and I guess that item was on the agenda.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] What happened at that meeting?

FORBES: The only thing that I can tell you about it is the vote. I don't recall specifically about the meeting.

TRELEVEN: Whether there was a long debate . . .

FORBES: Long discussion or not? No. There might have been some discussion.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I can't be helpful on that.

TRELEVEN: Well, there was finally a motion made.

FORBES: Right. I don't know. . . . Who made it?

TRELEVEN: You don't remember?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Well, I guess it was [Lawrence J.] Kennedy [Jr.].

FORBES: Oh, it was. Larry Kennedy.

TRELEVEN: Who the heck is Kennedy? Now, you don't recall who seconded the motion?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Well, all I can do is relay to you what the record shows.

FORBES: What does it. . . . I did?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Okay. Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: So the vote was taken and it was fourteen to eight.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Mrs. Heller, in her oral history, indicates the eight regents who voted in Kerr's favor . . .

FORBES: Were?

TRELEVEN: Coblentz, Dutton, Heller, [Einar O.] Mohn, Mosher, Roth, Simon, and [Speaker of the Assembly Jesse M.] Unruh. And I substantiated that with another source.

FORBES: Yeah. Fine. Okay.

TRELEVEN: So by that point. . . . And, of course, one of the fourteen is Reagan. But that means that by the time the vote came, there were thirteen other regents who were . . .

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: . . . ready to . . .

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: What happened after the vote was taken?

FORBES: The only thing I. . . . I talked. . . . Nothing of importance. You know, that's quite a shock.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Quite a big item. I'm sure the press were all over everybody. But I have no recollection of anything in particular.

TRELEVEN: Did you feel bad personally?

FORBES: Did I?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Yes. Yeah, I felt bad personally, but I felt that it was a necessary piece of business. I felt relieved because I knew that we would still have Franklin.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Good. We are just about out of tape.

FORBES: Okay.

[End Tape 12, Side A]

[Session 8, June 7, 1990]

[Begin Tape 13, Side A]

TRELEVEN: So before we broke for lunch we talked about the fourteen-to-eight vote.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: As a result of that vote, in came Harry [R.] Wellman as acting president. But to sum up Kerr, I wanted to ask you a few general questions. First, what do you consider his major and lasting accomplishment in behalf of the UC system?

FORBES: I think his guidance at the time of the Master Plan for Higher Education and the addition of the three campuses, Irvine, San Diego, and Santa Cruz, stand as hallmarks.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We may have touched on these already, but let me ask again what factors were the most responsible for his losing the confidence of you and other regents?

FORBES: I don't know. I do know that the average tenure of a university professor is four years. He was

there a good deal longer than that. Not like a Bob Sproul, but he was there for quite a while. Maybe it was time. But I can't mention anything specifically.

TRELEVEN: Well, you're right. As chancellor and president, he was there about fifteen years.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: On the Berkeley campus.

FORBES: Yeah. Contrast that with Franklin, who was there just eight years.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But a big eight years.

TRELEVEN: Well, funny you should mention him, because the next thing after Harry Wellman is appointed as acting president. . . . My sense is that it was understood he was an interim president while you searched for another one.

FORBES: Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: Franklin Murphy is a possibility.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Did you ever discuss that with him?

FORBES: Yes, I did.

TRELEVEN: And what was his response?

FORBES: Well, I felt so strongly about it that I bucked

the early morning traffic to get to his home on Sunset Boulevard at 8:00 one morning. I did not have an appointment, but I wanted to be sure to get to him. He met me at the door, and I told him how I felt about him and the presidency. You asked what he told me, he said, "Bill, Judy and I have had some years as dean of the medical school in Kansas City, and some years at KU [University of Kansas], and now at UCLA. Our home has been a home for faculty and students." And I think he said, "And it's been twenty years." And he said, "I've had enough." He might have said, "And that's sufficient."

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] So there was no . . .

FORBES: But he did not want to be considered.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I know he appreciated my interest.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you would have preferred Dr. Murphy had he thought otherwise. What kind of a person was needed, in your view, at that time to be the president of the university?

FORBES: Good administrator, an intellectual to the point of having the full confidence of the faculty, a broad-gaged person who would be understood by the

community and by the students. And back to square one, a good administrator.

TRELEVEN: You ended up believing that Charles [J.] Hitch looked very good.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: I don't know that much about his background. I guess he had been a financial analyst, or . . .

FORBES: Well, now, I can't off the top of my head give you a rundown on that, but he had had some academic experience, for sure. But he had a lot of good marks. It was a pleasure to vote for him.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall whether there were any other very strong candidates?

FORBES: No, I do not.

TRELEVEN: Okay, okay.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall if there was any opposition to Hitch amongst the regents?

FORBES: No, I don't think there was any substantial opposition.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, with or without Kerr, as we said before, the student rebellion continued. This is in a context of further escalation of the war in

Vietnam, the black power movement . . .

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . which got under way. The Chicago convention of 1968, Democratic [party] convention.

FORBES: Yes. Quite a conflagration. Eldridge Cleaver.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. It seemed to be an atmosphere of sort of militarism abroad and militantism domestically. But right in the fall of '68 Cleaver turned up as a lecturer at Berkeley, and some regents were very upset about that. Do you recollect that?

FORBES: Yes. Yes, I do.

TRELEVEN: Were you upset about it?

FORBES: No. No, not particularly. As I recall he wrote a book called Soul on Ice.

TRELEVEN: Soul on Ice, right.

FORBES: I read the book and found that it had quite a bit of meat to it. I may have told you about this earlier, but there was a meeting on the Los Angeles campus at that time, when Eldridge was a big subject. One of the members of the board said that she did not think that he had written the book.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, you did tell me that.

FORBES: It may be already on the tape.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, you substantiated it.

FORBES: But we checked with the publisher and found that he had written it. And that was reported the following day.

TRELEVEN: You also indicated that you had heard Cleaver speak at Irvine.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I guess that would have been after Cleaver was sort of traveling around to various campuses, giving . . .

FORBES: I think it was later. . . . I think it was a bit later.

TRELEVEN: Somewhat later.

FORBES: But not too much later, because both our daughters were anxious to hear him. Mrs. Forbes and I and the two daughters went to Irvine. I told Dan [Aldrich] I was coming down, so we sat with the Aldriches. They kind of protecting us. You know, who might be throwing bombs at who? But obscenity and all, we heard him, and he made a good talk, expressed his point of view.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. He is rather well known for four-letter

words.

FORBES: Obscenity. Right.

TRELEVEN: Especially the unmentionable word beginning with "f," right?

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Aside from Cleaver's politics or his message, it struck me that the issue raised by some regents about Cleaver lecturing was a dip by the regents into the operations of the campus. Is that too farfetched? In the sense that the academic affairs are handled by the academic senate . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . and the chancellor of a campus.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And through that system, Cleaver had been . . .

FORBES: Invited.

TRELEVEN: . . . invited to lecture to this class.

FORBES: Simple as that.

TRELEVEN: Was that pretty much your attitude at the time?

FORBES: That's right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: So you have that in the fall of '68, and before

lunch I was reading from this little calendar¹ about the various things that took place from the time of the FSM all the way through the sixties. The Byrne Report I really read as being quite sympathetic to student concerns. It reflects. . . . I think how you've explained how you felt. But by '68 or '69, were you personally reacting less sympathetically to student demonstrations and sitdowns and strikes?

FORBES: Well, I don't think I was ever very sympathetic toward strikes and sitdowns and demonstrations. I was against that. But I was for students having a forum from which to speak. It's quite a direct line there.

TRELEVEN: Okay, with your thought being that, if such forums were established and those lines of communication existed, that would diminish the visibility of the kind of activity that had been going on? Namely sitdowns and strikes and so on.

FORBES: It might tend to diminish. But these were days of great concern, concerning the draft,

1. Rorabaugh, W. J. Berkeley At War: The 1960s. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

concerning the war, burning draft cards, stopping trains. So offering a forum would help some, yeah. But it might not stop the radical--I'd call him a radical or call her a radical--from doing some thoughtless things, some less effective things.

TRELEVEN: Some of the brunt of which would fall on you personally. I mean, you were a member of the establishment.

FORBES: That's right. That's right. And we got tired of it. We got tired of it. The regents got tired of it, generally, to the point where we said, "Let's not meet on campus. Let's avoid that." And that helped.

TRELEVEN: People's Park. As I understand the situation--or maybe not as I understand it, but as I perceive it--People's Park grew out of regents' neglect of a piece of property. Is that too strong?

FORBES: Maybe it shouldn't be the word neglect. It seems to me that we acquired some property, and we might have been considering its use for residence halls, or for some such purpose. We hadn't done anything with it. It was vacant property. So here, this is a big thing, we could get on

university property and make a nuisance of ourselves, which some people did. It was there that. . . . Now, these are in the days, I think, of Reagan.

TRELEVEN: That's right. This was . . .

FORBES: Because he got some troops out, or someone got some troops out.

TRELEVEN: Brought in the [California] National Guard.

FORBES: Got the national guard . . .

TRELEVEN: And they were there for . . .

FORBES: So there was more anxiety and trouble over whether you can't do this or you can do this. And "It's our property." And "No, it isn't your property." I think some shots were fired. I'm not sure, but I think there was a little gunfire. But I'm not positive about that.

TRELEVEN: I'm trying to remember whether there was birdshot or possibly buckshot. There was certainly tear gas at that point. So it's this vacant property that was not developed. Why?

FORBES: Why wasn't it developed?

TRELEVEN: Uh-huh. [Affirmative]

FORBES: I can't answer that. I don't know whether it wasn't in our budget or the plans weren't drawn

or we hadn't decided specifically what it was going to be used for. I can't say.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Heyns is in the middle of this by then.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How well did . . . ? Well, let me ask this: did Hitch do a better job of keeping hands off the University of California, Berkeley, chancellor than Kerr had?

FORBES: I don't think I'd be in a position to compare that. The way to find out about that is to ask Roger Heyns.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, my context is your. . . . Furthering decentralization and its . . .

FORBES: Yeah. I'd call Charlie Hitch a good manager. He was a good manager, a good administrator.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I want to go on to Reagan's participation in regents' meetings if I could. We've talked about Pat Brown in the past and you have explained his philosophy of his relationship to the board. We get to Reagan, and we certainly know he was at the first meeting as governor.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: How regularly did he attend?

FORBES: Oh, I would guess maybe a third of the time, maybe 40 percent of the time. The governor is a busy person.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And he has a lot of responsibility. I'd guess that, but I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Even though he was there and would preside as past governors had, he decided that he would not preside, that the chairman would preside.

FORBES: That's right, yes.

TRELEVEN: That's what I've read. Is that your recollection?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall him ever giving any reason for that?

FORBES: No, simply, maybe the president might have said that the governor has asked if Ed Carter, or Ed Pauley, or whoever was chairman at the time would preside. I think it was quite informal that way.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Actually, I think it was Meyer.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: It may have been . . .

FORBES: Oh, Ted Meyer was chairman at that time?

TRELEVEN: Could have been.

FORBES: Yeah, could have been.

TRELEVEN: Could have been. Let's see, Carter, Meyer. . . . I'm not quite certain. Now, Mrs. Heller, in her oral history, recalled that Reagan would come with sort of an entourage. That he just wouldn't show up at the regents' meeting alone, or even, say, with a bodyguard, that he would come in with a small group. [Laughter] Is that. . . . What do you remember?

FORBES: He had some security people with him, and then he had--I don't want to say what's-his-name--but a chap [Franklyn C. Nofziger] who was invariably standing over on the side of the meeting.

TRELEVEN: Would this have been Alex Sherriffs?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: No?

FORBES: No, it wouldn't. It was the chap who was convicted in Washington [D.C.] not too long ago who has a goatee.

TRELEVEN: Well, I'm not going to remember the . . .

FORBES: Oh, what is his name? But he was, let's say, an adviser, I'd guess, a companion to the governor consistently. I'll think of his name.

TRELEVEN: Well, if we can't now, we can . . .

FORBES: He was mixed up with the people in New Jersey. Some people in New Jersey own this small company that went belly-up. I almost have the name. It's two syllables, I think.

TRELEVEN: I'm not going to . . .

FORBES: Public relations, PR.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But any rate . . .

TRELEVEN: Anyway, he would be there.

FORBES: He would be over on the left side of the room listening and watching. Then before too long, Reagan had some appointees, appointed regents. Before too long he had some vacancies to fill.

TRELEVEN: Right. I think he reappointed Mrs. Hearst. And then he appointed . . .

FORBES: William French Smith.

TRELEVEN: Yup. William French Smith.

FORBES: Dean [A.] Watkins, [W.] Glenn Campbell.

TRELEVEN: That's right. [Maxwell L.] Rafferty [Jr.] was there as public instruction.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: [P. Allan] Grant started as agriculture board and . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . has since been named to a full term.
That's some of them. Robert [H.] Finch was
lieutenant governor for a while.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Higgs. Now, he came in . . .

FORBES: He came in, I think, earlier. I've got . . .

TRELEVEN: Right. I've got him from about '66 on.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: So that was probably a Brown appointee. Would
that make sense that he was a Brown appointee?

FORBES: Yes. Yes, it does. It shows here about '66-'67.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: DeWitt Higgs.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, Mrs. Heller made quite something of
this guy Alex Sherriffs. He's the guy who had
worked for UC vice chancellor of student affairs,
and then Reagan included him in his cabinet. He
was his chief educational adviser.

FORBES: Okay. All right.

TRELEVEN: Does he come back to you at all?

FORBES: Yeah, I remember him and remember him as a person
who was present and involved to some extent with
university affairs. But nothing too specific.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When Reagan, one or another of his entourage--oh, I don't want to say his entourage--when Reagan couldn't make it to meetings, and like he'd send someone in his place to observe. Now, that wouldn't include . . .

FORBES: Yeah. I'm trying to think of this fellow's name, and I can't. But we'll get it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I should really be able to help you out here, and I don't know.

FORBES: Well, his name wouldn't be mentioned much in . . .

TRELEVEN: In the public record.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. But when Reagan would send somebody in his place, that doesn't mean that that person would sit in on executive sessions, did it?

FORBES: Oh, no.

TRELEVEN: No?

FORBES: Not at all.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so it was just open meeting. . . . You can't delegate . . .

FORBES: No, no, no.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It's regents only, plus whoever is involved in the subject matter.

TRELEVEN: Then who--we may have named some of the names just a few minutes ago--I was going to ask who Reagan's chief allies were amongst the regents?

FORBES: One that comes to mind first is William French Smith.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I think he was one of his first appointees and his personal counsel, and a very bright person.

TRELEVEN: Grant?

FORBES: Well, you said that Allan Grant was appointed as an appointed regent.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: I wasn't aware of that.

TRELEVEN: Well, he was a member of the state agriculture board initially.

FORBES: That's right. That's the context I remember him. But I don't remember him as an appointed regent.

TRELEVEN: You'll recall that the constitutional amendment came about and the terms were changed to twelve years?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: At that point there was no longer a member of the state board of agriculture.

FORBES: Yes. So he was appointed.

TRELEVEN: So he was appointed as a . . .

FORBES: By Reagan?

TRELEVEN: By. . . . It would have been by Reagan.

FORBES: I think so. But it just shows here about either '67 or '68.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But I'm unclear about that. I didn't realize that.

TRELEVEN: Did such people as, say . . . ?

FORBES: Oh, another one would be Dean Watkins.

TRELEVEN: And Dean . . . ?

FORBES: Watkins.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Did people like Smith, Watkins, Grant, Finch, Rafferty, did they constitute sort of an ideological block?

FORBES: Well, you can call it an ideological block. I would rather say that William French Smith, Glenn Campbell, Dean Watkins, William Wilson--was another who came along--would vote for Reagan's point of view.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess I have to ask you, then, what was Reagan's point of view? Vis-à-vis the operation of the University of California. Anyway you

could generalize about that?

FORBES: The way I would generalize it on a comparative basis with Pat Brown, I would say that Ronald Reagan was not supportive of the university. He was simply not supportive. Now, some of these people. . . . There might be many indications where they were, but I would just say on a scale of one to ten, if Pat Brown were a nine or a ten, Reagan would be a three or a four. In honest support of the university. He was suspicious of the university, I think, and I don't think he ever fully understood it. I don't think he cared that deeply. And I say that thoughtfully. I'd like to give you an example. Maybe I've done it before, but right in this context on this tape I'd like to tell you that the regents infrequently were invited to the laboratories. On one occasion I went down with about eight members of the board to visit Los Alamos. We were briefed on confidential subjects. During one briefing, in a room not much bigger than this one, a member of the laboratory staff was giving a lecture on a subject, and the signs up there said confidential, complete secrecy, and all this

business around the room. He was working at a blackboard and writing some things and then erasing them, and then writing some more things and then erasing them. Mr. Reagan was sitting at my left, and I noticed that he was making notes on his four-by-six or three-by-five cards. All these signs were around here, these people were erasing these things, and he was making notes. And I got poofed about it and looked over at what he was writing. The few words that I saw were about the Seventh Fleet [United States Navy] in Southeast Asia, which had nothing to do with the subject matter. But Mr. Reagan left this two- or three-day meeting that night for Omaha, for a governors' meeting. And in the paper the next day, he was quoted speaking to the governors about various things, including the Seventh Fleet in Southeast Asia. So while he was presumably in Los Alamos on university business, he was writing a political speech. To me it showed a lack of interest in the subject matter and a lack of an attempt to understand what the university was doing and something about nuclear energy. I didn't like it. I still don't like it. He

wasn't paying attention.

TRELEVEN: You say he was suspicious of the university. By that do you mean suspicious of the intellectuals who are doing various things in the university, suspicious of the free exchange of ideas?

FORBES: Maybe the word isn't suspicious as much as it is wondering about its functions and its status in society. He didn't understand it, I don't think. I don't think he understood about the search for truth and true academic freedom. I don't really think he thought that out.

TRELEVEN: So to some extent, then, kind of an intellectual shallowness, perhaps.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: I don't want to put words in your mouth, but I'm trying to interpret . . .

FORBES: No, no, no. That's right.

TRELEVEN: In a very real way, how badly was the university hurt because of the budgetary decisions that he and his administration . . . ?

FORBES: Oh, I can't give you numerically or percentage on the injury to the university, but the university needs to constantly move forward with progress and needs to be invigorated by support of moral

as well as financial. . . . It lacked the. . . . He lacked the enthusiasm, the understanding of a Pat Brown. Pat's words to us at one meeting were, "Look, I'm a busy person. A governor has to be everywhere. You people on the board are doing a good job. You keep on doing it." It's that kind of forward momentum that we had in his administration. We didn't have it with Reagan.

TRELEVEN: Well, some things have been written of how Reagan cut the budget drastically and really injured the university. Yet you read other writers and they will say, "The cuts weren't really that bad, especially when compared to Jerry Brown, who came later." And that's why I am asking what your . . .

