California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

CHARLES B. GARRIGUS II

California State Assemblyman, 1959 - 1966

May 14 and 15, 1988
Cayucos, California

By Carlos Vásquez
Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

March Fong Eu
Secretary of State

California State Archives
1020 O Street, Room 130
Sacramento, CA 95814

Information (916) 445-4293
Document Restoration (916) 445-4293
Exhibit Hall (916) 445-0748
Legislative Bill Service (916) 445-2832
(prior years)

PREFACE

On September 25, 1985, Governor George Deukmejian signed into law A.B. 2104 (Chapter 965 of the Statutes of 1985). This legislation established, under the administration of the California State Archives, a State Government Oral History Program "to provide through the use of oral history a continuing documentation of state policy development as reflected in California's legislative and executive history."

The following interview is one of a series of oral histories undertaken for inclusion in the state program. These interviews offer insights into the actual workings of both the legislative and executive processes and policy mechanisms. They also offer an increased understanding of the men and women who create legislation and implement state policy. Further, they provide an overview of issue development in California state government and of how both the legislative and executive branches of government deal with issues and problems facing the state.

Interviewees are chosen primarily on the basis of their contributions to and influence on the policy process of the state of California. They include members of the legislative and executive branches of the state government as well as legislative staff, advocates, members of the media, and other people who played significant roles in specific issue areas of major and continuing importance to California.

By authorizing the California State Archives to work cooperatively with oral history units at California colleges and universities to conduct interviews, this program is structured to take advantage of the resources and expertise in oral history available through California's several institutionally based programs.

Participating as cooperating institutions in the State Government Oral History Program are:

Oral History Program
History Department
California State University, Fullerton

Oral History Program
Center for California Studies
California State University, Sacramento

Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

Regional Oral History Office
The Bancroft Library
University of California, Berkeley

Oral History Program
University of California, Los Angeles

The establishment of the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program marks one of the most significant commitments made by any state toward the preservation and documentation of its governmental history. It supplements the often fragmentary historical written record by adding an organized primary source, enriching the historical information available on given topics and allowing for more thorough historical analysis. As such, the program, through the preservation and publication of interviews such as the one which follows, will be of lasting value to current and future generations of scholars, citizens, and leaders.

John F. Burns
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

This interview is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer/Editor:

Carlos Vásquez
Director, UCLA State Government Interview Series,
UCLA Oral History Program
B.A., UCLA [Political Science]
M.A., Stanford University [Political Science]
Ph.D. candidate, UCLA [History]

Interview Time and Place:

May 14, 1988
Garrigus's home in Cayucos, California
Session of two and three-quarters hours

May 15, 1988
Garrigus's home in Cayucos, California
Session of two hours

Editing

Vásquez checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against the original tape recordings, edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spellings, and verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed. The interviewer also prepared the introductory materials.

Garrigus reviewed the edited transcript and returned the transcript with only minor corrections.

Papers

There exist no private papers which the interviewer was able to consult for this interview.

Tapes and Interview Records

The original tape recordings of the interview are in the university archives at UCLA along with the records relating to the interview. Master tapes are preserved at the California State Archives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Charles B. Garrigus II was born on June 13, 1914, in Benton, Illinois. He was educated at the University of Illinois where he earned his B.A. in History in 1936, and his M.A. in English in 1938. During World War II Garrigus taught the children of American servicemen stationed in Rantoul, Illinois. In 1945 he moved his family to Cottage, Oregon, where he taught school until 1947, when he came to California. After teaching high school in Kingsburg, California, for two years Garrigus joined the humanities faculty at Reedley College, known today as King's River Community College. He retired from the college in 1972. He married the late Fern Marie Fetters in 1936; they had five children, several of whom also became teachers.

Garrigus served in the California Assembly from 1959 to 1966. He was part of the 1958 Democratic electoral sweep, and one of the liberal reformers who accompanied Governor Edmund G. Brown, Sr., to Sacramento. He served as vice-chairman then chairman of the Committee on Education. He also served on the Committees on Agriculture, Water, and Civil Service and Personnel.

Because of Garrigus's commitment to education and the liberal arts, he carried numerous bills affecting the California community college system, teacher certification, school curriculum, community college districts, and various plans for educational funding. In addition to education bills, Garrigus devoted his legislative efforts to water and agricultural issues. He was active in statewide Democratic party politics. He served in both Adlai E. Stevenson's and John F. Kennedy's presidential campaigns and was highly supportive of the social programs established by President Lyndon B. Johnson's "Great Society."