FORBES: I'm negative on both as far as support of the university. I'm negative on both Mr. Reagan and Mr. Jerry Brown.

TRELEVEN: You were appointed to the board by Pat Brown. You were Republican and Pat Brown a Democrat. He also appointed Norton Simon.

FORBES: And Ed Carter.

TRELEVEN: Well, Ed Carter goes back to '52.

FORBES: Yes. But he then reappointed him.

TRELEVEN: He reappointed him, that's correct.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: That's correct. And Jerry reappointed him. Reagan didn't seem to operate that way. It seems to me that the record shows that he sure didn't appoint any Democrats.

FORBES: [Laughter] I don't know of any.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Really, that is in a sense the heart of what I was just trying to express to you. Ed Pauley, a Democrat, was the one person of influence who was most outspoken on my behalf, and I a Republican, to a Democratic governor. To Ed Pauley, the university was much more important than a political party. He wasn't troubled at all about being enthusiastic about me. He simply thought that I would be a good regent. That's all.

TRELEVEN: All right, this is above partisan politics.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: But in the case of Reagan and Reagan's appointees

. . .

FORBES: Look at the record.

TRELEVEN: It looks to me like somebody had to measure up to a certain standard in terms of not only political partisanship but ideology. Maybe that's too strong. Any comeback?

FORBES: Each one of his appointees can be analyzed.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: I think it would come out about that way.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, another major issue: Angela Davis. Before we turn to her, I want to put her in context at UCLA. Dr. Murphy had resigned and had gone to Times Mirror Company by then. Incidentally, before I forget, when you went to see him at the chancellor's residence, the incident you related several minutes ago, did he indicate at all that he was leaning towards Times Mirror? Or was that a little early?

FORBES: Nothing at all.

TRELEVEN: A little too early for that. Okay. So Murphy had left, but before he had left, he had a strong preference for. . . . In fact I think he was even a strong lobbyist for Chuck Young.

FORBES: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall Franklin talking to you about Chuck Young?

FORBES: He talked to the board. He was extremely supportive of Chuck. He had had Young as his assistant for eight years and had groomed him. So he was in a good position to judge.

TRELEVEN: How well had you gotten to know Chuck by then?

FORBES: Oh, how well is well?

TRELEVEN: How well is well?

FORBES: You know . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, would you see him at regents' meetings? Or would you go to past presidents' meetings at UCLA?

FORBES: Sure I'd see him at various functions. I was president and he was chancellor, yeah, we would see each other a good deal. And Sue [K. Young]. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, why did you think he'd make a good chancellor? I mean, after all, he was only thirty-five or thirty-six years old at that time.

FORBES: That's right. That's right. I think my view was that of the board, which I think was unanimous about Chuck Young. We respected Franklin Murphy's judgment, and that was good enough for me. Plus the fact that I liked him and saw him in action a bit and liked the way he handled

himself.

TRELEVEN: Well, it certainly got nationwide coverage, Time magazine, etc., selection of the "boy chancellor," I think he was called at the time.

FORBES: Right. That's right. I think he was the first Ph.D. out of Riverside.

TRELEVEN: Well, he was certainly. . . . Yes, who went on to get a Ph.D. from Riverside. He was certainly the first student body president of the Riverside campus.

[End Tape 13, Side A]

[Begin Tape 13, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Did you have in your mind any sense that given the kind of alienation that many students were feeling that a chancellor who was relatively young might relate better to students?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Didn't give that any . . .

FORBES: I just took him on merits.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Okay. So back to Angela Davis. The context is UCLA has this quite young, energetic, bright, knowledgeable chancellor who is just beginning to get his feet wet in the top spot, and up pops the name of Angela Davis. In fact, I

think this first came up at a regents' meeting in July of '69. What do you recall about the origins of what became known as the Angela Davis matter?

FORBES: The origins of it?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: As I recall, there was a little question about whether she actually had a Ph.D. or not. I'm not sure about that. But there was some question about her qualification, I think, but don't hold me to that for sure. But the main thrust was whether she had communistic leanings. Was she a communist? Was she safe for the university?
[Laughter] That was the problem.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, that's my impression.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: That if she was a member of the Communist party, she could not teach, because the regents had a policy going back . . .

FORBES: Had a policy against that.

TRELEVEN: . . . way back to 19. . . . Well, it was reaffirmed, I think, in 1949, 1950.

FORBES: And she probably--I'm going to say, knowing that --she probably disavowed being a member of the

Communist party. But she may have had leanings. Who knows?

TRELEVEN: Do you recall how this ever came up in the first place? In other words . . .

FORBES: No, not now.

TRELEVEN: In other words, who blew the whistle? [Laughter]

FORBES: I don't know. I don't know. I have told you about the luncheon with her.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Which. . . Yeah, you indicated on an earlier tape that you had had lunch with Angela Davis and Regent Simon in . . .

FORBES: And Fred Dutton.

TRELEVEN: And Fred Dutton, in Westwood. Remind me what the reason was for that.

FORBES: For the luncheon?

TRELEVEN: First, was it in the context of after this matter had come up and there was . . . ?

FORBES: It had to have been after that because otherwise there would have been no reason for Fred Dutton to be curious enough about her to arrange the luncheon. But one morning Fred called me and said would I like to have lunch with him and with Angela Davis and Norton? And I said sure. So I went out and we had lunch. As I've reported,

most of the time Norton was having a debate with her about whether or not she was a communist. She was very quiet about it. And he, laughingly, or in good humor said, "I don't think you are a communist." But I found her as a quiet, soft-spoken person.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But there were some regents who were really upset that she was teaching.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Yeah. We had people on the board who felt strongly about such things.

TRELEVEN: Right. There are some other incidents that I'll come back to but I don't want to lose track of. Now, Chuck's position as the chancellor of UCLA was that--and after consulting with the appropriate faculty and academic senate--was that--and the chair of the philosophy department--was that the university had an ethical and perhaps a legal obligation to carry out the contract with her. She had begun teaching in the summer, and it was over the summer and into the fall when the regents began to raise some questions. At least some of the regents. So that was Chuck's position. He was supporting . . .

FORBES: His academic people.

TRELEVEN: . . . his academic people. What was your position on that?

FORBES: As far as I recall, I was supportive of him.

TRELEVEN: And with other regents, it depended on . . .

FORBES: Philosophy.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Simon?

FORBES: I'd better not mention any of them. I wouldn't think that Simon would be much disturbed.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, then Chuck's got a lot of pressure on him, and he refused to fire her. Actually, we've interviewed another person in the oral history program who was close to Chuck and said that Chuck was not even sure that he'd have a job after one regents' meeting because of his decision not to dismiss her. What do you recall about Hitch's position in all of this?

FORBES: Who?

TRELEVEN: Hitch.

FORBES: Oh, I can't recall it. I can't recall it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Nothing that you can recall at this time?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Then somehow, when I was reviewing all this stuff, somehow the whole situation took me back to the recommendations of the Forbes Committee in

the Byrne Report. You know, wasn't this the case of a chancellor being able to operate his own campus? And weren't the regents who were making an issue of this, really weren't they meddling in operational affairs?

FORBES: They probably were. If they were telling the chancellor what to do and what not to do. That's a subject for the chancellor to discuss with his president, Hitch, and for them to make a determination. So I would guess that Hitch was supportive, fully supportive of Chuck Young.

TRELEVEN: But it didn't mean that certain regents couldn't speak and express themselves and wring their hands.

TRELEVEN: Well, on one hand, the chancellor is supposed to operate his own campus. On the other hand, there's the regents' policy that says no communists in the classroom.

FORBES: Okay. But it would not be up to the regents, even if it's regental law, to do anything but refer that to the president for administrative action.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: See, the regents wouldn't step in and, for

instance, fire Chuck Young. They would have to go through the president's office. I would just think that on the facts that Charlie Hitch was supportive of Chuck Young. If one or two regents want to speak out, let them speak out.

TRELEVEN: Right. And then the issue was further complicated, I suppose, because not long before, in a case I believe in the east, the Supreme Court had, in effect, made a judgment that threatened the validity of the regents' policy that went back to 1949. I think apparently both Chuck knew this and Hitch knew this, and some of you regents knew it. But ultimately, Chuck kept his job, of course, and the regents fired Angela Davis.

FORBES: And the regents . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Fired her.

FORBES: We did, did we?

TRELEVEN: Yup. "You get rid of her or we will," said some fifteen of the regents. You were among the six to say no. I don't know if you remember that.

FORBES: I don't recall that specific vote.

TRELEVEN: So it came to a vote, and in effect, the vote overrode President Hitch, overrode Chuck Young.

And . . .

FORBES: Bad.

TRELEVEN: Bad.

FORBES: Does it show who else voted no?

TRELEVEN: No? Dutton, Coblentz, Heller, Hitch, Roth,
Forbes.

FORBES: Voted no?

TRELEVEN: Voted no.

FORBES: Right. Good for them.

TRELEVEN: So you supported Chuck?

FORBES: Sure. Sure. I'm not surprised at any of those
votes. That's good.

TRELEVEN: Simon's missing, but it's only . . .

FORBES: He might not have been there.

TRELEVEN: He may not have been there.

FORBES: See, I voted not. . . . The only thing I voted
for were just on the issues and what I felt
personally to be right. I had no concern about
political innuendo or political aspects of this
at all. Just what's right.

TRELEVEN: Now, the ramifications of this, as I seem to be
able to piece them together, and I wanted to see
what your reaction is to this, is that the
majority of the regents had voted to take the

matter of Davis into their own hands. In fact, there seems to be a larger pattern going on of certain regents beginning to question at every meeting the recommendations chancellors made about appointments and promotions.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: That's what I'm making of some . . .

FORBES: You mean meddling, really.

TRELEVEN: Meddling. That's a better word. Is that what was going on?

FORBES: Well, if the minutes indicate it, I won't. . . .
Yes.

TRELEVEN: But you are one who feels strongly that the regents don't belong in the business of . . .

FORBES: Operation or administration.

TRELEVEN: . . . looking . . .

FORBES: We just mustn't.

TRELEVEN: . . . and mucking around in appointments and promotions.

FORBES: That's right. Correct.

TRELEVEN: And yet . . .

FORBES: This isn't anything new. When a board with a variety of people with strong opinions express themselves, they aren't always totally thoughtful

about what is proper.

TRELEVEN: But isn't it true, in doing this, that you'd worked hard in the mid-sixties to get further decentralization and to get straightened out who does what? It resulted in chancellors having more authority over their own campuses. And then . . .

FORBES: To negate it with this.

TRELEVEN: To negate. . . . And it seems that they did negate it with this.

FORBES: It sounds as though they did.

TRELEVEN: Well, is that the way you remember it?

FORBES: Well, when the board by majority vote fired her, whether I remember or not, that's what happened. I'm delighted that I voted the way I did. And I'm not surprised. But no one is perfect. The board isn't perfect. Whether it's in the sixties, the seventies, the nineties, after the turn of the century, there will be people on the board--on any board--who will want to get into administrative and operational matters. It's the nature of the beast.

TRELEVEN: Now, I do not remember seeing anywhere an instance where any regent wanted to meddle into

the political beliefs of a right-winger. It's consistently questioning people who are on the left.

FORBES: So?

TRELEVEN: Why? Aren't there dangerous right-wingers teaching at the university?

FORBES: Well, maybe. But people are hired for their ability in their discipline.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Yeah. What difference does it make if a Jonas Salk is a right-winger or a left-winger in the history of infantile paralysis?

TRELEVEN: Well, or Herbert Marcuse, who was a . . .

FORBES: A San Diego professor. Right. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Who created a bit of a storm.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Well, he didn't create the storm. Those who questioned his being there are the ones who . . .

FORBES: Set up the noise.

TRELEVEN: . . . set up the noise. [Laughter] But it's interesting to today, here in 1990, express the sentiment about the regents involving themselves in operational matters. It kind of echoes what Simon complained about at some point in the mid-

seventies: that the regents are too often involving themselves in the management of the university.

FORBES: Norton was very critical of that. Of the board and of individuals of the board. That's right.

TRELEVEN: But you did have the very real problem sometimes of professors involving themselves in antiwar demonstrations.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: What was your attitude about that?

FORBES: It depends on the manner of involvement. A professor is entitled to speak and express himself. But he is. . . . It's questionable when a member of the faculty has a shirt made out of an American flag.

TRELEVEN: Which did happen?

FORBES: Which did happen. On the Santa Cruz campus. And participates in certain activities. That, to me, is not right. So it depends on the nature of the individual incident.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Other campuses. UCLA, I guess it was '69 when you met in the faculty center. We've sort of touched that already.

FORBES: I can remember a stormy afternoon.

TRELEVEN: Students on the roof of the faculty center.

FORBES: Yes, and throwing pebbles against the glass and maybe breaking some glass. It was a very unpleasant incident. I think we exited by way of Hilgard, in kind of an unusual formation.

TRELEVEN: In fact, that happened the same day as the injunction was to be issued to remove the occupants of People's Park, which is kind of . . .

FORBES: Well, you see there were a lot of things going on.

TRELEVEN: That's right. Kind of . . .

FORBES: These were troubling times.

TRELEVEN: But let me ask you this: UCLA certainly saw its share of student activism . . .

FORBES: Yes. .

TRELEVEN: . . . before the stormy period was over. But the question has been asked many times: why, compared to Berkeley, is UCLA relatively quiet?

FORBES: Oh, I'd just have to make some rather vague comments about that. Berkeley had a Sather Gate. A very obvious place to foment trouble.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Berkeley had a community that I would say might be quite liberal. At least moderate. UCLA is in

the middle of the high-rent district. That might make a difference.

TRELEVEN: In the sense that more students commute to campus?

FORBES: No, in the sense that the community itself, and community involvement . . .

TRELEVEN: Oh, okay.

FORBES: . . . that there would be more, probably, Republicans in Westwood than moderate Democrats.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: A la, let's say, Berkeley. There's a different environment. Might be a reason. And, as I say, since UCLA has no Sather Gate, it has no quick spot to gather. You could say you have Westwood Boulevard, but that's a whole lot of parking and stuff.

TRELEVEN: How about leadership, in terms of Murphy?

FORBES: Maybe, maybe.

TRELEVEN: Do you think that . . . ?

FORBES: Yeah, I think that should be mentioned. Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, Santa Barbara.

FORBES: Well, when you think of Santa Barbara, you think of the tragedy at Isla Vista.

- TRELEVEN: Radical students like to indicate. . . . They'd like to indicate at the time that they split the regents. How do you react to that?
- FORBES: I react by saying they failed.
- TRELEVEN: They failed.
- FORBES: Yeah, they didn't split the regents. The regents were together. We didn't always vote together, but as a board we were together.
- TRELEVEN: Anything linear like the students politicize the campus, the campus politicizes the governor's office, the regents become more politicized as a result of Reagan, the governor, and his appointees, which leads to--in turn--to a greater ideological split amongst members of the board? This, again, gets back to, particularly, the Reagan appointees.
- FORBES: Yeah. Well, you can call it an ideological split. The appointees of Reagan usually or almost always voted his position. Most of the regents who had been on the board before Reagan did not follow that line, because, as I look at it generally, we were more supportive of the university than he was. You could debate different issues, and it would be hard always to

distinguish what's right and wrong, but the heart of it was that Reagan was not supportive of the university, generally, and his appointees followed him. I don't mean to diminish the integrity of a Dean Watkins, or a Bill Smith, or a Glenn Campbell, or Bill Wilson. Sometimes there would be a personal understanding of one or two of them. I remember Bill Wilson and I got together on some matters having to do with the budget and money, money owed the university for health services. Now, on that issue Bill Wilson and I were right together and worked hard at trying to straighten a bad situation out. Because the university was trying to operate these hospitals.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, which we talked about.

FORBES: And it didn't have the money because of delays in payments.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Third party and otherwise.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But I don't know, maybe I made the point. I hope I did.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think what you're indicating is on

something like that, a Reagan ally and you could get together and you would be totally in agreement.

FORBES: Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: I think where you began with this, though, was-- if I can paraphrase, and see if I'm right here-- you as a Brown appointee, as a Pat Brown appointee, never felt that you had to vote the way Pat Brown thought about a particular issue.

FORBES: Never.

TRELEVEN: Or Norton Simon sure as heck didn't, I suppose, given his independent streak.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: But . . .

FORBES: I just have to interrupt there and say Pat Brown said to me, "Bill, be a good regent for the people of California." He never tried to influence me or tell me at any time how to vote on anything. Just be a good regent.

TRELEVEN: And if I hear what you're saying correctly, as opposed to that, Reagan appointees seemed to vote . . .

FORBES: Seemed to conform.

TRELEVEN: . . . the Reagan line. What Reagan wanted, they

voted for. It was a difference in the kind of independent thinking and independent voting that you had had at an earlier time. Well, maybe that's what I mean by using the phrase, "the board becoming politicized."

FORBES: Maybe that's what you mean. Yeah. I guess that would be right, if politicized is the word. They conformed to what he wanted rather religiously.

TRELEVEN: Now, I know you had, you know, some other things going on in your life, because all of our lives are complex and overlapping and all of that, but as you moved into the seventies, was being a regent a little less fun? A little less interesting than it had been because of the kinds of, say, Reagan appointees and how their behavior became somewhat predictable? Was it less fun, less interesting, less exciting than it was when you . . . ?

FORBES: Oh, ho, ho! I never once lost my enthusiasm. And it wasn't a matter of fun. There's a lot of hard work all the time. Maybe the seventies and the latter part of the seventies were less exhausting and not as exciting, but the university is such a live entity that you're

continually full of it. I didn't say, "Let's not attend as many meetings. Or let's not do this or that." No, no, no. When I finally resigned a year before my term was up, I think it indicates that I felt a deep responsibility for full participation as a member of the board in university affairs. When my wife became that ill that I couldn't fully discharge all the responsibilities on committees and various things, I felt I was letting the university down. I resigned and asked the governor to name someone in my place. I made a suggestion and never got an answer.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: No response of any kind.

TRELEVEN: Let's move on to Jerry Brown a little bit. Had you known him in any context in the past, while he was secretary of state or before he became governor?

FORBES: Not really, no. No.

TRELEVEN: So Jerry is elected and he comes to, presumably, his first regents' meeting. How did you size him up? Or how did you begin to size him up as you saw him, listened to him, and so on, in the

context of regents' meetings?

FORBES: My impression now is that he did a good job at his first meeting. The regents, I think, generally felt encouraged starting out. Thereafter, we kind of went downhill.

TRELEVEN: Why?

FORBES: Oh, the man, the person, I think. This is a terribly personal reaction, but I think Jerry loves to run for office, loves to run for something, but I'm not sure of his administrative and operational talents. I think he made a lot of mileage out of the blue Chevrolet,¹ but I don't know that it's really becoming to do it that way. Even regarding the incident I just mentioned, my resignation. I had no letter back of acknowledgment. I told him that I specifically felt that I should resign because I couldn't give the time to it that I felt it deserved. He waited, I believe, some time before appointing an eighty-year-old woman [Theodora Kroeber-Quinn], whom I had never met. But I had suggested that he appoint someone who was younger

1. Actually a Plymouth.

and who had had experience and was familiar with university affairs. And had no reply.

TRELEVEN: You didn't have a specific name in mind, you were . . .

FORBES: Yeah, and I'm trying to think of Roger's last name. Served as president of the UCLA Alumni Association, served as an ex officio regent, a successful lawyer, served on the higher education board [Coordinating Council for Higher Education]. Roger. . . . Roger . . .

TRELEVEN: We can fill that in later.

FORBES: Can you?

TRELEVEN: And . . .

FORBES: But I suggested him as an example of the kind of person who could pick up immediately, because he had been on the board, and he was in his forties, then, and would be. . . . Oh, Roger Pettit.

TRELEVEN: Oh, sure. Yeah, I know the name.

FORBES: Yeah. A stalwart. But . . .

TRELEVEN: Well . . .

FORBES: That's just indicative of my reaction, but I sat next to Jerry at a luncheon at the Berkeley Alumni Association building when there were a lot of arguments about our involvement in South

Vietnam, our involvement in owning securities.

TRELEVEN: In South Africa?

FORBES: In South Africa.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I had a little dialogue with a student or two, and Jerry was present, as I recall, and there was no contribution, there was no real understanding of what was involved. As a stockholder of IBM I was able to tell the student about the reports to stockholders about what they're doing for blacks, and a wonderful program. I said, "This kind of effort on the part of the U.S. institutions should be applauded, and we should be a part of it. Did you know that?" I asked the student. He said, "No, I had no idea of that." And I said, "Well, study these issues." But I got no response from the governor.

TRELEVEN: Well, in terms of regent appointees, Jerry had his own ideas about how he wanted to diversify the board.

FORBES: He did.

TRELEVEN: Diversify the membership of the board. I think before you left, he had appointed Vilma S. Martínez, I think just before you left.

FORBES: Just about that time.

TRELEVEN: Yvonne [Brathwaite] Burke just about that time.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And I think . . .

FORBES: The recording David [Geffen, founder of Asylum Records], who has since sold his company for hundreds of millions and has resigned from the board.

TRELEVEN: David?

FORBES: David. . . . Records. He sold out to MCA [Music Corporation of America, Inc.] a few months ago. All right. Yeah, but it was. . . . I did have a visit with him just to try to find out. . . . I don't know what meeting it was or what session, it wasn't a regents' meeting, but to kind of plumb his interest. Someone the other night at a recent meeting indicated that it was not too soon for him to get off, that he hadn't been interested or aware or attended. Well, that's You are doing such a disservice to the state of California when you appoint people to an important board who have no notion of what it's all about and have really no interest in doing a job, when there are so many people from all

around this state who are qualified.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Oh, he. . . . A disaster.

TRELEVEN: I think we're about out of tape, so I'll shut this off.

FORBES: Okay.

[End Tape 13, Side B]

[Begin Tape 14, Side A]

TRELEVEN: But just to clarify where you left off with that statement, I don't think you mean that you--maybe you do mean it, you'll have to let me know--that you're inherently against the idea of diversifying the membership of the board of regents to include representatives of the population that have never been on the board. I'm sure you . . .

FORBES: Not at all, no. I think the governor should appoint the most capable people on the board. Capable. . . . And by capable, I mean knowledgeable and interested enough, who are interested in it and understand it. There's a lot to comprehend about the board. I think that from the standpoint of race, color, creed, I think it's wide open. Membership on the board

should represent all the people of the state. But not someone because of some factor that's involved to be a member of the board, but the best qualified. That would go for a Ralph Bunche or a Glenn Seaborg, two Nobel Laureates.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Or Cho Ming Li. Name just good people.

TRELEVEN: So are you then saying that California is clearly, in terms of various cultures, ethnic groups, colors, it has top-notch people who can be good regents?

FORBES: I certainly am.

TRELEVEN: All we have to do is go out and find them, unlike David Geffen, who hardly ever went to a meeting.

FORBES: Who could care less.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: I'm not really saying that seriously, because I don't know him well enough.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But just on reports that I've had.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Had everyone had his or her own way, the Jerry Brown administration would have been the second installment of his father's great love and dedication to the university, but it wasn't. In

fact, the university financial picture, under Jerry, if anything, deteriorated even further.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How do you account for that?

FORBES: Well, I can't account for it. I can find a letter in my files from Pat saying to me during Jerry's administration, "Bill, let's have lunch together, and maybe we can be of help to Jerry." But Jerry must have been a big disappointment to both his mother and father as president of the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We may want to get back to Jerry in a subsequent session, but let me pull you back into the sixties again, if I could. In the midst of the student upheavals, there seemed to be a rather constant pressure in some quarters to charge tuition for in-state students. The historic position of the regents had been to resist. [Randolph] Randy Collier, assemblyman, was rather constant in his efforts to implement tuition in '64, and so on. But as we all know, it's history now, because eventually tuition began to be charged. What was your position on that whole issue? Students . . .

FORBES: You're not acquainted with it?

TRELEVEN: No, I want your position.

FORBES: Yeah. You're not acquainted with my position?

TRELEVEN: I think in past recordings you've alluded to your position.

FORBES: Yeah. I'll be happy to state it.

TRELEVEN: You'll be happy to state it. And if you want to, please underscore those things that you feel are most important about your position-- how you feel about it and why, about the whole tuition issue.

FORBES: Well, it begins with my start at UCLA, on the [North] Vermont Avenue campus, when there was a \$20 incidental fee for my first semester.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: That was it. I put a nickel in the box when the streetcar went to the end of the line, Heliotrope Drive, and that was the campus. And I didn't have that many nickels. So it starts early on as knowing that if there had been a tuition charge, I may or may not have been able to attend. I got acquainted at UCLA with Ralph Bunche, who was a brilliant political scientist, who later became involved with the State

Department, and because of the treatment of his wife and himself in Washington [D.C.], being black, he elected to work for the United Nations, where he became undersecretary and served wonderfully. Ralph told me that if there had been tuition, which I asked him about during this business of, "Well, we've got to start charging tuition." I asked Ralph. "Well, Bill," he said, "if there had been tuition, I couldn't have made it." And he said, "I had a pretty good job that summer after graduating from Jefferson High School. I had a job reupholstering automobiles. And it was pretty good pay. But," he said, "I went to UCLA."

Then I got acquainted with Glenn Seaborg, who was another Nobel Laureate and co-discoverer of, I guess, the better part of a dozen atoms. Glenn came from an area southeast of Los Angeles, on the other side of Watts. He said, "If there had been tuition, I couldn't have made it." And he said, "As a matter of fact, I didn't get interested in education until the eleventh grade. I had a chemistry teacher who got me excited about chemistry." He said, "From that

time on, I liked studying. But," he said, "I couldn't have made it if there had been any tuition."

So early on, when this tuition matter came along, I had talked to two nobel laureates, the only two at that time that UCLA had. And I knew what they had said to me. Then I read a white paper from the Morgan Guaranty Trust [Company] that said that education was not a cost but an investment. So I developed the philosophy that anyone who had the capacity for study at the university and the desire should have some kind of entrance without borrowing himself into debt. But I wanted equal access to higher education, University of California, for those who could qualify academically and who wanted the education. So I was a foe of any kind of tuition and was consistent, even though as the years passed we moved into registration fees and incidental, other kinds of fees. I voted against every one of them and have seen the position gradually change. I know that there are loans now and some grants and some ways of making it. But I was against tuition and am on any kind of a

state institution.

TRELEVEN: To this day?

FORBES: To this day.

TRELEVEN: Why did it shift? Why did the sentiment shift?
Not your own, but those of your . . .

FORBES: Money needs, the need to raise revenues, lack of
support from Sacramento. Lack of support.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So . . .

FORBES: Lack of understanding. Lack of understanding.

TRELEVEN: By lack of support, the university submits . . .

FORBES: Budgets.

TRELEVEN: . . . its budget.

FORBES: And the only way we can do this is to move our
registration fees up a little bit.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: The state will participate but it won't do this
unless we gotta have some more registration fees.
We've got to have this. We're up now. . . .
Actually, the University of California is a
bargain, compared with higher education
elsewhere.

TRELEVEN: Oh, yeah. And compared to the private schools of
Southern California.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And across the state.

FORBES: That's right. It's a bargain. But I don't want us to lose a Ralph Bunche.

TRELEVEN: How do you feel about . . . ?

FORBES: Incidentally, I just had this kind of It was speaking of him. Why the seventies--and I don't know when he passed away--but why the seventies were just as exciting as the sixties was the fact that Harvard [University], and one other institution, and UCLA were competing for his papers.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We had Mrs. Ralph Bunche, his widow, out here. [Robert G.] Bob Vosper and some of the people in the library said would I come and have a little dinner meeting, and so and so and so. We worked hard and we got the papers from Ralph Bunche.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But there were things like that that were going on that were just fun. Not as noisy as the days of the rebellion, but just as exciting.

TRELEVEN: Do you have a sense that the final and successful push for tuition by the legislature had to with, like, a kind of a punishment to the students?

FORBES: Maybe.

TRELEVEN: Punishing the . . .

FORBES: Maybe, maybe.

TRELEVEN: If the students are going to act up, then they should pay for it.

FORBES: People closer to Sacramento than I would know better on that. But maybe there was a little of that to it. I don't know. But certainly the anti. . . . Certainly the pro-tuition people could say, "Well, look, let them pay for this. They are going to make all this noise and burn up things. Let them pay for it."

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Could be some of that.

TRELEVEN: Specifically, because of people like Randy Collier, who, you know, threatened to introduce bills and, by legislative fiat, introduce tuition. Does it sort of get to a point, then, in this case that the regents would see the inevitable and say, "Well, we are going to institute tuition, because we know . . ."?

FORBES: Yeah. We better move our registration fee along a little bit.

TRELEVEN: If we don't do it, the legislature. . . . And

then you get into the whole issue of . . .

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . who's the cart and who's the horse? Yeah.

Well, the money pays for something. It pays for faculty compensation, salaries, insurance, retirement benefits. I just want to know, generally, the level of your involvement in the evolution of what's become a very excellent fringe package for University of California employees, fringe benefits package.

FORBES: Yeah. How much was I involved in this?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. As a . . .

FORBES: Member of the board?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. As a member of the board.

FORBES: No, I don't have any great comment on that. I think that salaries and fringe benefits have moved along. But they should move along. But I can't be more informative than that.

TRELEVEN: Well, I certainly get a sense that a lot of it was taken care of within the president's office. You know, submitted . . .

FORBES: To the board.

TRELEVEN: Various materials submitted to the board before the meeting.

FORBES: Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: And with always a fairly well detailed. . . . You know, tables, and so on, to. . . . Comparing the university to . . .

FORBES: Well, we would compare with other institutions, such as [University of] Michigan, and so on.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Then we have had and still have this developing problem of when we are seeking new faculty. We have problems about housing.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And the costs at Irvine or Westwood are tremendous compared to where they have been in [University of] Kentucky or wherever. We have to do some things to recruit good people. We've got to have good people. We've got to get them.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Produce the proper inducements.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: But as time has gone on, the cost of housing has become just an enormous problem . . .

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: . . . that the universities at least here, and I suspect on other campuses, are having to increasingly wrestle with.

There is also a great amount of support staff. In fact, I happen to be one of them. Non-faculty staff, and this can range, I think, from librarians to grounds keepers, I guess. Certainly from the time when you went on the board, there was something called the California State Employees Association [CSEA].

FORBES: There was.

TRELEVEN: Some regents were bothered by CSEA. Bothered by unions such as the operating engineers [International Union of Operating Engineers].

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Bothered because these as entities would sometimes go directly to the legislature and complain . . .

FORBES: Make demands.

TRELEVEN: Make demands and complain about the way . . .

FORBES: They are treated by the university.

TRELEVEN: . . . they are treated by the university and the way the regents sliced up the pie.

FORBES: That's one of our problems, that's right.

TRELEVEN: And how they were sort of getting the crumbs off the table compared to other groups within the university. How did you look at this kind of

organized employee activity?

FORBES: Generally, I thought that. . . . I had the feeling that the university was fair with its employees, that it had a good, solid pension system, that. . . . And it troubled me to have to do business with unions. It divided loyalty somewhat. I didn't like it. I thought that the university should be competitive, and I thought we were. I thought we were fair in compensation. I didn't like unionization. I didn't have it in the business that I ran, and I was fair to my people. No one complained, and a lot of them stayed a long time.

TRELEVEN: Well, the university is not a. . . . It's not a terribly well organized campus in terms of the unions.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: Clerical workers unionized about five years ago, AFSCME [American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees] is the. . . . And then the hospital workers, to some extent. But if I recall, Ed Carter in particular was very stridently . . .

FORBES: Opposed.

TRELEVEN: . . . opposed to these kinds of things being done by unions.

FORBES: Well, he would be in a position to make some good observations, because he ran, successfully, a big business [Carter Hawley Hale Stores, Inc.] and had a lot of involvements, and he knew what they meant. When I was at CBS in Hollywood, I negotiated some contracts with the unions, IBEW [International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers] and all. So I know what it is. I think that I-- when it involved the university--I don't like the divided loyalty, don't like the problems. But we ought to be fair.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's always the issue.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: What's fair. [Laughter]

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: It's when a group feels that things are not fair that they organize.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: You have already made your position, I think, very clear about another issue which continues to this day, and that is university investment policy. The most recent concern or demand has

related to South Africa. At the same time, I think within your regency, it didn't just involve South Africa. I think that strident student leaders would say that University of California, if you have any investments in the Dow Chemical Company, you should get rid of those, because Dow is making napalm, and they are dropping it on Vietnamese people. And not to invest in any, quote, "bad corporation," unquote. Is that right? I think . . .

FORBES: We. . . . I don't remember about Dow. I remember reading about it. But that may have been . . .

TRELEVEN: No, I used that as an example.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I'm thinking probably more of the regents of the University of Wisconsin, at that time.

FORBES: Yeah. Well, what I would say about investment policy is that the university was in my day and is today in very good hands concerning investment policy. There is a regental committee, but beyond that, there is an excellent staff headed by the treasurer, [Herbert M] Herb Gordon. From the day of Bob Underhill, we have had an excellent record of investments. And the university was ingenious

in setting up substitute bond investments. I don't know if you are familiar. Bond substitutes, they were called. This goes quite a way back. What bond substitutes were and are are certain electric utilities common stock. It started before my time, but carried on during that time. When the presentation was made originally--and I wasn't there, it was before my time--but they said--it was said that. . . . Now, your yield right now will be less than you get on your bonds, but the history of these electric utilities is that dividends . . .

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Okay, let's pause for a minute.

Before the phone rang you were saying the historic yield on electric utilities.

FORBES: So the historic yield is that they will gradually move up. Their dividends will increase while your bonds will stay even. After a time, your dividends will give you better yield. In addition to that, the history of the utilities is that they grow, the equity value will grow. So the committee was asked by the treasurer's office to start with bond substitutes. It did. And

through the years have added and added and added, and it has been extraordinarily successful. The yields have gone up, stock have gone up, and bonds have been put way behind. It's the best example I know of the quality of work in the investment committee in the treasurer's office. But we are blessed with a fine operation. I get the reports every year and read them avidly and know what they are doing. We have a very sound investment program. Beyond the bond substitutes, at investment committee meetings, the staff will bring in companies that they think ought to be added to our list. By that they are asking the investment committee to approve the company. A General Electric [Corporation], a General Mills [Company], a something, to place on the list. Not for immediate buying, but when the staff feels that the time is proper to buy, they have the approval to begin investing in that particular company. This has worked very well. It's just another good dimension of university operations. The record speaks for itself.

TRELEVEN: Okay. The object is to maximize profit. Is that right? Safely?

FORBES: With safety, yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Invest pension funds, and also endowment funds. You give to the university some money, but god, you want to protect it and you want it to do a good job for the university. So you want it carefully cared for so that it doesn't lose position relation to inflation. So it's invested wisely, intelligently. And we've done a good job. Excellent job.

TRELEVEN: Well, what if I. . . . Say, what if in the sixties I was a concerned student and I really had strong feelings about the university investing in . . . ?

FORBES: Dow Chemical?

TRELEVEN: Let's say Dow Chemical, for the sake of an example.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: But Dow is a good stock to have. Would that . . . ?

FORBES: But you don't like it because of what? As a student.

TRELEVEN: A moral position. The moral position is that Dow is manufacturing something that is doing a lot of

harm to a lot of people, which became evident, of course, with television and the napalm burns on people and all that.

FORBES: Was the napalm burning caused by Dow or by the Defense Department?

TRELEVEN: It was caused by who dropped it.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I mean directly.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: What I'm trying to get at is does the university have a moral responsibility to make judgments? To not only safely maximize profits, but to also invest in so-called decent companies?

FORBES: There are a whole lot of decent companies. To answer your question, I think it's a good question. I think that the university record will show that it has invested in decent companies. Could you push that thing off for just a minute?

TRELEVEN: Sure. Sure.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. We paused to look at a publication . . .

FORBES: The treasurer's report as of last June.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Treasurer of the University of California.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And you were showing me the list of blue chips.
Is that right?

FORBES: The list of the chips. A good many of them blue chips that the university has invested in through the years, and show a fine increase in equity value and dividends.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, for. . . . Well, let's take me as an example. In par to what you are saying, it would be much more difficult for the university to provide salaries, fringe benefits, like they do without investments like this? In other words, don't these investments to some extent underwrite the cost of salaries, fringe benefits, and so on?

FORBES: Yeah, they underwrite certain costs of the university. These investments provide the pensions for university personnel. These funds grow as the years go by and as personnel of the university increases. Because they contribute, too, to the pension funds.

TRELEVEN: Right. Okay. Well, I'm sure for the next. . . . For the foreseeable future, there is going to be criticism of the university about the kinds of

investments they make. Probably increased pressure for the university to invest in environmentally good companies, corporations, if the recent past is any kind of prologue.

FORBES: I would say that the university will be looking for investments that will be safe and productive, and those are good criteria.

TRELEVEN: If you want to go on for a minute more, I'd like to turn back to this issue of equal opportunity and affirmative action. In terms of equal opportunity, I think the regents went on record as supporting about 1960. It was right in that Affirmative action came somewhat later, and these involved faculty, staff, students, and so on.

FORBES: Are we talking about quotas of certain . . . ?

TRELEVEN: No. Well, you are nibbling at what I am going to get into though, because the whole issue of quotas, as you know, is very controversial. But the policy of the regents that there shall be equal opportunity and that the regents shall and did--shall implement and did implement--affirmative action measures to set up programs to attract more qualified students from ethnic and

cultural minorities. Then came, in '74, Bakke.

FORBES: Davis.