In 1967, Garrigus became California's fifth state poet laureate. Appointed for life, he has been the poet laureate longer than anyone in the history of the state and is the first poet laureate to come from the ranks of the legislature. He is a prolific poet and an active speaker, much in demand throughout the state. He has read poetry before the state legislature more often than any of his predecessors and written numerous poems dedicating public projects and important events. He is the author of a multi-volume chronicle of Americana, "An American Journal" (1984); a novel, Brief Candle (1987), and several collections of poetry, including California Poems (1967) and Echoes of Burg (1975).

I. LIFE HISTORY

[Session 1, May 14, 1988]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

Family History

VASQUEZ: Tell me something about your life story. Where were you born and how did you happen to come out to California?

GARRIGUS: Well, considering the fragmented state of our society today, Carlos, I was extremely fortunate being born in a small town in a rural area of southern Illinois. Marion, Illinois, was where I was educated, and Benton, Illinois, was where I was born. Incidentally, that's where [Douglas] Doug Collins, the coach of the Chicago Bulls, was born also. He coaches Michael Jordon.

I had the advantages of growing up in a small town. It's so important, and I believe this firmly, for a youth growing up to have a good association with nature as a part of his environment. I was fortunate in being surrounded

by lots of hills and lakes and small creeks and clean air and wildlife. There were birds and deer not far. It was the runoff of the foothills of the Ozark country, really. I was lucky to be born there and I grew up in that type of environment.

My grandfather was, first, the district attorney and, then, the city judge [of Marion, Illinois]. I lost my father [Charles Byford Garrigus] when I was four years old in the First World War. He was the chief commissary steward of a troop transport. The awful influenza of 1918, that terrible epidemic, hit the ship that he was on. They were carrying their third load of soldiers to France. The father figure in my life was my grandfather.

VASQUEZ: What was his name?

GARRIGUS: His name was Richmond Fowler. He was a judge and state's attorney and a man who loved to read, [he] was reading constantly. A very good jurist who often went to Chicago to hold court, he had that jurisdiction in Illinois and became a friend of the great criminal lawyer, Clarence Darrow. He was a very strong influence in my

life. A very intelligent, upright, moral man who was a fine jurist.

Formal Education

I graduated from high school in Marion, Illinois, and went to the University of Illinois [Champaign-Urbana] where I worked my way through college.

The first two years, I worked in a girl's sorority helping the cook. I started out with pots and pans and worked up to dishwashing and went from dishwashing to cook's helper where I learned a lot of valuable things. [The cook] was a girl who had come over here from Germany, and she was an excellent cook. I learned a lot of cooking that's lasted me all of my life from that [job].

VASQUEZ: What year did you graduate from high school?

GARRIGUS: I graduated from high school in 1932. Then I went to the University of Illinois that same year and graduated from Illinois in 1936. After a year out [from school], because of the flood where I was teaching in Paducah, Kentucky, I went back and got my master's degree in '37-'38. I taught high school in Illinois for five

years and then I moved my family to Oregon.

I had taken the National Teachers Examinations, and there was a teacher shortage in Oregon. One of the teachers in my system wrote me that the pay was much better in Oregon, and I wanted to settle my family in the West, anyway. So, in 1945, I sold all of our furniture and put camping equipment on our old '36 Plymouth and took my three children and headed for Oregon. We made it in eight days.

I taught in Oregon one year and then couldn't stand the rain there. A friend said, "You'll get used to it." I said, "That's what I'm afraid of." So I wrote letters to five high schools in California, as there was a shortage of teachers in California. One of the schools responded, from Kingsburg, California.

VASQUEZ: I've had an opportunity to see a few pages of your "American Journal."[1] Tell me a little bit

1. "An American Journal," by Charles B. Garrigus II is a five-volume typed manuscript which chronicles the Garrigus family in the context of major national and world events from 1939 to 1984. The manuscript is available in the libraries of the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana.

about the period of the Depression, as a young father.

GARRIGUS: Well, it's so difficult for people today to know how disruptive the Depression was in the Midwest and in the East and in the Southwest and the Southeast. After you got past the Rocky Mountains, the Depression had [little] impact.