TRELEVEN: At Davis. A white, male student who claimed he had been subjected to, in effect, reverse discrimination because of affirmative action policy of the regents and carried out by the chancellor of the Davis campus. What do you remember about that situation?

FORBES: If I may take the subject generally, rather than the specific Davis situation . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: . . . but affirmative action, and quotas, and equal opportunity. Can we talk about those?

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Rather than that particular case that went all the way to the Supreme Court.

TRELEVEN: Right. And we know the outcome.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah. But let me go back to my origins with this. The university is dependent on the federal government for a good part of the budget.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: There are politics in Washington, and there are views in Washington. And the university was told that we had to do certain things about equal

opportunity. There was no choice. We had to do certain things about equal opportunity, affirmative action, etc.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Or we would not get federal funds. So it wasn't a matter of what did we think was right? But we had to say, "Well, if we want federal funds, we've got to conform."

TRELEVEN: Okay. So, in terms of building residence halls with federal money, you had to be sensitive to a nondiscrimination policy.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And to get other kinds of federal monies to do various things with, you had to live up to, well, let's say, the Civil Rights Act of 1964.¹

FORBES: Right. Right. So . . .

TRELEVEN: So I understand . . .

FORBES: . . . there are federal laws and federal requirements and ourselves trying to administer a university and, let's say, do right by all people. You get into a situation, and now I'll be specific so I can tell you the whole sequence

1. Pub. L. No. 88-352, § 78 Stat. 243 (1964).

of one. We want to see more blacks in the UCLA School of Law. Well, that's a good idea. Let's do it. What about admission requirements and all that? Well, let's see if we can find some blacks that can be academically rather sound and acceptable and put them in the law school so we will have a bigger percentage of blacks. So it happens. And we did. Graduation came, and they graduated. And then the [California] bar [examination] has to be passed. By golly, not that many passed the bar.

TRELEVEN: Not that many black graduates.

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: So we looked bad compared with Stanford [University], [University of] Michigan, or Boalt Hall [School of Law, University of California, Berkeley], and so and so. So what do we do? Well, we want to open our admission, and we do. We try to do it intelligently, but we get punched in the nose because the results aren't all that we want. What this sequence says to me is that we do the best we can, and we try our best. But it's a continuing, never-ending battle to try to

do everything that we're supposed to do and come out where we want to. We want to have a high position as a law school. It's important to us. We mustn't drop our quality. We must have quality of faculty, we must have quality of students. I personally went to the dean of the School of Law when this happened and talked to him. Murray [L.] Schwartz.

TRELEVEN: Murray Schwartz, yeah.

FORBES: We put our feet up on the table and we talked it out. He said it's a hell of a problem, but this is the way it is. We need this, we need this, we need this. But we will continue to work with it, we'll continue to try to get better. But I guess my view on equal opportunity and quotas and on all facets of, let's say, integrating our society is that we do what is right and we push ahead as much as we can as fast as we can. I've mentioned Ralph Bunche before, but there's no guarantee that a black isn't going to be brilliant, which he was. Ralph Bunche was the reader for my political philosophy class. Professor [John F.] Sly, from Harvard, taught it for a year. Here is this black checking papers for all these whites

in the audience. A brilliant person. So color hadn't anything to do with it. Except that a whole lot of people who were colored haven't had the opportunities that Ralph had to get as far along. And we've got to help push them along.

TRELEVEN: You mean not only as far as he got in college, but in terms of their matriculation even before college?

FORBES: Yes. Yeah, society must start way back, preschool, and give people as much opportunity as possible. It becomes a more and more difficult situation with more single homes, single parent homes. It's tougher all the time. But we must keep on striving to do everything we can for equality.

TRELEVEN: Well, one of the strivings was affirmative action, and the regents thought they had set up a plan that was okay.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And the U.S. Supreme Court says it isn't okay. Which in some ways seemed to be indicating that maybe you have to set up something like a quota system. Yet there's a great amount of controversy over the quota system.

FORBES: That's right. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Coming from various quarters for various reasons.

FORBES: That's right. To me, I don't like a quota system. I like to have the freedom to move as far beyond of a quota. . . . Let's not be restrictive, let's do the best that we can, whatever it is, más o menos.

TRELEVEN: We're going to pause.

[End Tape 14, Side A]

[Begin Tape 14, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. Did you have anything more to finish that?

FORBES: I don't think so. No. No, I rambled a bit, but . . .

TRELEVEN: No, I don't think you did at all. I think you explained your position very well. I suppose the one thing I'd add is this whole area is by no means resolved today, in 1990.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Some . . .

FORBES: No, I think we're going to. . . . Are we on the thing? I think in the nineties, we are going to have the University of California. . . . The state of California is going to be changing from

the standpoint of race and color so dramatically. We've got to move ahead with it and opt for quality. We've got to develop equal opportunity for schooling, as I've mentioned, from preschool on up. We've just got to widen our horizon.

TRELEVEN: Financial disclosure, 1970. Again, this is something that comes about because a state statute [financial disclosure], and there's a little bit of a tussle over, well, does this affect the regents of the university because, you know, we're a separate entity set up under a But anyway, the regents did not win that. So financial disclosure came about. Is my information correct? That Regent Boyd left a little bit early rather than submit to disclosure?

FORBES: Oh!

TRELEVEN: Disclosure of financial

FORBES: I couldn't say.

TRELEVEN: Do you remember that?

FORBES: I remember. I remember that vaguely, but as well as I knew Phil, I wouldn't know if that had anything to do with it. I don't know. I know he

was tremendously generous to the university.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Deep Canyon [Desert Research Center].

TRELEVEN: Right, which we've . . .

FORBES: Bell tower at Riverside.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Et cetera.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But I don't know.

TRELEVEN: What was your position on . . . ?

FORBES: Disclosure?

TRELEVEN: Disclosure.

FORBES: No big deal. If they say you have to do it, you do it.

TRELEVEN: So it didn't . . .

FORBES: Didn't bother me that much.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think at this point I'm going to have to do a little digesting.

FORBES: Fine.

TRELEVEN: And review what all we've covered today.

FORBES: All right. A pretty good day.

TRELEVEN: I think I may have some follow-up questions. I think we will shut off the recorder for now and probably get back for perhaps one short session,

and we'll see where we are.

FORBES: Okay. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Thank you.

[End Tape 14, Side B]

[Session 9, June 13, 1990]

[Begin Tape 15, Side A]

TRELEVEN: June 13, and I'm back with William Forbes.

FORBES: All right. Good morning.

TRELEVEN: In Pasadena. Good to see you again. I think we are probably going to finish up this morning.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: We covered a lot of ground last week, and I relistened to the tapes and I have a number of follow-up questions. Please forgive me if you think you've answered these already.

FORBES: Go ahead.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] You'll think I'm being repetitious. First, I wanted to ask you about a subject alluded to in the Byrne Report: the impersonal and alienating nature of the large university with many students. What do you recall about steps that were taken to reduce that kind of estrangement for students?

FORBES: The first thing that comes to mind is the

movement toward a student regent. I can't give you the exact date that a student regent came on the board, but I think from those days of the Byrne Report on, the board, and perhaps the administration, were much more likely to listen to student opinion.

TRELEVEN: Okay, but in terms of students being on campus, a large campus like Berkeley or UCLA, is a certain amount of impersonality and alienation just part of life at a large university?

FORBES: Oh, yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Just something that one has to accept?

FORBES: Is it a part of life? Yes, it is. It's the way it is. There are some huge classes, and there are some smaller classes. There are an awful lot of students on any large campus walking by each other and never saying, "Boo!" There's a lot of impersonal facets of life. You go into the bookstore at UCLA and it's like a supermarket.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] It sure is. An international supermarket.

FORBES: Correct. Right.

TRELEVEN: Well, if the modern university, or the multiversity, to use Clark Kerr's word, if it's

impersonal for white students, it just seems that those students from nonwhite backgrounds would find it even all the more alienating. I was wondering if you had any comment on that, because in the general context of equal opportunity, affirmative action, and efforts to try and get nonwhite students to campus, it's so huge and so impersonal and it seems like it would be all the more intimidating to brown students, black students, and so on.

FORBES: I would think it is likely that it would be. But being white, I can't really comment intelligently on what the reaction of a nonwhite would be. I would think it would be tougher, by and large. But I don't know for sure.

TRELEVEN: Right. I can't recall how strenuous the efforts were when you were a regent to not only get minority students--as we might call them--but retain them. One thing to get them there, another thing to retain them in that kind of a impersonal atmosphere.

FORBES: Yes. All right, I think you'd find that the record would show that there were extra efforts, such as tutorials, and extra assists to move all

students, particularly minorities, along. And succeed. I have to be that vague about it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Along these lines of affirmative action, I notice that, particularly beginning in the seventies, the architectural firm of Robert [A.] Kennard began to get a couple contracts from the University of California. Kennard is the best known black architect in Los Angeles.

FORBES: Okay, so that would be indicative.

TRELEVEN: What I wanted to ask, though, is this something that was done by the regents purposefully, or is this something that you needed to pay attention to because of federal contracts regulations? Do you recall anything about that?

FORBES: I would say probably both. But it would be the administration who would make recommendations for architects. It might be a growing understanding of a problem in offices, for example. An Elmo Morgan, who is involved in construction.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Another follow-up question from the last session. Which, if any, legislators, assemblypeople or senators, contacted you personally about student rebelliousness? Especially at UC Berkeley.

FORBES: No name comes to mind.

TRELEVEN: Really.

FORBES: Specifically. There might have someone on some occasion, but it doesn't pop out.

TRELEVEN: How about your own representatives here where you're living in Pasadena? You had probably an assemblyperson and a senator.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Never contacted?

FORBES: No. No recollection.

TRELEVEN: Would you say . . . ?

FORBES: Now, I had letters. I had letters pro and con from the public. But not specifically from the legislature.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Are those letters saved in part of what you might turn over to the UCLA Archives eventually?

FORBES: Some letters. . . . I have some material, not on the rebellion but on tuition, that I saved. And that's in the file for the archives.

TRELEVEN: That includes communications with legislators?

FORBES: People who just wrote and said they supported my point of view.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

- FORBES: I did go out front on the tuition issue, and I still feel it. As I read back over some of these letters, there was an excellent letter from Vern [O.] Knudsen about it, which is in there.
- TRELEVEN: Okay. What I'm trying to get at here is, as a regent for that roughly seventeen-year period, to what extent did you have, outside of regents' meetings where a Jesse Unruh would be there, or the governor, what kind of contact, if any, would you have with individual legislators?
- FORBES: The contact I had--and this came on in later years--would be on a special day that UCLA would set up to go to Sacramento . . .
- TRELEVEN: Okay.
- FORBES: . . . and meet for lunch with a whole slough of legislators.
- TRELEVEN: Which they still do. Okay.
- FORBES: And at that time you'd broadly contact.
- TRELEVEN: But outside of that?
- FORBES: No. No, no, no. And I think that's the way it ought to be.
- TRELEVEN: Okay.
- FORBES: I think that the board should set policy for the university and not have continuing contacts with

. . . . It's all right to have them, but they didn't contact us--me particularly. We just went about our business.

TRELEVEN: Okay. A question on partisan politics, specifically the Republican party. You made a statement about your personal strong dislike for the John Birch Society.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Were you implying by that that you believed that the Birch Society philosophy was getting a firmer grip on the California Republican party?

FORBES: I had the feeling that most of the people in the John Birch Society were in the Republican party, and I abhorred it. When I would have solicitations from the party for donations, I would write back and say, "As soon as you speak out against the John Birch Society, I'll consider giving money to the party." It alienated me. I just simply disliked it immensely.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And a clarification. You stated that after your conversation on the airplane with Dr. Murphy, you let both Mr. Higgs and Mrs. Chandler know about that discussion.

FORBES: Correct.

TRELEVEN: And as you indicated also, you were extremely disturbed. You were very disturbed after that conversation. Did it follow that you played any role at all in sort of a behind-the-scenes movement to get rid of Kerr?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Not at all? Okay.

FORBES: No. Except. . . . Well, I think that was. . . . It wasn't behind the scenes, particularly, it was just a realization on my part that if something didn't happen regarding the president, we'd lose Franklin Murphy.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And it was a loss that I could not tolerate.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So is what you're. . . . Leading up to the January '67 meeting that we discussed last week, is what's going on just regent by regent they are falling away from Kerr for individual reasons?

FORBES: I guess.

TRELEVEN: In your case, Murphy. In somebody else's, some other kind of situation involving Kerr.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We had briefly discussed the selection of Charles Hitch to succeed Kerr. Well, actually

succeeded acting president . . .

FORBES: Harry Wellman.

TRELEVEN: . . . Harry Wellman. Were you on that search committee?

FORBES: I can't tell you whether I was or not. I can't.

TRELEVEN: No, you don't know. Okay. And I don't mean quantitatively but qualitatively, how good a job did Hitch do?

FORBES: Excellent job.

TRELEVEN: Excellent?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Why?

FORBES: Because he was a good administrator, the communication between Hitch and the regents was top flight, because his recommendations were sound. In reviewing some of this material in the last few days, I ran across a long statement by Hitch. It was a speech during the days of the student rebellion. He talked out about free speech and what it meant and what decency and courtesy to the speaker meant. It is an excellent document on the subject.

TRELEVEN: Now, Hitch in some ways did not have an easy time. The student rebellion continued, as we

talked about last time

FORBES: That's right. These were difficult times.

TRELEVEN: There was an increasingly powerful number of Reagan regents on the board. I've heard it said that Hitch would stand up to Reagan. Do you recall any instances to support that?

FORBES: No, but I can't imagine him not standing up to the governor.

TRELEVEN: He's that kind of a person?

FORBES: That's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, as long as we are on the presidency, Hitch, in turn, was succeeded by David [S.] Saxon in 1975.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: You don't recall whether you were on that search committee, do you?

FORBES: No, but I. . . . Again, I might have been. I can't tell you. There was Hitch, and then there was Saxon, and then there was Gardner. You know, we talked about David Gardner early on. When he had not been at the University of Utah very long.

TRELEVEN: You mean leading up to Saxon's selection, you were also . . . ?

FORBES: Could have been, but I'm not sure.

TRELEVEN: You're not sure.

FORBES: Yeah. I'm not sure whether that's related.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But at any rate, I was or wasn't on the Saxon committee, but everyone on the board got very involved, as he should, regarding the selection of a president.

TRELEVEN: To what extent had you gotten to know David Saxon before he was selected? He had been Chuck's [Charles E. Young's] executive vice chancellor, of course.

FORBES: Yes, he had been at regents' meetings and in discussions and deliberations. So one gets to know people such as a Dave Saxon readily.

TRELEVEN: I take it you were favorable towards that appointment?

FORBES: Oh, yes! Very. Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: Anything come especially to mind about why you thought he would make a good president?

FORBES: No. No, I felt he had the attributes, and there was no problem on my part being supportive.

TRELEVEN: Were there among any regents . . . ? Bad way to start a question. . . . Amongst any regents, did the issue of Saxon's refusal to sign the loyalty

oath in the early fifties come up?

FORBES: I recall nothing.

TRELEVEN: Did that come up?

FORBES: I recall nothing.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You were on the regents for about two years with Saxon at the helm.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How did that work out?

FORBES: Very well.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I liked him. He did a good job.

TRELEVEN: And he began that. . . . Saxon began his tenure I guess headlong into the Jerry Brown administration.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Not an easy time either.

FORBES: Not an easy time.

TRELEVEN: Anything you'd like to say in addition on Saxon? I know he was not president all that long while you were regent, but I just . . .

FORBES: No, I would just say that he was a good president, handled the office properly, and a good friend personally. Nothing beyond that.

TRELEVEN: It's been said that Saxon had a harder time at

Berkeley presiding because of the sort of ingrown Berkeley crowd, and Saxon, in a sense, was an outsider. That he was from the UCLA campus, and therefore some of the entrenched bureaucrats up there felt he never really fit that well and they gave him a hard time with it. Were you sensitive to anything like that?

FORBES: No, I was not.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: No. Others may have felt that and sensed it. I didn't.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Okay. Again, this is a follow-up. You mentioned again the student regent this morning. Do you recall any regents who were really opposed to that idea of having a student regent?

FORBES: No. No. There might have been some silence, but no. It wasn't. . . . It was a development of the times, and the board correctly realized that more communication was necessary. And that the students as a basic segment of the university society should have some representation.

TRELEVEN: Well, if I were a radical student, I would say, "This is nothing more than tokenism. There's no

vote for the student regent." How would you respond to that kind of criticism?

FORBES: I would respond by saying that it's a step toward better communication and that we want a representative student to whom we could ask questions and who could supply us with answers that we might very much want.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and I gather from what you said before, last time as well as this morning, that you really do see a continuum, starting with the Byrne Report and extending up to the time when that student regent was appointed. Is that accurate? Am I misreading that?

FORBES: I don't think you are misreading it, but you also have to. . . . Something else was happening. At that same time, in '65, we had the war in Vietnam. And we had a changing attitude in the country about that issue. I've said earlier that I think that younger people, students and nonstudents, began to see the correct issue regarding Vietnam well ahead of Washington and the elders and the national administration. It was a sweep toward correcting an attitude. It started with the start of Vietnam, in my view

erroneously. We shouldn't have gotten in there to begin with. And it took us a long time to turn around and get out. Part of that was led by younger people.

TRELEVEN: So perhaps another milepost would have been the eighteen-year-old vote?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: If you are old enough to fight you should be old enough to vote?

FORBES: Yes, that's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: So in that broader context is what you're saying.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Along with the rebellious students were more responsible students who would attend our meetings and listen and offer suggestions. Like the young fellow at the meeting in Los Angeles when we were discussing Eldridge Cleaver's book [Soul on Ice]. He in a very responsible way said nothing during the meeting, but came up to me after the meeting and said, "The authorship was challenged, but I know for a fact that he wrote the book."

TRELEVEN: Right. Which you've mentioned last time, I

think.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: The checking you did and how you determined that he had.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I want to clarify one more thing. You'll have to forgive me if I bring up Phil Boyd and the Byrne Report again . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . but I just want to clarify it for the record.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: You did say last time he was by nature careful and cautious.

FORBES: Phil Boyd?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Was he opposed to the type of balanced investigation and findings that you felt was necessary? Or was he questioning more the procedural manner?

FORBES: He was questioning the procedure.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: At times he would, instead of my making a

decision and moving ahead, he would say, "I think we ought to call the committee together to discuss this."

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I, knowing how difficult it was to get a committee together, would have to decide, "Phil, it just isn't possible." Or, "All right, I'll endeavor to get it. If I can get the meeting, fine. If I can't, I think I'll go ahead."

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: With some matter.

TRELEVEN: So you are the chair and you want to keep this thing moving and get it done. And Phil would say, "We should have a full committee meeting."

[Laughter]

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So.

FORBES: That was all.

TRELEVEN: Okay. All right. Last week also you ranked on a scale of one to ten Pat Brown with a nine to ten, Ronald Reagan with a three to four, and this is in terms of governor's level of support for the University of California. When you said that I totally neglected to ask you, well, where would

Jerry Brown be on that scale?

FORBES: Very low. Very, very, very low.

TRELEVEN: Lower than Reagan?

FORBES: Oh, they'd run a pretty good race.

TRELEVEN: Somewhere in the three to four area.

FORBES: Down there, yeah. Three to four.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Yeah. So negative that at one time Pat Brown wrote a note to me saying, "Let's get together for lunch, and maybe we can figure out some way to help Jerry."

TRELEVEN: Okay. This was another follow-up question after listening to the tape.

FORBES: Right. I didn't do it.

TRELEVEN: You didn't do it?

FORBES: No, I didn't.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: A matter of fact, I didn't think it would be useful.

TRELEVEN: Up to the time you left the board, did Jerry soften at all, in terms . . . ?

FORBES: Soften?

TRELEVEN: In terms of . . .

FORBES: It would be on different issues?

TRELEVEN: . . . support for the university in general.

FORBES: I don't know. I think the thrust was negative. Well, let's just say it wasn't positive. It wasn't supportive as his father was. A vast difference in attitude.

TRELEVEN: What is your explanation for that? Jerry's seeming lack of support and lack of leadership when it came to the University of California?

FORBES: I think Jerry loved to run for office. He liked to have issues, he liked to do things differently, such as his residence, such as the Chevrolet or Plymouth that he drove.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: He was an oddity.

TRELEVEN: How often would he show up at regents' meetings?

FORBES: Oh, I didn't keep a clock on it.

TRELEVEN: No, I know. [Laughter]

FORBES: I don't know. He. . . . I could only say some of the time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Did he, like Reagan, have an entourage when he came to the meetings?

FORBES: He may or may not have. I don't think I noticed.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Back to Reagan, again, another follow-up question. You mentioned last time that as things

evolved, a number of regents could be counted on to vote the way Reagan desired.

FORBES: Correct.

TRELEVEN: That's my paraphrase of what you were saying, and I hope that's accurate.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Would it be fair to conclude that most of you pre-Reagan regents, with perhaps an exception or two--maybe like Rafferty--but fair to conclude that most of you pre-Reagan regents found yourselves fighting increasingly a defensive battle? In support of the university against the growing power of the Reagan appointees?

FORBES: I'd say that's true. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: In the context of the politics within the regents, did the pro-Reagan appointees jockey kind of aggressively for the important committee assignments? Do you remember any of that?

FORBES: I don't recall that. No. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, where was [Harry R.] Haldeman in all of this? He . . .

FORBES: Haldeman . . .

TRELEVEN: He, like you, was an ex officio regent.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: UCLA Alumni Association. But at that time was he a pro-Reagan vote?

FORBES: Oh, I wouldn't say that, no. No. Bob Haldeman had and has a lively interest in the university and was supportive of the university on everything that I can recall. No. I wouldn't consider him a Reaganite, or anyone. . . . Well, that would be my vote, my guess. I would feel very comfortable about talking with Bob on any issue that would come up, knowing that there would be a thorough and interested response. Good man.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, were I an advocate of Reagan and the philosophy that, you know, various entities of government have grown too large, and there's too much fat, and it's got to be cut, why shouldn't the university have to also cut? Because you had a tremendous expansion period in the sixties, and it couldn't go on forever, could it? So, if I wanted to take the Reagan line at that time, why shouldn't the university also have to do its duty, say, to the taxpayers by doing a little cutting back?

FORBES: The university at all times should be responsible

to the taxpayers and should take a good look at staff, at programs, and forgo anything that is likely to be considered excessive. That's right. I think facts will show that while we added three campuses when there was a big increase in enrollment, that enrollment continued to increase.

TRELEVEN: That's right. It surely did.

FORBES: So we had to have bigger budgets and more support. One must remember that the university can be criticized in such a way as, "Well, the professors don't teach that many courses, and they are doing too much research. They are off doing anything but being in the classroom." But there can be a vivid response to that. By way of illustration, Regent Canaday, at one time, asked a Nobel Laureate, Dr. Melvin Calvin [professor of chemistry; associate director, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory], this question: "Dr. Calvin, I wanted to ask a question. How much time do you actually spend in formal teaching?" His response is something we could put in the record if you wanted to go that deeply, but it is a perfect illustration of how a gifted person works an eighty-hour week for the university and for

higher education. Finally, he asked Regent Canaday, after perhaps a 250-word explanation, "Does that answer your question?"

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] How badly did Reagan hurt the university? All told, during his governorship?

FORBES: Difficult to measure that.

TRELEVEN: I know it's difficult to measure.

FORBES: Extremely difficult. But we were hurt budget-wise.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We didn't get funds for an issue that on Grounds and Buildings Committee I kept yipping about, and that's deferred maintenance. We didn't take care of our property. There are many ways of injury, and I can't measure it.

TRELEVEN: Well, it seems what you're saying is that you can't measure it over the eight-year period, because if you're deferring maintenance on existing structures . . .

FORBES: But that's just one example. But whether it's support for important classes or projects. We were required to do without and do with less. When education, in my book, is an investment rather than an expense, it hurts all the people

of California, it hurts the state. And I think the state was injured.

TRELEVEN: Okay, now, there were some suggestions by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. They had these various study committees and so on. There were suggestions that might improve the efficiency and, therefore, ostensibly, lower costs. One was the observation that most teaching takes place from eight to five. And why not have night classes? Why not have Saturday classes to utilize more frequently the facilities?

FORBES: The facilities.

TRELEVEN: It never seemed to happen. It certainly has not happened at UCLA in 1990 to any great extent. Do you have any recollection of that? Discussions about that, implementing something like that?

FORBES: Well, we had many studies on year-around education and the greater use of the facilities. When you get right down to it, it's a push as to whether or not it would be useful from the standpoint of productivity. You have then an acceleration of people, you've got to have more people to do that work, to do the

teaching. So your overhead goes up there. It's questionable in my view whether. . . . Let's talk about year-round studies on a full basis, whether it's the Los Angeles City school system or a university, whether or not it would be really efficient. I have my doubts.

TRELEVEN: So on a cost-benefit basis . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . it sounds better than it really looks when you begin examining the figures.

FORBES: I think you'd find that.

TRELEVEN: Well, I know the idea of the trimester system was kicked around.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: UCLA did implement a quarter system with a summer session attached, which it has to this day. Faculty, I think, likes it better than the students, but that's another issue. Now, Berkeley was also slated to do that and didn't. Berkeley is still on the semester system.

FORBES: Okay. And Berkeley might be right. I can't say.

TRELEVEN: But I guess that was deemed also as a way that, well, students could get more of the courses they wanted because they are stretched over three

periods instead of two periods as you have with the semester system, and so on. So, again, that was kind of along the lines of how to make the teaching enterprise more efficient. But it sounds like you well remember all kinds of studies along those lines.

FORBES: Yes, there were, in those days of budget corrections, let's say, we did a whole lot of studies on that. As we should.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: As part of our job.

TRELEVEN: Right. No, and I've seen some of them. Geez, studies relating to comparison of salaries and benefits between University of California and other leading universities. Studies like that to not only just sort of look inward, but to compare UC with other institutions.

[End Tape 15, Side A]

[Begin Tape 15, Side B]

TRELEVEN: I was wondering this morning whether you might just share with me some personal impressions of a number of regents that you served with. We've already talked about several in various contexts. I remember Regent McLaughlin you sort

of laughed whence his love for red tile roofs.

[Laughter]

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Certainly Phil Boyd has come up in a number of contexts, and Ed Pauley. What I'm really not looking for, I'm not looking for some sort of ranking from one to ten. That isn't what I have in mind. But I just wanted to go through the names and just see what pops into your head.

FORBES: Fine.

TRELEVEN: If there are some specific things that you'd like to mention, fine. We're still dealing with tapes here that are not going to be available for 2000. So, okay. Glenn Campbell. We're going to do this alphabetically. Or should I start from the bottom? [Laughter]

FORBES: That's all right. Glenn Campbell wasn't one of my favorites. A typical . . .

TRELEVEN: We'll pause for a minute.

[Interruption]

Okay. Before we were interrupted by the phone, you were beginning to tell me about Glenn Campbell.

FORBES: Well, Glenn isn't one of my favorites. Reagan

could count on him for his vote every time. He would deny it, but I don't think his heart was in the university, really.

TRELEVEN: John Canaday. We just mentioned him a minute ago.

FORBES: Yeah. John. A real stalwart. He understood the university, he supported it. Top person.

TRELEVEN: How did he react to those Reagan years?

FORBES: Thoughtfully. He regretted them, I'm pretty sure.

TRELEVEN: Ed Carter.

FORBES: Outstanding. A good man. Served a long time, as you know, on the board, and with great distinction. He was a good regent.

TRELEVEN: I understand that his demeanor was. . . . He really wouldn't say much at regents' meetings, but when he did say something . . .

FORBES: I think that's right, yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: He didn't speak unless he thought it was important to speak, or some such.

FORBES: Of course, I don't think. . . . I can't recall anyone who was known as a talkative regent. I think we were deliberative.

TRELEVEN: Who would you say was the heir apparent to Edward

Dickson? Carter or Pauley? In terms of impact, in terms of influence on the board of the type that, of course, Dickson had.

FORBES: Oh, it's a fine line, but I'd probably say neither. I'd say they are both great, but Edward A. Dickson was on a pedestal, really.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: He was an outstanding statesman. And I don't mean anything negative toward either Ed Carter or Ed Pauley by that. They're just different. There isn't any heir apparent.

TRELEVEN: Well, I was thinking in terms of who emerged as the strong southern regent, which, of course, Dickson had been for forty-three years, until '56.

FORBES: Oh, they both were strong. They both were strong.

TRELEVEN: Speaking of strength, Dorothy Chandler.

FORBES: Outstanding. Outstanding person. Was thoughtful, creative, a good, solid member of the board.

TRELEVEN: What was her reaction when things began to shift a little bit from Pat Brown to Reagan? Do you recall?

FORBES: I wouldn't want to guess her reaction. I could guess it, but I wouldn't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay. William Coblentz.

FORBES: Strong, intelligent member of the board. Thoroughly devoted to the university. His own man. He'd speak out on issues. A good man.

TRELEVEN: He was on your committee, right? Yes.

FORBES: Yes. Yeah, he was on that committee.

TRELEVEN: The Special Forbes Committee.

FORBES: We worked on a number of committees together.

TRELEVEN: Fred Dutton.

FORBES: Fred Dutton, a little bit of an unusual personality. A very bright person who didn't make as many meetings as he should. He wasn't always in attendance. Different. A little illogical at times. A good man. I liked Fred.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] I'm curious, though, by what you mean not by illogical. . . . What's the earlier word you used? Gosh, I lost it.

FORBES: Different.

TRELEVEN: Do you want to expand on that?

FORBES: No, you'd really have to see him in action to really understand. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Okay. [Laughter]

FORBES: But we saw eye-to-eye on a whole number of things. And not at all supportive of anything that Governor Reagan wanted, which was good.

TRELEVEN: Fair to say that Dutton was one of the most liberal, politically liberal people on the board?

FORBES: Yes, I think so. Yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Robert Finch, for a little while.

FORBES: For a little while. Bob Finch was . . .

TRELEVEN: As lieutenant governor.

FORBES: Yeah. Supportive, good man.

TRELEVEN: Speaking of lieutenant governors, [Lieutenant Governor Mervyn M.] Merv Dymally was there during your last several years.

FORBES: Yes. Yeah. Not my favorite. He would vote a certain way, and when I challenged him a time or two, quietly and after a meeting, I found that he readily admitted that it was for political reasons that he had voted a certain way. He wasn't one of my favorites.

TRELEVEN: Okay. He seemed to think politically.

FORBES: Yes, oh, sure.

TRELEVEN: When issues would come up.

FORBES: There was a matter concerning Santa Barbara one time that I became poofed about. I talked to him

later about it, and he said, "Well, don't pay any attention to that. I had to vote that way politically." Well, you know. Which is more important in my book?

TRELEVEN: Allan Grant.

FORBES: Good man. Intelligent, knew his field very well. I liked Al.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Catherine Hearst.

FORBES: Catherine was quite a character, and quite different, and too inclined to get caught up with Ed Teller and Glenn Campbell on issues that weren't really in the best interest of the university. I say it quite candidly. And I like Catherine very much. She's a delightful person, but too doctrinaire in some areas.

TRELEVEN: In an interview that's on the shelf already in the state government series, the interview is with Gladwin Hill¹ who was the L.A. correspondent for the New York Times . . .

FORBES: Yes. Good reporter.

1. Gladwin Hill, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1987 by Carlos Vásquez, UCLA Oral History Program, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.

TRELEVEN: And covered the regents' meetings regularly. He had a recollection that the regents would be discussing some important issue, and Mrs. Hearst would make a comment that was . . .

FORBES: Irrelevant?

TRELEVEN: Irrelevant or did not even relate to the subject under discussion. Well, that's something he remembered in his own interview.

FORBES: That could happen.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Elinor Heller you've talked about quite extensively. I take it she's another one of the more liberally inclined people on the board at that time? Or what would you say about her?

FORBES: Well, all I would say about Ellie is that she was a top-notch member of the board. She had her own mind; an excellent, thoughtful, hard-working, member of the board. She thoroughly deserved to be the first woman chairman. I say this, it's quite personal, but I was on a small committee to recommend to the board the next chairman. I had some Reagan votes against me, but I would not say no. I pushed the committee to recommend Ellie Heller. I feel very happy about having done it. Good person.

TRELEVEN: DeWitt Higgs, San Diego, who, incidentally, is
. . .

FORBES: Good. "Dutch" Higgs, a fine member of the board,
thoughtful, supportive. Good man.

TRELEVEN: I hope to get in touch with him. His name is in
the San Diego phone book.

FORBES: DeWitt Higgs.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. He's probably about your age, about the
same age.

FORBES: Probably about.

TRELEVEN: Hoping to . . .

FORBES: He hits the ball right down the middle of the
fairway. Ask him about his golf. And I want him
to know.

TRELEVEN: All right. Good. I hope to get in touch with
him later this summer. Let's see. You had
another lieutenant governor, here, [Lieutenant
Governor] Leo [T.] McCarthy.

FORBES: Yes. Supportive. I didn't get to know him too
well, but I like him. Good man.

TRELEVEN: And we have a few speakers here, [Speaker of the
Assembly Robert T.] Bob Monagan.

FORBES: Yes. Good man. Solid citizen. Good man.

TRELEVEN: Okay. [Speaker of the Assembly Robert] Moretti.

FORBES: Yes, and I would say he was supportive. I didn't know him too well.

TRELEVEN: Okay. While we are on speakers, why don't we . . . ?

FORBES: Jesse [Unruh]?

TRELEVEN: Tell me about Jesse. Everyone has a Jesse story.

FORBES: Oh, sure. Sure. Well, he was full of stories, and a good man. He understood the university. He was, of course, terribly political. He was a political animal. But fortunately, he knew the university, liked it, and supported it in his own inimitable way.

TRELEVEN: I've gotten the idea he supported education partly because of his own background and very humble origin.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: From the bottom up?

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: What happened? What happened on the board--if you can remember anything about this--when Jesse is still on the board and Reagan gets elected governor. Would they clash at these meetings?

FORBES: I have no recollection of a clash, although Jesse, I'm sure, would look for an opening.

TRELEVEN: Nothing you remember specifically, though?

FORBES: No, no.

TRELEVEN: Let's see, we have Samuel Mosher, who . . .

FORBES: Sam . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . joined the board back in '56.

FORBES: That's right. He was on the board when I came there. A delightful person, a good friend. Supportive of the university.

TRELEVEN: Ed Pauley we've discussed, I guess, in various contexts.

FORBES: Outstanding.

TRELEVEN: His overall contribution to the university was . . .

FORBES: Oh, yes. Devoted to the university, devoted to UCLA. He would walk the campus, I'm told. Just because of his interest. Looking, observing. But Ed was a devoted excellent member of the board.

TRELEVEN: Max Rafferty, who was . . .

FORBES: Max Rafferty was all right. I was never enthusiastic about Max. I think he had interests elsewhere.

TRELEVEN: Greater political ambitions or something like that?

FORBES: Yes. Yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: That was your impression anyway.

FORBES: Different drummer.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. What was your impression of [Lieutenant Governor] Ed Reinecke?

FORBES: Ed Reinecke was a supportive member of the board. I liked him. I thought he made some good contributions.

TRELEVEN: Was he independent-minded, even though he was Reagan's lieutenant governor?

FORBES: I would think so, yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And Wilson [C.] Riles was the superintendent of public instruction.

FORBES: Outstanding person. Again, there's a person who understood education, understood the university, was supportive. Good man, good man.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Bill Roth.

FORBES: Excellent man. Bill Roth was an intelligent, thoughtful, and an excellent member of the board.

TRELEVEN: Joined the board about the same time you did.

FORBES: I think a little later.

TRELEVEN: A little later. That's right. After your ex officio term.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: William French Smith.

FORBES: An extremely intelligent person. In the Reagan web, his personal attorney, but a bright person who supported the university. But not to the extent that he might have had he not had the political ties that he had. But I liked him very much.

TRELEVEN: Still in practice at. . . . What is it?

FORBES: Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher.

TRELEVEN: Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, yeah. Jesse Tapp was only there a few years during your period.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: But what do you . . . ?

FORBES: Extremely quiet and supportive. I don't recall too much about Jesse.

TRELEVEN: Dean Watkins came up during our last taping. I can't remember the context.

FORBES: Dean Watkins?

TRELEVEN: Watkins.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. He was a Reagan appointee, and a reasonably supportive person. It's strange how Smith and Watkins and Campbell and a few would vote, and yet I think of them as understanding the university and liking it. But some reservations. But I liked Dean personally very

much. A nice person.

TRELEVEN: I guess what you are saying is he tended to be a supporter of Reagan's position.

FORBES: Yes. That point of view.

TRELEVEN: Okay. There's one name that I'm going to come back to in a larger context, which is Norton Simon. I'll delay that a few minutes, because I want to tie that in just a little later in our discussion to the campaign and to the museum.

FORBES: Fine.

TRELEVEN: Oh, gosh, I forgot [Lieutenant Governor] Glenn [M.] Anderson.

FORBES: Glenn Anderson. It's easy to say that he, as lieutenant governor, was on the board a long time and was extremely supportive and understood what the university was about. I liked Glenn very much. He had a sensible approach to things. He's now in Congress [House of Representatives].

TRELEVEN: Right. In fact he was acting governor during the Watts rebellion.

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: Pat Brown was out of the country. Glenn had to deal with that. He's having a freeway named after him, down by the airport. That's the most

recent thing, I guess, that I've read about him. Some researcher someday is going to accuse me of missing somebody here, but I think we've pretty . . .