But back East, it had a terrible impact because there were so many corporation structures that laid off so many workers. And because there were so many small farms that depended upon small crop turnovers and quick cash flow, prices just went to pieces.

When you think of high-quality lard selling at a nickel a pound and high-quality corn selling at twenty cents a bushel and men not being able to sell their milk, pouring it to the stock and in ditches in order to keep the price from going any lower, you can begin to appreciate what a terrible thing it was. There was a tremendous surplus of teachers. A lot of kids had gone into teaching because they thought it would give them security, but there were so many in there . . .

Why Garrigus Became a Teacher

VASQUEZ: Why did you go into teaching?

GARRIGUS: Well, I decided to become a teacher simply because of the role models of my professors. I was fortunate in having some men who were really distinguished in their fields and had a strong impact on their students, not only because of their scholarship, but [because of] their philosophies, their outlook on life.

VASQUEZ: Who were some of these people? Do you remember any of their names?

GARRIGUS: Well, one of these men was Dr. P. V. B. Jones, a history professor at the University of Illinois who had been there for years and was a good friend of [President] Woodrow Wilson's. [He] worked on the Versailles treaty as a member of Wilson's staff.

Another was a man by the name of T. W. Baldwin, who was one of the foremost Shakespeare scholars in the country, especially on Shakespeare's education. I did my master's degree under him. Another was Arthur Secord, who had a splendid grasp of the power, influence, and significance of seventeenth- and

eighteenth-century novels. He introduced me to that whole field of literature, which is largely neglected.

One of the tragedies of our day is that great novels of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries would not be read except that they're on the required reading lists of every liberal arts college and kids have to read them to get the credit. This keeps them alive. Of course, there will always be some people who will want to read them, but they will always be a minority.

During the Depression I sold cars. It was a good experience for me, but it sure made me anxious to get back into education. I taught elementary school for four years. The first three years of my [teaching] life, teachers' salaries were so low. I had children coming all the time. If it hadn't been for the fact that I rented a big house and rented out rooms, we wouldn't have been able to make it the way we did.

It taught me good consumership. It taught me how to shop, how to buy wisely. It also

taught me that much of the world's economic problem is caused by people being careless consumers, not thrifty, but wasteful. When I worked in this girl's sorority during the Depression years in college, we wasted enough food to feed three or four families, [food] that came back from the tables of girls who were more or less not typical of the day because they were [from] upper-middle-class families in Chicago and places like that whose families were all right during the Depression.

If you had a little money during the Depression, you were king. But money was so scarce. You could live well during the Depression. A family of four could live well on a hundred dollars a month, which, to my children today is unbelievable, but you could. We managed, and then as salaries increased, we were able to start saving some money. By the time we moved to Oregon, we had saved $4,000, which in that day was a lot. This was in 1945, the last year of the war.

Garrigus's Wife

VASQUEZ: Tell me about your wife.

GARRIGUS: Her name was Ferne [Marie] Fetters. She was the middle child of a family of three from an extremely poor environment.

VASQUEZ: Also from Illinois?

GARRIGUS: Yes, central Illinois, near the little town of Rossville, Illinois. Her mother and father had inherited enough money from a grandfather to buy thirteen acres that they owned. And that's all they ever owned, thirteen acres. A lady who lived in Florida rented eighty acres to them on shares. With that eighty acres of rented land and their own thirteen acres, this hard-working, poverty family managed to put three kids through college by great sacrifice. Of course, my wife was in college largely because of the state scholarship program. She won this scholarship.

VASQUEZ: So you met her at the University of Illinois?

GARRIGUS: Yes. She was salutatorian when she graduated there. She was Bronze Tablet. She was Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi. She was an extremely intelligent girl. I met her doing church work where she was a member of the McKinley Youth Foundation Student Council, which was a Presbyterian youth foundation on the campus of

the University of Illinois. We worked together in the work of that Presbyterian youth foundation.

She was a saintly woman. She fulfilled, I think, every obligation that our tradition has put upon a good wife and a good mother. Her children all venerate her memory, and I think that I was lucky to have the companionship of an extremely spiritual and intelligent woman for forty-seven years. We had a wonderful time. When she married me, I had nothing at all, except I was teaching in a small Kentucky high school. And a flood knocked me out of that, the great river flood of 1937.