FORBES: You've done a pretty good canvas.

TRELEVEN: We've pretty well. . . . I appreciate those little insights that . . .

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: If we had a couple more years, we could probably reconstruct and get into great detail about these people's positions on various issues and so on.

FORBES: We could.

TRELEVEN: Well, maybe I'll come back and we'll get into that. Just a couple more specific questions. Somewhere around '75 Reagan and Campbell were pushing for the development of a National Humanities Center at the university at San Diego. Does that ring a bell at all?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: No, I can't imagine why, but I don't recall it.

TRELEVEN: Well, the only thing I could think of. . . . Well, it was to be in conjunction with the [National] Academy of Arts and Sciences. And I

didn't have time to look up that organization. I was guessing it might be some sort of right-wing think tank.

FORBES: I wouldn't know.

TRELEVEN: Such as the Hoover Institution up at Stanford [University]. But it doesn't ring a bell? Okay.

Several times in the seventies, Carter would come to regents' meetings and he would question whether these long faculty promotion and tenure lists had to be included with the material he was receiving and you were receiving as a regent. Why do these lists have to continue coming? And Campbell said, "Oh, we should keep the lists. I pay attention to them and I read through them." Do you recall those lists coming? And do you recall that issue coming up?

FORBES: Yes. This was a routine. This was a routine. I think the genesis of that was that certain appointments had to be approved by the board. We needed background material about the candidates, and it would be impossible, really, for a regent to understand thoroughly all aspects of each appointment. So to that extent it was routine. Now, whether or not we should have such lists or

not, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Well, if I recall right, this seemed to hark back to the late sixties when there. . . . It isn't that there weren't such lists before, but they were never so extensive. And then they became very extensive.

FORBES: The thing that occurs to me now in 1990, as you mention this, is Glenn Campbell's interest in having the lists . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: . . . is the fact that he was director of the Hoover Institution and was looking for various people. Sure, he'd be interested.

TRELEVEN: Looking to hire them, or looking to get rid of a few?

FORBES: Both.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Let's come back to UCLA. We left last time Chancellor Young and President Hitch being overridden by the regents. That is the majority of the regents. You were in the minority on the Angela Davis situation. Let's update it, though. At this point, in 1990, Chuck Young has been a chancellor for well over twenty years now. Chuck's very forthright, and I think

he'd be the first to admit he's made his share of mistakes. But how do you size him up?

FORBES: How do I size him up?

TRELEVEN: Looking over his chancellorship.

FORBES: In a very positive way. The board appointed him on the recommendation of Franklin Murphy, who had seen Chuck for eight years as his assistant. So we took Franklin's recommendation, and I'm very glad we did, because he was right. Chuck has been outstanding in developing the UCLA campus. By that I mean he has improved it and widened it academically. He has had so many problems in an environment as complex as Los Angeles and Westwood to deal with, and he's kept his feet on the ground. He has been a tremendous person in fund-raising. Extremely active. I can't say too many good things about Chuck. I think it's been a fine administration.

TRELEVEN: Well, early on when he'd have situations such as the faculty center demonstration at the regents' meeting . . .

FORBES: Oh, you mean when we had the rebellion?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, when pebbles were going against the window and all. How did . . . ?

FORBES: No fun.

TRELEVEN: How did Chuck react in a situation like that? Or how did he react at that time to that particular situation?

FORBES: Oh, all I can say is that as I recall, he answered properly as a beleaguered administrator. By that I mean he tried--not tried--he kept his cool. We had the regents, on one hand, that were in danger to some degree. We had campus police. We had, maybe, outside police. But he handled it well. But it was a very difficult situation.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And in '72 there was an antiwar demonstration at UCLA. Of course, police being called on the Berkeley campus had become commonplace by '72, but it had never happened at UCLA until May of '72.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: I guess the question is how did you feel about that when you heard the news that the outside police had been called onto the UCLA campus?

FORBES: Well, I would say that if the chancellor or the chancellor's office called the outside police, it was probably because they were needed. That

campus police were not adequate to quell whatever was happening. I don't have any knowledge of the details, but I would guess that Chuck handled it properly.

TRELEVEN: I bet you hoped you'd never see the day when police would have to be called onto your alma mater's campus.

FORBES: Well, that's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But one has to remember that when fifty thousand people come and go on a campus every day, it's a big operation. In a complex society, a whole lot of things can happen.

TRELEVEN: It was several years after the Angela Davis situation that Chuck and President Hitch again raised the question to the regents about the chancellor's assuming authority for appointments and promotions, which the regents had taken away. Do you remember that?

FORBES: It would be a hazy recollection now.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Is that incident the time when there was a vote and I voted to support?

TRELEVEN: I do not have a . . . I don't have a conclusion

to this.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: In fact, in future interviews with Chuck, this whole area has to come up. It's like an update to this, an update to, god, an update almost to the Byrne Report. I guess the key question being to what extent do chancellors now run their own campus and take the appointments and promotions.

FORBES: And how much, really, did the Byrne Report cause the statewide administration to decentralize in some areas?

TRELEVEN: That's right. That's right. And stay decentralized.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: In terms of authority, in terms of budget and budgeting process. Well, I wanted to ask you one more thing. . . . Well, several more things on the UCLA campus specifically. One was the [James C.] West Alumni Center, which was completed in late '76, just about the time that you had to decide to leave the board. Were you involved at all in that fund-raising effort?

FORBES: I really wasn't. No. No, I was not one of those who made that possible. Naturally, I was

delighted to have a person, glad to hear that there was a person who could fund that. It's a fine part of the campus now, but I can't take any credit for being a part of that fund-raising operation.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I suppose I was thinking in the sense that you were still a regular attendee of the past presidents' meetings [UCLA Alumni Association] and this must have been an exciting thing to be developing in the association.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Yeah, yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: And [James A.] Jim Collins and [Robert W.] Bob Kerr, I guess, were two of the major donors.

FORBES: Jim Collins and who?

TRELEVEN: Kerr.

FORBES: Bob Kerr?

TRELEVEN: That's the name I've picked up.

FORBES: Bob Kerr goes to an era back before me. There's one Bob Kerr that I think of.

TRELEVEN: I'm going to have to find out who it is.

FORBES: It might be another. But Jim Collins has been a stalwart in supporting and enlarging UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, at the time this was proposed, Chuck pointed out that the alumni office had

increased the amount of gifts received from \$7.7 million to \$11 million from '68-'73. And in the same period, the UCLA Foundation funds went from \$500,000 to at one point \$3 million. And what's going on? Chuck really seems to have a great talent in this area of fund-raising.

FORBES: This is right. It's been my observation that he has done a great job.

TRELEVEN: Any personal insight into why he does so well in that area?

FORBES: No, I think it would be wonderful to ask him that question. He has to have great devotion and love for that part of accelerated growth. From where we operated when I was president of the Alumni Association, in '59-'61, in tiny quarters, with a tiny staff and a tiny budget. Something as I look back on, it was probably an error on my part not to push it harder for expansion. Because the expansion came later. But we didn't expand it as much as we should have. Those were the days when Harry Longway was the executive secretary or director. But I'm getting away from your question. But Chuck Young had a grasp of fund-raising and really moved ahead. It was a time

when the economy was good and the friends of UCLA multiplied. And I give Chuck great credit for that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I'll bet you never dreamed you'd see a, what, a \$300 million fund-raising effort.

[Laughter]

FORBES: No. You wouldn't dream. . . . No.

TRELEVEN: That's just incredible.

FORBES: At the time of Pauley Pavilion, when we were trying to scrape up money for that, I went to the board and said that part of it would be that the Alumni Association would endeavor to raise \$1 million. And someone on the board said, "Regent Forbes, do you think you can?" And I said, "I don't know. We think we can, and we'd really like to try." So they went ahead with the proposition, and that's one of the reasons why Pauley Pavilion came to light.

TRELEVEN: Well, we could get into this area of, you know, outstanding donors.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Which, again, we're not going to be able to. You know, John [E.] Anderson being one of the later people.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Topa Equities, [Ltd.], new management building.

FORBES: Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: Jules and Doris Stein, the [Jules Stein] Eye
Institute [at UCLA].

FORBES: Wonderful. Right.

TRELEVEN: And this new structure that was just completed at
LeConte and Westwood: Doris Stein [Eye Research
Center] . . .

FORBES: Addition.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Whatever the. . . . Is it called the
Forum? I think that was the original. . . .
Which was about a fifteen-year effort. And just
a question I want to ask, though. I mean, I'm
leading up to a question, and that is were you
ever involved personally in any of this hard
negotiating that UCLA had to do with the Steins?

FORBES: With Jules Stein?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: On the eye institute? Hard? No.

TRELEVEN: Or the later building?

FORBES: No, no. I know that Jules Stein. . . . I knew
him as a great friend of the university, of UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And devoted, would give great amount of time. For instance, there was a day when the graduating seniors could explore various walks of life. UCLA pulled people from various areas to visit with students who were interested. And here was a panel of Jules Stein and Bill Forbes talking about advertising and promotion and radio and television and so on.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Here was this quiet fellow, head of MCA, sitting there answering questions of students. A devoted. . . . But I didn't get into hard negotiations on the eye institute. I recall vividly attending the opening, or inauguration of the center, when people from all over the world came to pay respects and to see what UCLA had. It was a great donation. And both Jules and Doris are great friends.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, that latest building. . . . Well, it's in that area where the medical school started. Right on that corner of LeConte and Westwood. So they have been generous donors and kind of tough bargainers.

FORBES: Okay. Fine.

TRELEVEN: But millions and millions . . .

FORBES: You see, Chuck has had a whole lot of tough bargainers.

TRELEVEN: Yes, that's for sure.

FORBES: And he still persevered. That's why I give him great credit.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. Within, as we've talked about before, this quite limited space as well. It makes it even more difficult.

One thing I wanted to cover on the list that you had just put together off the top of your head way back before we began these interviews, you listed "Rodin's Walking Man" in the sculpture garden, and I wanted to. . . . I think that means you wanted to say something about it.

FORBES: Well, yeah. I thought that was an interesting I think this is an interesting incident. I believe I was one who, on the Alumni Council, said we ought to show our appreciation to Franklin Murphy for what he's done for UCLA. This was long before there was any hint of him leaving UCLA. We simply wanted to thank him for good work. Somehow it came about that we should look for something in the area of art because of

his interest in art. It might not have even been that specific. But Bob Haldeman and I decided that we'd make a date with Norton, because of Norton's knowledge of art and Norton's knowledge of Franklin's appreciation of art.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I'm going to have to interrupt just a second.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: Sorry.

[End Tape 15, Side B]

[Begin Tape 16, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay. We're back on. You were consulting with Norton Simon.

FORBES: Bob Haldeman and I made a date to go over and see Norton one afternoon and just say, "Look, the Alumni Association wants to do something for Franklin. Have you got any thoughts on what we might do that would be right?" Norton turned the tables on us and said, "Well, if the gift can be The donor can be anonymous, the UCLA Alumni Association can give Franklin Murphy The Walking Man, Rodin's Walking Man. But I don't want my name mentioned." Well, that was a ten-strike! That was wonderful. And we accepted

that forthwith. And that's how it came about. Actually, on the award night of the Edward A. Dickson Achievement Award, given to the alumnus of the year, that was the time that Franklin Murphy was given this sculpture. Maybe that was the start of the Sculpture Garden. Maybe it wasn't. But to indicate that we were on the right track in such a gift, Franklin was that interested in art that he has a sculpture garden at UCLA named after him.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And it's unusually beautiful.

FORBES: Excellent.

TRELEVEN: Not only beautiful but functional.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: It's a nice quiet area, full of . . .

FORBES: That's right. And you see students having lunch and talking . . .

TRELEVEN: Yep. Studying.

FORBES: . . . and visiting . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: . . . and walking. It's great.

TRELEVEN: Well, whether or not The Walking Man started the garden, it certainly was a great addition to it. Outstanding addition to it.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay. A couple other areas quickly in regard to the UC system which I just wanted to ask you what you remember about them. One was patents. Here's my way to sneak in a question relating to the University of Wisconsin. At one regents' meeting you suggested the possibility of UC, the University of California, devising a university patent model that was sort of based on the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation [WARF] patent model.

FORBES: I wonder where I got that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. It doesn't come to mind right now, though?

FORBES: No, it doesn't.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall why you were thinking at that time in terms of this whole area of patents back at that time?

FORBES: It would come to mind now as well as then that a university deep as it is in research of all kinds would have an input on patentable things. And that the university. . . . It might be useful to a university system to gain monetarily from that. Just to widen education that much more. I recall an incident where Mazda, the Japanese

motor company, came out with a totally different kind of engine. Berkeley acquired one, the engineering department at Berkeley. And I went to that department, saw the engine running, and talked to the people about this as maybe a successor to the usual engine that we have in most of the cars. Well, it never worked out to any great extent. There were gasket problems and so on. But I simply was interested in furthering any development, patents, patentable ideas, for the good of the university.

TRELEVEN: Well, a lot of good. It means millions of dollars.

FORBES: That's right. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall the issue that came up about studies centers?

FORBES: Studies . . .

TRELEVEN: Centers. This was really an outgrowth of student activism in general and minority student activism specifically in the sixties. What resulted then were centers for Chicano studies, Asian-American studies, Afro-American studies. Is this something you were close to in any way as these developed? Or . . . ?

FORBES: I was aware of these developments, but I wasn't in the forefront of pushing anything.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Perhaps you were not . . .

FORBES: Native Americans were interested.

TRELEVEN: Native Americans. Later women's studies.

FORBES: That's right. Sure. All sorts of studies.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. But you weren't . . .

FORBES: I wasn't in the . . .

TRELEVEN: Educational Policy Committee, I suppose, is the one that would have . . .

FORBES: Well, yes. It would come there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I mentioned women. Certainly, that's another outgrowth of the activism of the sixties.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Suddenly, there was pressure on the university, beginning in the early seventies, to hire more women faculty. And at least consider more women for high-ranking administrative positions. Rosemary Park at UCLA I think was the first woman . . .

FORBES: Outstanding person!

TRELEVEN: First woman vice chancellor in the UC system

ever.

FORBES: Great, great person.

TRELEVEN: Yes. We've done a nice interview with her.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: Recall any of the regents discussion related to
. . .

FORBES: That? No.

TRELEVEN: . . . more, especially more women faculty at that
time?

FORBES: No, no specifics. I'd just point out that the
first student regent was a woman.

TRELEVEN: Right. Yes, I think you had mentioned that
before.

FORBES: I had.

TRELEVEN: Associated Students. What is the legal
relationship between the Associated Students on
each campus and the regents?

FORBES: The legal . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Better ask a lawyer.

TRELEVEN: This issue came up in the sixties, you may
remember.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Came up at Riverside over the student government

deciding to do something and the chancellor saying you can't do it. It came up at your regents' meetings in the sixties when the Associated Students voted to use some of its funds to bail students who had been arrested out of jail. It seemed to. . . . And I think the Byrne Report kind of refers to this. You talked about these murky lines of communication as well as authority, and student government was an area that you got into.

FORBES: I'd leave the legality to the lawyers. I'd say that the Associated Students are--whether official or unofficial--the Associated Students are a part of the university. They're on campus, they have to do with the student segment of the university. Their goals should be the advancement of the university. Once in a while there were aspects of the relationship. . . . I remember rather early on there were funds that the Associated Students or the Alumni Association had for investment. They had a separate investment policy and a separate investment operation. The usual investment area of the university was not used. The treasurer's office

was not used. They had another entity to handle their investments. Now, whether they still have it or not, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: I don't either.

FORBES: But it would be something to be looked at. I know some of the people who were involved at that time. But it would bear scrutiny.

TRELEVEN: Big operations now.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: ASUCLA [Associated Students of UCLA], its gross is I think at this point about \$70 million a year.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: That's a rather large company.

FORBES: Yes, it is.

TRELEVEN: Sitting there in the midst of the campus.

FORBES: Yes, it is. Such things as the bookstore.

TRELEVEN: Bookstore, all the clothes.

FORBES: A big operation.

TRELEVEN: Vending machines.

FORBES: Tremendous.

TRELEVEN: Eating facilities.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: A campus monopoly, as it were. [Laughter]

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Just a little bit on CCHE. You reminded me that you had served a stint, I think, on a . . .

FORBES: Several.

TRELEVEN: Several stints. And . . .

FORBES: This was the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

FORBES: Usually meeting in Sacramento. It was trying to keep proper liaison and educational aspects of the state in tune between the university and the state colleges, or the state universities and the community colleges, who all had representatives. Then there was a staff that headed it up, and we would have frequent meetings. A member of the board of regents was a member of that. It was just an extra chore that someone needed to do, and I did it for a good many years.

TRELEVEN: Do you remember roughly the period you were I must say I

FORBES: Oh, let's call it. . . . Let's just say late sixties, seventies. All through.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And

FORBES: But in the seventies maybe.

TRELEVEN: Is this an appointment that would be made in the same way that a regent would be appointed to an internal regents' committee? In other words, would the president of the regents ask you if you wanted to serve on CCHE?

FORBES: They did. Oh, yes, it would be officially done.

TRELEVEN: Now, we. . . . Go ahead.

FORBES: We got even into discussions on the Coordinating Council as to. . . . At least the Coordinating Council's attitude toward athletes who would be students of, let's say for example, a UCLA or a Berkeley, and the policy of the university toward accepting 2 percent or 4 percent of its incoming class on let's call it an academic waiver or an academic level less than the ordinary requirement.

TRELEVEN: I see. Right. I understand what you mean.

FORBES: Such things as that would come to the Coordinating Council. Not necessarily for action but for review. I remember that issue came up two or three times.

TRELEVEN: By then, by the time you got there, let's say it was the late sixties and seventies--and I'll find

the dates when I look in the CCHE materials--was the animosity sort of rung out of the relationship between UC and the state universities?

FORBES: Well, let's just say that we kept our elbows in, and each segment was watching out for itself.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you were there . . .

FORBES: A competitiveness to a degree, just trying to help higher education.

TRELEVEN: So you, as a representative of UC, never forgot that you were looking after the interests of UC on the Coordinating Council.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And the representatives from the state . . .

FORBES: I'm representing the UC system, sure.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall if there was any major issues that threatened UC? That were bothersome to UC at that time?

FORBES: No. No. No, not that threatened us. It might have been slightly bothersome, but things were usually under control pretty well. I would report back to the president and the chairman of the board on anything that was of any significance.

TRELEVEN: Well, we could probably spend two hours on CCHE if I did a bunch more researching and dug into the issues.

FORBES: But it wouldn't add up to that much, really.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Any other major impressions, recollections you have of CCHE?

FORBES: CCHE? No, no.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, let's turn back to the regent we forgot temporarily: Norton Simon. It's probably unlikely that there will ever be an oral history interview with him, so it's only with interviews with you and another series we're doing at UCLA, not for state government, but UCLA with Harold [M.] Williams, that we hope to fill in a few things about him. As I say, it's unlikely that we'll ever be able to get his own personal recollections.

You developed, it seems to me, an appreciation for him and perhaps even a very strong friendship with him during the sixties. Why were you drawn close to Norton Simon?

FORBES: Well, it developed very naturally at the first meeting that Norton attended.

TRELEVEN: Regents' meeting?

FORBES: Regents' meeting. He was appointed a member of the board of regents, and the first time he was invited to something was a dinner of the regents, University House, Berkeley. And he was alone. No one knew him. Well, maybe some people knew him, maybe they had some ideas about him, but I remember that when we were seated, there was a place next to him. And I said, "If it's all right I'd like to sit down here." As we had this conversation I recalled to him that once I was new on the board, and I needed some questions to be answered about transportation, about what hotel we stayed at, just little mechanical things that would come up that he would either have to ask somebody or be told. So I think that from the first meeting he felt that I was someone he could turn to and say, "What about this? What about that?" I just wanted to make him comfortable, have him feel at home. It just developed from there. But a different sort of person and a great person and a fine member of the board.

TRELEVEN: You said "a different person" before. Can you specify just a little more?

FORBES: Well, I think he went to Berkeley for six weeks as a student and then left the university. I think that's right. I read it someplace. I never asked him. But that would indicate a different kind of person. He was his own man. He has a tremendous capacity for knowledge of various sources. He was a wide person who was sensationally successful in business, who took such an interest in art that he became an expert in art. He not only bought Rembrandts, but he could discuss intelligently framing of a picture. A [Jacques] Lipchitz, or one of these. I remember one time, this is a little later during the campaign, we had a little time one afternoon. He said, "I've got a date to go out to the [Los Angeles] County Museum [of Art] and talk to [Kenneth] Ken Donahue about something." Did I talk to you about this?

TRELEVEN: No, no.

FORBES: And he said, "Would you like to go along?" I said sure. So we went out to the County Museum, and there was a specific problem regarding the cropping and the framing of something. There had been some work done, and Norton wanted to take a

look, and so did Donahue. In my lay view, they talked at an equal level in art, which was a compliment to me to see Norton be able to do that. Then I've had him show me certain techniques on some of the paintings that were in his home. He said, "You see how that floor level becomes that wall? And where does it become?" He said that was a technique developed by so-and-so and when. So he not only acquired a great mass of art, but he learned about art.

He wrote a memorandum once to all regents. This is on a totally different subject, but it was concerning higher education and finance, and the value of higher education economically to a country. He said, "This is the best statement concerning this subject that I've ever read, and I am asking that it be sent to every member of the board." He had wide vistas. He had profound opinions about politics and about people. A very unusual person. I have quite a bit of material that you could look at and see that would illustrate how broad his gauge is.

TRELEVEN: Back many weeks ago, you decided you'd like to postpone any more discussion about Irvine until

we doing a tape that would be sealed. What did bug Simon about the Irvine campus situation as it was developing?

FORBES: I think he feared a conflict of interest on Ed Carter's part between the Irvine Foundation and the university. Ed Carter was in the complex situation of being on both boards.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: And was there a conflict of interest? I feel that Norton alluded to it in meetings. He would push for decisions or delays because of that. That's what I sensed. That there was a problem in Norton's mind about Ed Carter.

TRELEVEN: Who would push for delays? Carter? Carter would push for delays, or Simon would?

FORBES: Simon might push for a delay instead of doing something. "Well, let's delay this and let's do some investigating." And it would be difficult. It would be difficult for Ed Carter.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: To weigh the balances, weigh the scales.

TRELEVEN: Well, on one hand the regents are trying to get the best bargain for the university.

FORBES: And the other hand the Irvine company . . .

- TRELEVEN: Irvine is trying to get the best profit they can.
- FORBES: . . . trying not to give the house away. Yeah.
It was tough. It was difficult.
- TRELEVEN: Did it go beyond that, though? Beyond that, was there kind of an animosity between Carter and Simon?
- FORBES: Oh, I'd say. . . . I'd say on a continuing basis there was some difficulty between not only Carter and Simon, but Pauley and Simon. [Laughter] Ed Pauley wouldn't call him by his right name. He'd call him "Simons." He put the "s" on. He'd call him Simons. And "What's he getting at?" And so and so. Friction.
- TRELEVEN: How did Simon react to the so-called Reagan board?
- FORBES: I'd say he probably looked at Reagan a good deal the way I did. The Reagan board, you mean his appointees?
- TRELEVEN: His appointees and those who were loyal to him.
- FORBES: It would be probably correct to say that we probably voted the other way most of the time.
- TRELEVEN: Generally speaking, you and Simon? Is that what you're saying, that you and Simon both would vote the other way?

- FORBES: Yeah. And I would say Bill Roth and Ellie Heller and Bill Coblentz. There were five or six of us-- Dutton, when he was there--who would usually oppose . . . [Laughter]
- TRELEVEN: [Laughter] . . . the others.
- FORBES: The other side, yeah. Sometimes we had the support of other regents and sometimes we didn't.
- TRELEVEN: Okay. Then back to you. So you were a colleague, as a member of the regents. Did this develop then into more and more of a personal friendship as well between the two of you?
- FORBES: Not really socially. Not really socially, but we were good friends. Yeah, we developed into good friends. I could show you a personal letter from him that would illustrate that.
- TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, what I am leading up to here is Simon's decision in 1970 to enter the primary race for U.S. senator against the incumbent, George [L.] Murphy.
- FORBES: Right.
- TRELEVEN: I guess before turning to you personally, what was your understanding about why Simon decided to throw his hat into the primary race?
- FORBES: Oh, this is public knowledge, and he stated it at

the time. He thought that the Republican party could do better than to have George Murphy as senator. He tried very hard to get Bob Finch to run for the office. I think that Bob Finch equivocated a little for a while and indicated to Norton that he might consider it. But during the last week, when Norton called him repeatedly, Finch. . . . Bob did not say he would run. Finally, in a desperate, really a desperate effort to get him to run, Norton said, "Bob, if you don't run, I will!" He thought for sure that would push Finch over, but it didn't.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

FORBES: So he ran for office. And he made a. . . . We were in a board meeting on a Friday afternoon, and he asked [Robert] Bob Reynolds if he had any money that he could loan him. He asked me if I would loan him some money, because he had to go file for the office, and they wouldn't take a check.

TRELEVEN: Oh, no!

FORBES: They wouldn't take Norton Simon's check.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: So between Bob Reynolds and Bill Forbes, we

raised enough money so that Norton left the meeting early to go to someplace and file for the office. And we met for another hour or two. Then on the way home to Pasadena on my car radio I heard the news that Norton Simon had filed for the senate. I turned off the freeway and drove over to Norton Simon's home. Lucille [Simon], his wife at that time, was there, and Norton hadn't arrived yet. There were two or three others. So pretty soon he came along, and we started talking about this campaign. Discussed it for some time. Then I went on home. And after an hour or two the phone rang, and Norton asked what I thought about this and this and this. So we talked for a while. About 9:00 the next morning the phone rang again. Norton was asking what I thought about this. And I just said, "Well, why don't I come over?" So that was the start of the campaign. We put on a vigorous campaign of about three months. Traveled around the state, ran a lot of ads. Tried to get him to become a United States senator.

TRELEVEN: Your official position in the campaign was?

FORBES: Well, close the. . . . Turn the thing off.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Well, we just . . .

FORBES: Well, you asked a question of what I did in the campaign?

TRELEVEN: Right, what your function was.

FORBES: My function was to do anything that needed doing. I was active, of course, in my own business, the Southern California Music Company, but my routine was to go to my music company office in the morning and do anything that was needed to do in a short amount of time and then go out to campaign headquarters and do anything that was necessary there. Norton appointed [Sanford] Sandy Wiener as his professional campaign manager. Sandy was based in San Francisco, but spent a lot of time here, of course. He gave us professional advice and recommendations on how to do certain things-- developing newspaper advertising, radio advertising, appearances. We traveled around the state, Fresno, San Francisco, suburbs, and put on quite a campaign. [Laughter] Norton said he wouldn't know what to do if he happened to be elected.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: But he was showing the Republican party that Murphy was too far to the right and it needed a breath of fresh air.

TRELEVEN: I was going to ask . . .

FORBES: That was the issue.

TRELEVEN: Right. I was going to come back to that, whether it was the fact that it was Murphy's ideology, or whether Murphy was sort of a buffoon, ex-song and dance man that was an embarrassment to the state, or a combination of the two.

FORBES: I don't know what Norton would say to that. I think he felt maybe the ideology. But it was an interesting campaign. He got, as I recall, about a third of the votes, which is a whole lot of votes for someone starting from absolute scratch, no political background whatsoever.

TRELEVEN: Well, at the time, though, were you a little disappointed? Let me restate that. On election eve, because of the polls and all that, did you have any sense that Norton stood a chance?

FORBES: We didn't. . . . I think we did not expect to win. But we had a very gala situation the night of the election returns. I had gone out to the

Century Plaza [Hotel] and rented a room for him for headquarters up top. There's a presidential suite on the west side, and it was not available. And there is a vice presidential suite on the east side of the hotel, which is exactly the same except that it is six inches smaller in width because they wanted to have it a little different. But the suite had a great amount of space and very comfortable, fine quarters, as you can check some time. We had a headquarters down below where the election returns were coming in. I went down there. Norton didn't, of course. He was upstairs with Lucille and a few others, family. I'd talk informally to reporters as the . . . And did the usual things that you do in a campaign. I had never been in such a situation before, but I made a few friends down there.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Very nice people.

TRELEVEN: Was there . . . ?

FORBES: We finally wrapped it up and, after a reasonably late night, we went home. It was over.

TRELEVEN: Was Marcia involved in the campaign at all?

FORBES: Who?

TRELEVEN: Marcia [S.] Weisman. Norton's sister.

FORBES: She might have been with him a bit, but not with me.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: One person who was involved with me, a [Katherine] Katie Gates here in Pasadena.

TRELEVEN: Oh, sure. I recognize the name well.

FORBES: You do? Delightful person.

TRELEVEN: The old Pasadena Art Museum.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: She was very involved in that.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And Pasadena Art Alliance support group.

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: Right. Just in general, where did most of the campaigns probably come from?

FORBES: Where did the funds . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Oh, Norton, yeah.

TRELEVEN: He pretty much . . .

FORBES: Yeah, there might have been some money raised. We raised a little money, but peanuts.

TRELEVEN: By and large his own money.

FORBES: It was out of his pocket.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Sure. Incidentally, Steve Roberts, who was with the New York Times at that time, came out and interviewed Norton and some of the people around. And he did an extremely interesting story about it. Steven Roberts today is on "Washington Week in Review" very frequently. No longer with the New York Times. But same person. And I have a copy of it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Good. Did that end your career as an active participant in campaigns?

FORBES: In politics? Yes.

TRELEVEN: You never . . .

FORBES: No, I . . .

TRELEVEN: You never did it again.

FORBES: No. No, this was a personal issue.

TRELEVEN: Personal favor to Simon?

FORBES: Yeah, sure. No, I haven't been in any such activity since. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Sounds like . . .

FORBES: We enjoyed every minute of it. It was fun. We were in a home someplace somewhat south of San Francisco, and maybe I've touched this before,

but it's kind of worth repeating now that we are in confidentiality. But Norton. . . . It wasn't a fund-raiser, he had to get acquainted with a few people in a home there. And it was the night that Nixon announced his incursion into Cambodia.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Well, this was something. We were now going into Cambodia. And it was on television so people knew about it. Fred Dutton--now this is kind of funny--Fred Dutton [Laughter] was Norton's adviser. Now, Fred Dutton is a moderate to liberal Democrat.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, that's what I thought.

FORBES: But, no problem. He was a key adviser to Norton.

TRELEVEN: Let's come back to this and we will turn the tape over.

FORBES: You need to change it?

[End Tape 16, Side A]

[Begin Tape 16, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay. Fred Dutton?

FORBES: Fred Dutton, a liberal, moderate Democrat, was one of Norton's key advisers on strategy. So when this happened in the middle of this evening

of talking to people, well, what does the candidate think? What is his point of view on what Nixon has just done? So we didn't know just how to play this. So we borrowed the telephone out in the hall and called Dutton. We had quite a discussion about strategy. And the decision was that we would "waffle it." That we would say that we want to study this very carefully before approving what the president's done or disapproving. We want to think it over. So we waffled it. But this was an amusing incident in a--from our point of view--a very vigorous campaign. That's just an example.

TRELEVEN: Well, you obviously look back on it with great fondness.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Sure.

TRELEVEN: The record shows, of course, that Murphy was vulnerable, because he got beat in the general election by John [V.] Tunney, who was a Democrat.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: So . . .

FORBES: So it was in a good cause. Probably, if Finch had run, Finch might have licked Tunney. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: See, if he had been nominated.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, in '74 Simon asked you to join the board of trustees of the Norton Simon Museum, which he had recently purchased from the . . .

FORBES: Let me pick you up right there a little bit.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Because there was a museum of modern art there.

TRELEVEN: That was the last name of it, yes. It was a new building built by the Pasadena Art Museum. Then near the end they changed the name to Pasadena Museum of Modern Art. You know, this is sealed from me to the year 2000, too. When Norton took the museum over, it was known as--and is known to this day as--the "Norton Simon takeover." The museum had built a new building, they were deeply in debt, there was no way to get out of debt, and Simon offered to buy it. It became not a contemporary art museum but a place, except for the Galka Scheyer Blue Four Collection, became a place for Simon's own collection. That's my understanding of it.

FORBES: Well, let me pick that up at that time.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: One day I was playing golf with my friend John Poole, who was on the board of the Pasadena Museum of Modern Art. We were walking down the first fairway, and John said, "I wish to hell your friend Norton Simon would take over this thing. We really want to get out of it." Well, now, that happened before Norton bought it or acquired it, let's just say.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: I said, "This is none of my business. Whether Norton is going to do something about this is up to him totally." But after a while it came out that he had acquired it. And it was need of help, in need of help. What do I mean by that? Well, I mean that the museum was closed and it stayed closed for a long time. There were areas near windows where the floors had buckled because of water seeping in. It needed extensive help.

TRELEVEN: It had really fallen into disrepair. Serious disrepair.

FORBES: That's right. The lighting was up there, and it was totally inadequate. It strikes me that Norton didn't open the museum for about eighteen months. I'm not sure about how long it took.

TRELEVEN: That's sounds about right.

FORBES: But he spent a whole lot of money in fixing the physical structure. Then we restudied the lighting and so and so. And so the actual operation came much later. The operation of the museum. But Norton finally had it in order. And I think from the start Sara Campbell was a curator. An excellent, excellent judge of art and of Norton, because she was a very patient person who was perfectly willing to have certain paintings there one day and over here the next day. As Norton and his pursuit of the best possible presentation endeavored to put together a fine museum, which he certainly did.

TRELEVEN: Well, the collection is outstanding.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: One can read criticisms of the [Armand] Hammer collection, but one does not read any criticisms of the Simon collection, but . . .

FORBES: It goes to the basics that Norton knew and knows art and what is quality and what isn't. He acquired a great volume of material, whether it's the Degas dancers, the miniatures, the Rembrandts, Rousseau, Zurbarán, Matisse, Manet,

Monet. It's just an outstanding collection. We on the board enjoyed participating in this.

TRELEVEN: Well, why did you want to be on the board?

FORBES: Why did I want to be on the board?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, obviously he asked you to and you were a friend of his, but . . .

FORBES: I'm a resident of Pasadena, five minutes away. Norton invited me to do this. It was an easy thing to accept. He knew my limitations as a person who knew not that much about art, but one who enjoyed the environment of that museum.

TRELEVEN: You'd have board meetings. Did you really discuss and decide substantive kinds of things, or was Simon really calling the shots?

FORBES: Oh, this is his museum.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: We acted a good deal like most boards act, I think. We offered input. There were operational, mechanical things that board members would do. But the thrust of the museum was Norton.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So, all in all, a pleasant experience. And you stayed on the board, I think, until '79.

FORBES: Stayed on the board five years. There were some

changes. And there had been a lawsuit. You may know about. . . . There were three members of the board.

TRELEVEN: Oh, yes. That's right.

FORBES: [Alfred] Alfie Esberg and . . .

TRELEVEN: Alfie Esberg.

FORBES: Gifford Phillips.

TRELEVEN: Gifford Phillips.

FORBES: And one other. But they challenged some things. That dragged on for a long time. Finally, Norton was totally vindicated in that by the court.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. That's right. It had to do with past gifts of contemporary materials.

FORBES: Right, yeah. But it was a nuisance thing.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: So I lived through that. And [Robert S.] Robbie Mac Farlane, Jr. was. . . . I don't know if you knew Robbie, but Robbie Mac Farlane was a good friend of Norton's. And he was his--I don't know what the title was--but he was a "major domo" for a number of years. That was a pleasant relationship, because Robbie is an outstanding person.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Anything you'd like to add about Norton Simon as a regent or as a builder of an art collection?

FORBES: I think you've already had the impression that I'm an enthusiastic supporter of what Norton did for the university and for art. I speak in highest terms of him and Lucille, his first wife, and later Jennifer [Jones Simon], who was a delightful person. When she became chairman of the board of the museum, she demanded that I sit right here at her right so that she would handle the structure of the meeting properly, asking for. . . . Calling it to order, and asking for comments, and asking if there is further discussion, asking if she is. . . . "Ready for the motions, ready for the vote. All those in favor say 'Aye.' Contrary? So ordered." But she was a little nervous at that time, but she did a good job, and I did help her a time or two. Very nice.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think it might be said that both pretty substantial donors to some specific areas at UCLA, especially in medical and health sciences, they have been pretty hidden. But there is, for

instance, a Simon chair in the psychiatry department [Norton Simon Chair of Psychiatry at UCLA]. That's not well known.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: But both Norton and Jennifer have been very supportive in that area.

FORBES: Well, Jennifer got interested in certain parts of medicine. As I was looking through my material, this surfaces at times. She has been interested. And they have had great tragedies, each one, in their families.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I think in terms of--as we wind down here--there is an area that I call long-term trends in regard to UC and the governing board. I just wonder if you have any comments on some of these. These are areas that I seem to identify over the period of your regency, and in some cases, these trends may extend beyond.

FORBES: Yes. There are a number of things that come up periodically for review. One of them is the operation of the scientific laboratories at Los Alamos and Livermore.

TRELEVEN: Right, which is just come up again.