That's what caused me to go back and get my master's degree, and that year we had our first daughter. My mother [Ailene Marie Garrigus] and sister [Hope Estelle] were living with us in Urbana, Illinois. I was getting my master's degree that year, my sister was completing her third year of college, and our total income that year was $500.

The Garrigus Children

VASQUEZ: What's your oldest daughter's name?

GARRIGUS: My oldest daughter's name was Marmarie [A. Madison]. She taught for fifteen years at Modesto [California] High School. She was a marvelous teacher. She contracted cancer in her thirty-ninth year and she fought the disease all the way. She kept saying, "Daddy, I'm going to whip this thing, you watch." But she never gained an inch on it and she died a day before her fortieth birthday. She was a great teacher, a fine girl.

VASQUEZ: You had other children, right?

GARRIGUS: Yes, I had two sons and two more daughters. And both of my sons and one of my daughters are school teachers, although one of them dropped out of teaching to become a raisin farmer.

VASQUEZ: What's his name?

GARRIGUS: His name is the same as mine. He's Charles Byford Garrigus III, and the other son was named after my grandfather, his name is Richmond [R. Garrigus] and then my other daughter was named after the Greek goddess of fertility, Ceres, but I corrupted it and made it Karis [L. Kominitsky] after the Egyptian. Then my last [child] was named Rose Ann [Khan]; she's a teacher in the

same city where her older sister was a teacher.

Teaching During World War II

VASQUEZ: Now, you survived the Depression. Were you in the service?

GARRIGUS: I was teaching at Rantoul, Illinois. And Rantoul, Illinois, was the chief place for training engineers and navigators for the B-17 bomber. It was the big bomber school. It had expanded to over thirty thousand people, who brought in a lot of children with them, the army personnel and air force personnel. Our little school was bulging when I was teaching there. We got government help right away to build two buildings. But my first year there, I had eighty-five kids in junior high school in one room. It was a well-run and disciplined room, I'll tell you. They knew that they had to be quiet.

VASQUEZ: Why was that?

GARRIGUS: Well, we didn't have the room for them, you see. The reason it was a well-disciplined room was that I had a paddle and they knew I'd use it. The fact they knew I'd use it and the fact that I was a pretty big-sized man, and so was

the paddle, was the greatest force for law and order in that room.

I didn't have to use it much. The first year I was there, I used it nine times. The second year, I used it four times. The third year, I used it twice, and the last year I was there, I didn't have to use it at all. By that time the word had got around. But when I used it, I did not use it brutally. It was just one stroke across the boy who was leaning over to take hold of his ankles with a tight seat. That one stroke was enough.

The funny thing was that when I went to Oregon five years later, I got a letter from one of the boys I taught in that junior high school. He said, "My folks have said we can have the family car and come out from Illinois to Oregon to visit you, Gus, if it's all right with you." So, I wrote back and said, "Come along." So, five of those boys I taught in the seventh and eighth grades came out when they graduated from high school, and I took them fishing on Rosary Lake and the Willamette [Valley] National Forest. I took them over to

the Oregon coast, and we caught fish.

I got them jobs in the cherry orchards and they made spending money for their trip home. When we were up on Rosary Lake the second night, we were sitting around the campfire, and they started talking about their experiences with me as a teacher five years before in junior high school. It came out that I had spanked every one of those boys at one time. [Laughter] They were each telling the circumstances.

Of course, I really didn't remember the circumstances, but they got a laugh from each other, describing how they took that one smack of the paddle from me. But it served its purpose. They all became successful. One of them became a contractor, and when I was out there a few years ago to spend a couple of days with him, he showed me a housing project where he had a work crew of 210 men constructing 100 houses out there. I asked him, "Dean, what did I give you in arithmetic?" He said, "I think I got a C." I said, "Well, I'm going back and erase that and put an A on it. I think I made a mistake." [Laughter]

Coming to California

VASQUEZ: How many years were you in Oregon?

GARRIGUS: Just one year. I got wet enough in one year to come to California.

VASQUEZ: Then you came out here to Kingsburg, California?

GARRIGUS: Right. Kingsburg is known as the hometown [of] Rafer Johnson, who's a good friend of mine, and I've known him ever since. In fact, when he was a kid, he used to help me with my athletic equipment in the summer recreation program there. He was the one that lit the last Olympic torch in 1984 [Summer Olympic Games].

VASQUEZ: Tell me about your teaching career here in California.