FORBES: For the government. Right. In a personal note

from Norris Bradbury, who is director of the Los Alamos laboratory for a number of years, is this sentence. And this is indicative of the university's role. Now, I quote Norris here: "It is my own very strong feeling that this backing has been an integral part of the strength of the laboratory." Now, he's referring. . . . And I guess I should. . . . Maybe I should read this whole thing. "Thank you very much for your extremely kind letter. May I just turn the tables a bit and thank you for all the support and backing which the regents of the University of California have always given both me as an individual and Los Alamos as a part of the university. It is my own very strong feeling that this backing has been an integral part of the strength of the laboratory." I think that's important to mention, because from time to time people say, "Well, what are we doing in this?" Here is an observation from a director of Los Alamos, who states it very succinctly, that the university has been extremely useful. Now there may be others.

TRELEVEN: Good.

FORBES: But this comes to mind as one example of the long-term look.

TRELEVEN: Right. It's an area that is controversial every time the contract is up for renewal.

FORBES: Controversial every five years.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: There will be some people who will say we have no business there, and others who will say this is a good operation and it's been in existence since 1946, the end of the war. After we had done an outstanding job in the days of a Bob Underhill and real veterans of the university in developing this miserable bomb. But someone had to do it, and the university was a part of it.

TRELEVEN: Right. On a previous session that we had, I raised this whole question with you, and your response was very clear in terms of how you feel about this entire issue. Certainly, another continuing issue is the cost of medical education.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: By '76, I think, if my notes are correct, about 23 percent of the university's total operating budget was being spent for medical education. A

necessary investment?

FORBES: A necessary? Yes. Yes. When such entities as the county of San Diego or Sacramento--or whatever county it is up there--will say, "Look, University of California, take over our medical operation, our hospital operation," when a school of osteopathy, here in Los Angeles, really was a forerunner to the medicine at Irvine, we're called upon to function. In the delivery of health services, the tremendous costs involved because of the findings and the developments in medical treatments makes the entire situation extremely costly.

Then politics gets involved in it on a national level. Do you want to provide for your own services through Medicare and supplement it with Blue Cross and pay quite a sizeable fee four times a year? Or do you want to join such entities as Secure Horizons, and for \$2 or \$3 go to a physician that is suggested by this organization? Well, I talked to a friend of mine who is a retired brain surgeon, and I said, "Look, what is happening to have this great disparity in costs of delivery of health services? Should I

go with this \$2 or \$4 thing?" He said, "Well, it depends on whether you want to go into socialized medicine." Because it's the United States government that's paying these entities, the Secure Horizons, the difference.

Last week we went to dinner with some people who are not in the best health, and one of them has just acquired some kind of a breathing apparatus that is very helpful to her that she uses a couple times a day. It has given her great relief. And it costs \$175. Well, she was about to buy one when she asked the Secure Horizons people if they could acquire it for her. By golly, they could. So now she has a \$175 instrument, maybe paid two or four dollars for it. But the rest of it we are all paying as taxpayers as part of socialized medicine. It all goes back to the high cost of the delivery of health services. Costs are going up, equipment is going up, facilities require more advances. That's why we have a great deal of construction at UCLA now.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And you may remember this from when you were a regent, the leasing of space. At UCLA,

mostly by health sciences, by '77, about forty thousand square feet being leased. Partly because of the bad budgets that you had to deal with, and construction cut off and so on. But how do you feel about the legislature in providing a so-called fair share of the expense to the university for providing medical education? I suppose what I am asking is, over the long run, how successful were you and the regents in getting a fair share of that support money from the legislature?

FORBES: We struggled. We struggled. An example of that-- and I'm repeating--but it's when we would perform services and then not be paid until our accounts receivable got to the area of \$50, \$55 million. So while we were asking the state to support us, we had people to whom we had given service who hadn't paid us. Over a period of time the state recognized that and did develop some means of giving us money in lieu of the money that we had to wait for or never get. It's a continuing push. I think the best way for the university to operate their medical departments is to have the best possible person to head the medical

operation up and then get the best people we can get to watch costs, to provide everything that's needed, within reason. We need to get people who can tell the story to the legislature, to the federal government, so that they will understand. Understand the university.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's a sizeable chunk of the total budget.

FORBES: That's right. Tremendous.

TRELEVEN: The trend is likely to continue. It doesn't seem like it's . . .

FORBES: I don't see any way. . . .

TRELEVEN: Another trend has to do with the size of legal counsel. Back when you started there may have been a head counsel and a few assistants. Today the legal staff, systemwide, as well as on individual campuses, has grown enormously.

FORBES: Do you have the current numbers?

TRELEVEN: I do not have the current numbers.

FORBES: It has grown because there is more legal activity.

TRELEVEN: More legal activity.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Which means, I guess, that more people end up suing the university for one reason or another.

FORBES: Well, that's right.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: There are more lawyers. We manufacture them.

TRELEVEN: We haven't been immune from that. CESA
[California State Employees Association] sued the
regents once over a proportion of . . .

FORBES: Who did?

TRELEVEN: CESA, California State Employees Association.

FORBES: Oh. Okay.

TRELEVEN: That had to do with the apportionment of funds
available for raises. Its members felt like you
regents did not provide them enough money. That
was the basis of the suit. It was dismissed
finally. But it looks like that's a trend that
will continue also.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: It looks like the number of nonwhite participants
in the university at all levels is going to
continue to increase.

FORBES: Oh, there is no question about that. Just as the
state numbers will change. Oh, yes. Yeah. The
university will recognize those changes. Here we
have a new chancellor at Berkeley [Chang-Lin
Tien] with, what, an oriental background?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: We had a top person at Riverside who was Mexican or Latino [Tomás Rivera] and taken by death at a very early age. But he was an outstanding person, and we had recognized a good person. That's what we should. . . . We must continue to get the best available people, no matter what their race.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. After Bakke, the only option left was, apparently, to seek out--vigorously seek out--qualified nonwhite students, faculty, because you couldn't set up a quota system and you could not lower the standards to discriminate.

FORBES: I've discussed that.

TRELEVEN: You discussed that last week.

FORBES: Yeah, previously.

TRELEVEN: The Bakke.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I suppose the role of women is a trend we can expect to continue. Women in the classroom, in higher echelons. Tuition, your favorite subject, tends to be raised every year. Students . . .

FORBES: I think I said--a little note--that I am still against it. I could ask the rhetorical question

of, "How many people have we missed since we have had tuition? Is there a Ralph Bunche or is there a Glenn Seaborg who is doing something that he might not have been doing if he had had the opportunity?"

TRELEVEN: Right. But the option is really to, what, raise taxes and get more money out of the legislature and decrease tuition? It doesn't seem politically very likely, does it?

FORBES: No. No, I don't. . . . I think we move in odd ways in society. Again, I would emphasize that education is an investment. I could ask the question, well, if we should have tuition for the university, for the state colleges, what about grammar school? What about high school? Let's have tuition. Is it all right to provide an eighth-grade education to people and not provide higher education? We're talking about the need for skilled people. On the television this morning there was some discussion about the situation in Orlando, Florida, which is a problem to them, now, because of the Walt Disney company's work there. It's brought in a whole lot of employment for inexperienced help:

McDonald's, various services. But, this person said, this does not provide higher salaries that we need to raise and pay for families. Where are we going? A good many questions asked.

TRELEVEN: Intercollegiate athletics, especially at UCLA, I think. Back in '60 the regents' consensus was that athletics would follow the Ivy League model in terms of the relationship between academics and athletics. How well has that ideal been followed in the last thirty years?

FORBES: Tell me more about the attitude of the Ivy League. I wasn't aware that . . .

TRELEVEN: Very high academic standards. Ivy League schools tend not to be . . .

FORBES: Tend not to have spring practice for football.

TRELEVEN: Tend not to be minor leagues for professional teams.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: What I'm getting at here is obviously the big business aspect of intercollegiate athletics, and how you feel about it.

FORBES: One of the presentations that I made. . . . Well, the one presentation that I made to the board of regents before I was even president of the Alumni

Association, in 1956, was to break up the Pacific Coast Conference for certain reasons.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right.

FORBES: That was successful. But in the sixties I once suggested to Franklin Murphy, just quite informally, I said, "What about having a conference of Berkeley and Stanford and UCLA and Princeton and Yale and Harvard, maybe Penn State? Institutions that have high academic standards. And have such a conference as that?" I said, "In the old days it took two days to get to Idaho for a game or to Washington state. Now we can fly across the country in a few hours. Why not have this?" And Franklin's reaction was, "Well, no, remember the University of Chicago. [Chancellor Robert M.] Hutchins decided no athletics, and there were great problems thereafter." Well, the University of Chicago is a very good institution now, but it's not in athletics. What I'm driving at is that in the sixties I don't believe we developed, whether on a regental basis, statewide basis, or on UCLA, an attitude toward keeping away from being the farm clubs for the pros. I think we went in the

other direction. And business has been good. We've had reasonably good coaches, improved facilities until we have fabulous quarters in the John Wooden [Recreation and Sports] Center [at UCLA] for athletic endeavors of all kinds. Our tennis complex [Los Angeles Tennis Center at UCLA] is great. And we're the farm club. It's something that is too bad, I think. I think there's going to be a day when a fourteen-year-old girl, Jennifer Capriati, could retire on her \$5 million that she has through endorsements before she even hits one tennis ball professionally. I don't know. I don't know what's going to do it. But sometime we're going to have to get back to sanity on the dollar sign and athletics. Several \$3-million-a-year players in baseball. In a contract dispute that's going on, I think, now, with the Oakland [Athletics] team and [José] Canseco. The headline is, well, Canseco should ask all he can get. It's a bit away from your question.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

FORBES: But . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, it's . . .

FORBES: But it's too bad to see the dollar sign so important. We've, I guess, encouraged it.

TRELEVEN: Well, television receipts, too, have come to mean so much to an athletic department.

FORBES: Yes, yes. Sure, that's right. An athletic department just has to have those dollars to compete. But someday there may be a turning back. But these are some of the unanswered questions.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah. Certainly another trend has been the whole sort of building of an infrastructure to relate to lawmakers.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: UC lobbying office--excuse me--legislative affairs office in [Washington] D.C.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Another one in Sacramento. UC lobbying efforts are just going to have to continue, I suspect.

FORBES: Yes. Under present circumstances. Go down Dupont Circle area in Washington, D.C. and take a look at the buildings. They are peopled with lobbyists. That's our government. And the people should be heard, and there should be discussions. It's a matter of degree.

TRELEVEN: You've got to be right there to watch out for your interests. In other words, you, I mean the University of California.

FORBES: That's right. So it's part of the scene.

TRELEVEN: Constant attention.

FORBES: Every member of the House and the Senate has a budget of over \$1 million for his little operation. Staffs are immense. That's the way it is.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So if you have to compete against big business and big labor . . .

FORBES: You have to compete.

TRELEVEN: Big education had better be there!

FORBES: Yep, yep.

TRELEVEN: Open government. Always efforts to try to provide for that, Proposition 9, political reform act of 1974,¹ disclosure requirements, where the Fair Political Practices Commission interpreted the act to mean that regents had to also provide or disclose information on finances because they constitutionally handle investments.

FORBES: Well, one doesn't really follow the other.

1. Proposition 9 (June 1974).

TRELEVEN: Well, that's what the commission decided. In other words, if you are the--well, which you were--if you are the committee, if you are the chair of the committee of investments, you disclose your source of income so that you don't invest university money in a company in which you hold stock.

FORBES: Conflict of interest?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I guess that's the logic.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I guess the question here is how do you feel about the ability to attract high-level potential regents with that kind of disclosure required?

FORBES: I don't know what the answer would be to that. I think that there would be enough highly qualified candidates who would not be disturbed about disclosure. Now, again, if the university can't own IBM stock if a member of the board owns IBM stock, that's something else again. I think the individual has a right to make investment decisions on his own. As far as disclosure of wealth or funds or whatever you want to call it, I think there would be people who would be willing to disclose.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, it looks like, trend-wise, the effort to have more open government is going to continue. I sometimes wonder, though, the more acts that get passed, whether it really makes any difference.

[End Tape 16, Side B]

[Begin Tape 17, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, one other area was financial resources. It's at this point we've almost come full circle from where we started our discussion weeks ago. How well, during your regency, would you say the board protected the assets of the university?

FORBES: Oh, I think the assets were protected very well.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Last week you talked about . . .

FORBES: About the investments?

TRELEVEN: The prudent investments.

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: How did you do in sort of warding off various legislators, and two governors, who from time to time would want to raid the reserve funds of the university? By that I mean the logic being you have all of these reserve funds, and here you are asking for all of this money for capital and operating expenses. Why don't you use your

reserve money? How well did you protect that?

FORBES: I guess by persuasion. Yeah. The university has to have reserves. It has to. . . . But this isn't answering your question. You need reserves. And I think that we shouldn't be penalized for having done an outstanding job at investments. Shouldn't be penalized.

TRELEVEN: Well, in all . . .

FORBES: You know, we've had so many good years, and so few years of depression, and even recession, that we've got to look out for the future. When a country has all the problems our country has, and I could list a half-dozen, you have to have reserves. But it's rhetorical.

TRELEVEN: There really seems to be kind of a system of checks and balances amongst the California political and regental system. Which, at its best, I suppose, results in, what, creative tension, I suppose one might say?

FORBES: Pretty good.

TRELEVEN: And a stronger university and a stronger higher education in general. Would you say that during your seventeen years that worked pretty positively? The relationship between the

regents, the governor, and the legislature?

FORBES: I think that I had two unfortunate governors and one fortunate governor, so that isn't a good balance. I think that the legislature stayed about neutral, just about even. But I think the university had a bad break in having both Ronald Reagan and Jerry Brown.

TRELEVEN: Back to back.

FORBES: Yeah. That hurt.

TRELEVEN: Were there any serious incursions or infringements on the regents' constitutional authority by the legislature during your tenure? I know that the terms changed.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And that was one. But anything else that comes to mind that . . .

FORBES: The things that come to mind that impinge on that would be the things that we were persuaded we had to do or else.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It . . .

TRELEVEN: Which gets us back to medical education.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: The county hospitals.

FORBES: That's correct.

TRELEVEN: Where, "You do it or we are going to give it to . . ."

FORBES: Or we'll give the state college universities the right to take on advanced degrees.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and that, as we've discussed before, has had a long-range impact, in that the costs involved in that and not only the costs but the reimbursements that don't come back from third party carriers and so on.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Was the University of California and the governing board of the university healthier when you left in '77 than it was when you came aboard?

FORBES: The board itself?

TRELEVEN: The university . . .

FORBES: Board of regents?

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I would say it wasn't quite as healthy when I left. We had stalwarts when I came aboard in Jesse Steinhart and Don McLaughlin and Jerry Hagar. These are outstanding members of the board. I think the board became politicized, and to an extent has stayed so. And I think that

some appointments were regrettable.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Finally, were a newly appointed regent to drop up here to Pasadena and seek your counsel this afternoon on what he might or she might do as a regent, what advice would you have for that person?

FORBES: I'd tell him or her exactly what Pat Brown told me: "Be a good regent for the people of California."

TRELEVEN: Okay. Before we stop, I'd just like to spend a few minutes bringing us up to date about what you've done in the fourteen years since you left the board, thirteen years. Let's see, I think you told me many weeks ago you sold the music business back in . . .

FORBES: I sold the music company four years ago.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But carried it on through the years until that time.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: When I decided that I would be unsmart to renew leases, etc., at my advanced years.

TRELEVEN: Okay. [Laughter]

FORBES: So I decided to sell it. It took about eighteen

months to--maybe a little less--to find the right buyer. Finally, the business was sold and is carrying on in excellent fashion. Then, after that, would you like to have me tell you?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Then, after that, with a little more leisure time, I got involved in two areas. One, the program of literacy that I read UCLA is involved in. But I took a course in the Laubach System of teaching the illiterate at the Pasadena Central Library. The Laubach method is used nationally, has been for some years, and is an excellent way of teaching on a one-on-one basis, teaching people how to read and write. So I have a student, and I have been with him now for some time, and he is making progress. He is on book two, and about a fourth-grade level. He finds some exciting new words each time. So I do that.

In addition to that, I, a couple of years ago, joined an organization called SCORE, which is Service Corps of Retired Executives. It's an affiliate of the Small Business Administration nationally. We counsel, we give advice to people who are interested in starting a small business,

or people who have a small business and have problems. SCORE has been in operation twenty-five years nationally and has quite an organization headquartered here in Glendale, with branches throughout a good deal of the county. We don't go into Orange County. But I'd give advice to those who wish it. Not legal advice, but all the things that one needs to do about to prosper in a small business. I might add that 94 percent of those who start a small business fail.

TRELEVEN: Wow!

FORBES: But I also might add, and this is great to realize, but the phone rings incessantly in the Glendale office. People inquiring about starting a business, and unfortunately, a good many of them are looking for money from the Small Business Administration. We can't always be that helpful.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But there is an eagerness on the part of people to do something, and this is great.

TRELEVEN: So it's more along the lines of kind of nuts and bolts practical advice on all of the little things involved.

FORBES: Correct. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Which turn out, which in the composite turn out to be big things when you are trying to run a small business.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: So this takes, what, a couple days a week of your time?

FORBES: No, it takes less than that. Each one of those takes one day a week. So, to answer your question, yeah. About two days a week. Then I'm on call for extra help when available. And I try to work very hard on my golf game.

TRELEVEN: Right. I guess, finally, just bring me up to date, just briefly, on your family.

FORBES: Right. I have a daughter Julie, who lives with her husband John Holmquist and their two daughters Holly and Allison in Laguna Beach. I have a wife, Madeline. We have been married almost thirteen years now, and we travel a bit. We have been to England, Scotland, Wales about five times, and we are going again this summer. We've been to the Orient and to Switzerland, France. So even to the silly isles, the Isles of Scilly. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Ah!

FORBES: Twenty-eight miles southwest of Land's End.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: A delightful place.

TRELEVEN: Well, if you get to Cornwall this summer, stop in and tell them you were interviewed by Treleven, and somebody will probably figure out that I'm the umpteenth cousin of somebody back there. Still a provincial place.

FORBES: That's great. I will.

TRELEVEN: Where there is apparently a big controversy now over which way to bring back the Cornish language.

FORBES: I see.

TRELEVEN: According to the New York Times. But I hope you have enjoyed this interview as much as I have.

FORBES: I have enjoyed it.

TRELEVEN: It's been a fascinating and enlightening experience for me, both in doing the research and in going over these areas with you. I certainly want to thank you on behalf of the California State Archives. I want to thank you on behalf of UCLA. And certainly I want to--although she's not here--I would certainly like to thank your

wife Madeleine for the patience that she's had.

FORBES: I'll tell her.

TRELEVEN: I know you won't believe this, but I'm out of questions. I don't have anymore.

FORBES: Well, you had a lot of them.

TRELEVEN: But before we quit, is there anything else you'd like to add?

FORBES: I don't think so. I think you've covered it very, very well. Well prepared.

TRELEVEN: I hope so. I know it's going to be valuable in the future to future researchers who will want to understand California and the university and higher education a heck of a lot better.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: Again, thank you very much.

FORBES: Okay. Entirely welcome.

[End Tape 17, Side A]