GARRIGUS: Well, my teaching career in California consisted of two years at Kingsburg, then I went to the junior college system at Reedley, California. What then was Reedley College today is King's River Community College. The enrollment when I started there was 470; it now has an enrollment of 2,700. It's a beautiful campus. And one of the nicest campuses, I think, in California. It's right on the banks of the King's River.

VASQUEZ: Do you still teach there?

GARRIGUS: No. I retired in 1972, after twenty-five years of teaching there. We had lived in a beautiful home about three miles outside of the town which my whole family built--it was a cooperative effort. We moved out of there over to Cayucos after I finished the Cayucos home.

VASQUEZ: But you never did any military service?

GARRIGUS: Oh, you asked me that question and I got off the track. I started to tell you that there were only two men in this expanding [Rantoul, Illinois] system: myself and the principal. I was the dean of boys. There were eight women. So, because of the impact of students and because of the disciplinary problems that meant, every time I was put in [draft classification] 1A, the principal would go to the draft board and say, "Look, we need this man here desperately for all these children of army personnel expanding our school, to keep discipline and order. He'll do a lot more good here than he will anyplace with his three kids." So the draft board moved me back again [Laughter] into another classification. I spent the year there working with the children of mostly army and air force personnel.

II. POLITICAL AND LEGISLATIVE CAREER

How Garrigus Became Interested in Politics

VASQUEZ: Now, you taught at Reedley College and you were there, what, twenty-five years?

GARRIGUS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Who in your life had the greatest impact on you, especially at an early age, in forming your ideas of civic responsibility and social concerns?

GARRIGUS: Undoubtedly, that would be my grandfather Fowler. As I said, he was a widely read man. He was a great student of [President] Abraham Lincoln and a fine jurist.

VASQUEZ: How would you classify his philosophy?

GARRIGUS: Well, his philosophy was an American ethic philosophy. He believed that life is action and that work is the important part of a man's life, that work should be the kind of work that constantly gives him the feeling that he's doing something positive for his fellowman. He made that point very strongly.

He wanted me to be a lawyer, of course, but he died in my junior year [in college], and so I transferred because I wasn't that much

interested in law. I transferred over into teaching. I never had any regrets on that at all.

Why Garrigus Became a Democrat

My grandfather was reared a lifelong Republican, and he was a Republican office-holder. And, of course, I thought I was a Republican, too, because I looked up to him so much. It wasn't until I had moved to California and found myself voting for Democrats and when President [Dwight D.] Eisenhower refused to really discipline [Senator Joseph R.] Joe McCarthy for what he said about General [George C.] Marshall that I said, "I can't take this."

So I transferred out of the Republican into the Democratic party because I was a great admirer of General Marshall and I was a great denouncer of Senator Joe McCarthy. I wasn't going to stay in the same political party [Laughter] with him.

VASQUEZ: But up to then, you had been a registered Republican?

GARRIGUS: I had been a Republican, but my wife and I found ourselves--she had been a Republican too, both

grandparents on both sides were strong Republican households--but we found ourselves voting for [Franklin D.] Roosevelt and voting for Democratic candidates.

VASQUEZ: Why did Roosevelt make sense to you?

GARRIGUS: Well, because of the wonderful way that he had handled the Depression. In economic terms, it might not have been so great, but in terms of getting the country back on its feet and doing something to alleviate the terrible distress that there was.

Plus the fact that he had so much insight into World War II when we didn't want to have anything to do with it. He was doing his best to help Britain stop Hitler, and I admired him for that. He was not trying to push or pull the public in there, but, secretly, he was doing everything he could to encourage Churchill and tell him to be patient, that we would soon recognize that our destiny, as much as England's, lay in stopping Hitler.

I admired him chiefly for those reasons, plus the fact that he had such an easy personality for communication. The same reason

a lot of people like [President] Ronald Reagan. Roosevelt was a great communicator just like Reagan and he used the fireside chat just like Reagan uses television, you felt close to him. And you felt his confidence. You also felt his concern for the welfare of the lower classes, even though he was a Hyde Park [New York] aristocrat. His own class hated him because of the fact that he betrayed them. But those of us in the middle and lower classes found that he was very heroic in his ability to fight the terrible economic depression that we had suffered.

Election to Democratic County Central Committee

VASQUEZ: When did you first get involved in politics?

GARRIGUS: Well, there was a vacancy on the Fresno County Democratic Central Committee.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

GARRIGUS: Well, this was in 1954. I ran unopposed for that seat and was elected to the Democratic Central Committee. They put me in charge of [Governor] Adlai [E.] Stevenson's first campaign against General Eisenhower. A campaign that he had no chance of winning. General Eisenhower

was a national hero and deserved it because of the great service he had done us in World War II.

VASQUEZ: What got you interested in running for the Democratic Central Committee in the first place?

GARRIGUS: Well, the feeling that as a teacher I had an obligation to get involved in politics for the sake of education, that they should have somebody on the Central Committee that was conversant with educational problems. It was a way of taking education into politics, really.

VASQUEZ: You never thought of becoming a lobbyist for one of the teachers' groups?

Working for Adlai E. Stevenson

GARRIGUS: No, no, never thought of that at all. But, you see, [being] in charge of Adlai Stevenson's campaign, we became personally acquainted. When he came to Fresno County I was in charge of his activities. I became personally acquainted with Governor Stevenson, and he was a splendid man. Every time he came to Fresno thereafter, I introduced him to the public or wherever the rally would be held. He also campaigned for [Senator John F.] Kennedy in 1960. We had some

wonderful conversations. He said, "Gus, why don't you run for elective office?" He said, "You ought to get into politics, right." He said, "You're a wasted talent."

VASQUEZ: This was Governor Stevenson?

GARRIGUS: Yes. The governor told me this one evening when we were waiting for his airplane at Chandler Field to go to San Francisco. So I decided to go into politics largely on his urging, and it didn't take too much. But I hadn't made up my mind where to go in politics.

But it happened that [Assemblyman William W. Hansen] the man who was the incumbent in the legislature, a nine-year incumbent, alienated some of the big farmers in Fresno County. The Central Committee members turned to me and said, "Look, why don't you run for this seat? He's vulnerable now. His big farmer allies are turning against him because he voted with the Los Angeles group for the state to control the San Luis Reservoir."

VASQUEZ: So, it was over water?

First Bid for the Assembly

GARRIGUS: It was over water. So I went along with it and I campaigned hard. Out of 54,000 votes that first election, I lost by 80 votes. In fact, I lost it in one precinct in Selma-Reedley-Caruthers, California, which voted heavily as a block, a church block, against me.

VASQUEZ: And your opponent?

GARRIGUS: He was a fine old dairy farmer by the name of Hansen, who had been in there and was largely the protégé of the [California] Farm Bureau [Federation]. He had been a faithful friend of the Farm Bureau. And, of course, they hated to see him go because when I ran against him their slogan was, "What does a schoolteacher know about agriculture?"

Well, they were not very consistent, because when they held their big conventions, they invited these professors in the agricultural colleges to come in and talk [on] what they should do for the future. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: So, you lost your first time out?

GARRIGUS: Yes, 80 votes out of 54,000.

VASQUEZ: What impact did that have on you? Did it

discourage you?

GARRIGUS: No. Of course, there are no second prizes in politics. It was quite a blow for me because I had campaigned hard. But it gave me some tremendous associations with some very fine people in politics, state senators, lieutenant governors, and governors. I was educated to the fact that there was a great need for somebody with my outlook and my background in politics.

VASQUEZ: What was it that made you an attractive candidate for the Democratic party and for the people?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think the thing that made me an attractive candidate for the party was the fact that I was a highly educated man; the fact that I had done a lot of community service for the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association] and the Red Cross, speaking at father-son banquets for the summer camp program for the YMCA; the fact I was well known around the county at banquets that were held in different communities; plus the fact that I had quite a student following from satisfied students whom I had been teaching for several years and who were going out into the communities.

VASQUEZ: This was all at Reedley, right?

GARRIGUS: One man told me, "Well, I was a Republican and I wouldn't have voted for you, but my daughter said I had to, so I did." [Laughter] She was one of my students. That type of pressure on parents helped a lot. [Laughter]

The Value of Oratory in Politics

VASQUEZ: Do you think oratory played a role in making you an attractive candidate?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think that, undoubtedly, if a person has a fluent command of the English language. I have always been impressed by what Lincoln's tutor [Mentor Graham] told him. And this is one of the sad facts of our education.

If I were to tell you the name of the most influential man in Abraham Lincoln's life, it probably wouldn't ring a bell with you. It probably wouldn't ring a bell with 99 percent of high school students in the United States, yet here was a man we all owe a great debt to because of the positive influence he had on Abraham Lincoln's life. One of the things this man told Lincoln was this: "Abe, the man who controls words so people understand him is the

man who controls people." Abraham Lincoln never forgot that. I think that was the key to the [Gettysburg] Address and all of the other great speeches that Lincoln made. It certainly had a big influence on me as a young student.

I started making public addresses, and, of course, practice is the key to anything. I started when I was in high school entering the county oratorical contest and things like that. I then continued right on into college, making speeches to student groups. And, of course, when you go into education as a professor, you make a speech every day.

VASQUEZ: [Laughter] At least once a day.

GARRIGUS: [Laughter]

The Second Bid for the Assembly

VASQUEZ: So then the second time out you ran against William Hansen again?

GARRIGUS: I ran against him again. This time I beat him by 3,700 votes. But I won't give myself too much credit for that because I think that victory was due to a large extent because the Republicans in the state were in a big civil war with each other.

The two leaders of the Republican party--I mean Governor [Goodwin J.] Knight and Senator William Knowland--were having a feud and they split the Republican party. Because of that split, [Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] rode in, and, I think, I was firmly entrenched on Pat Brown's coattails.

VASQUEZ: You feel that's why you got elected?

GARRIGUS: Well, that was certainly a strong element. But I also had the support of the most powerful newspaper in the area. [Fresno Bee]

VASQUEZ: In your first campaign, who were your supporters? Who were the people that went out for you in the press? Who were the people that provided whatever money you may have used in campaigning?

GARRIGUS: Well, the first thing I want to say on that point is I ran the cheapest campaign out of the 120 campaigns in California, no assemblyman or senator ever ran a cheaper campaign than I did.

VASQUEZ: Why was that?

GARRIGUS: It was because I did not encourage the big money. I did not go after it. I did not want any obligations on myself. But the tragedy of

that, professor, is that nobody made anything out of it. It wasn't appreciated. Instead of saying, "Well, this is a strong point in voting for this man." People said, "Well, he'll be lucky to get elected, not spending any more money than that," you know. Or, "The other fellow will probably beat him." They didn't realize the importance of running a campaign without letting big money come into it.

The Thirty-third Assembly District

VASQUEZ: Let's back up just a little bit. Tell me about the Thirty-third Assembly District.

GARRIGUS: The Thirty-third Assembly District was one of the strangest districts in California for this reason: It only represented Fresno County. But the center of population, the strongly organized Democratic center of population was the city of Fresno, which was then a city of about 160,000. It's now a city of over 300,000. That was the hole in the doughnut and it was the real power of registered Democrats.

Then, around that were the small towns and the [rural] area of the county, small towns like Selma, Reedley, Fowler, and Caruthers. This

small-town area and all the little farms around there was what I represented. It was the richest agricultural county in the United States. It had the largest farm income from tremendous crops, especially grapes, nuts, citrus [fruits], and cotton. [I also represented] the west side. I was, you might say, the rural representative of the small town.

Now, this didn't make much sense for this reason: Although I had a Democratic registration, which looked good, many of my Democrats had been Democrats under Franklin Roosevelt. [But] after they made it under his recovery program, they became Republicans.

I had one of them tell me this out in the field. I said, "Mr. Anderson," after I'd hailed him on his tractor. He said, "Well, I'm a Republican." I said, "You're registered as a Democrat." He said, "Well, I haven't changed my registration, but I made enough money to become a Republican." And he laughed. Which was true of a lot of them, you see.

I had registered Democrats that never voted Democratic in the rural areas. But, on the

other hand, my chief support was labor, both unorganized farm labor and [the] organized. The members of the unions lived to a large extent in outlying areas near their work.

VASQUEZ: And these were [farmworkers] who would vote, could vote?

GARRIGUS: They were people that could vote. Whereas the business structure of a town would be under the control of Republicans, most of that population would be working Democrats, and they would vote for me.

I never had any trouble getting reelected four times, with the powerful help of the Fresno Bee, which was always behind me solidly, plus my record, plus the fact that I ran [as an] open-door representative. Anybody could see me any time. I talked a kind of an easy common sense to the people that they understood, and I didn't travel the grey area of primrose promises, telling them great things that I couldn't possibly live up to.

I explained a lot of hard facts to them. I took controversial stands, like the last time I was elected I came out firmly for the defeat of

the proposition [Proposition 14] that would have repealed the Rumford Act, which was the Fair Housing Act put through in California.[1] I stood up for that, whereas the majority of the people in my area were for it. I went against my people in that case.

Campaign Supporters

VASQUEZ: Let's talk a little bit about your campaigns, your early campaigns. You got elected in 1958 without the help of any of the big agricultural forces?

GARRIGUS: Yes, none of them. Chiefly with union contributions.

VASQUEZ: From which unions?

GARRIGUS: Well, there was the electrician's union [International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 100]. There was the United Farmworkers [Organizing Committee] union. And there was the Union of Classified School Employees and the teachers union [American Federation of Teachers]. There were also environmental clubs and groups that supported

1. A.B. 1240, 1963 Leg. sess., Cal. Stat. 1853 (1963). Proposition 14 appeared on the November 3, 1964, ballot.

me, like the Sierra Club and things like that.

VASQUEZ: You don't feel you were hurt at all by aligning yourself publicly with the UFWOC, which at that time was very new?

GARRIGUS: Well, I had the MAPA [Mexican American Political Association] endorsements all the time. The [United Farmworkers] union was not a strong force in our area. It was south of us in the Bakersfield/Delano area.

VASQUEZ: But it was receiving a lot of negative publicity.

GARRIGUS: It was. And, of course, there were a lot of people voting against me because they [UFWOC] supported me. On the other hand, there were a lot of them we got registered and they voted for me.

VASQUEZ: In your first campaign you had the support of the McClatchy paper [Fresno Bee]?

GARRIGUS: I had the McClatchy paper behind me all the time, throughout all my campaigns.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think that was?

GARRIGUS: Well, they liked my stand on things. They liked the fact that I was an aggressive person. They liked my legislative program and the fact that I

communicated well with them. [Laughter] One researcher told me once, "When I looked in the file of the paper [Fresno Bee] to get some information on you, I couldn't believe the number of headlines they had in there for you." Which was true. Every time I made a speech, I almost had a headline, and I made a speech on a lot of topics. Oh, that was my main political ally, the Bee.

Opposition in Second Campaign

VASQUEZ: Who was your main opposition?

GARRIGUS: The Farm Bureau [Federation], and that was largely from misunderstanding. There was no real reason for them to be opposed to me.

I worked with [Assemblyman Augustus F.] Gus Hawkins, who's now one of the leaders in the United States Congress. [He sponsored the] Humphrey/Hawkins bill, you know.[1] I worked with him to lower the minimum wage for California to $1.00. And after I got that compromise, my farmers, farm voters, rose up against me and

1. The Full-Employment and Balanced Growth Act, P.L. 95-523, October 27, 1978.

came by the busloads up there to kill that bill for the $1.00-an-hour minimum wage.[1] And, of course, I told them at the time I spoke to them, I said, "[Cesar] Chavez is going to be in here, and in a few years you're going to be paying $1.50." I said, "Most of you are paying $1.00 an hour right now. You have to to get the labor you want. But you don't want the bill on the books." I said, "It's an unreasonable opposition." And it was an unreasonable opposition. Like I said, two years later, there wasn't a farmer in the area that wasn't paying $1.25 an hour. Five years later, they were all paying $2.00 an hour.

VASQUEZ: What was [behind] your and Gus Hawkins's idea of getting this on the books?

GARRIGUS: Now, I'm talking about my farmers, who were paying this $1.00 an hour. When we held hearings down in Imperial Valley, we found out there were growers down there who had been paying eighty and eight-five cents an hour for the last ten years, whereas inflation had gone

1. A.B. 1223, 1959 Leg. Session.

up and everybody else's wages had gone up. These farmworkers were still making what they were making ten years ago.

VASQUEZ: What year would this be?

GARRIGUS: Well, this would be in 1960, '61, '62. They were making, some of them, seventy-five cents an hour.

The Importance of the Water Issue

VASQUEZ: What were the principal issues in your first campaign?

GARRIGUS: The principal issues in my first campaign were water, getting through the California Water Plan, to take the surplus water from the North down to Los Angeles and below Paris Island and over the Tehachapi [Mountains]. This was the traditional fight, because those up in the North were afraid of losing it and those in the South desperately had to have it and were afraid of the consequences if they didn't. There were even some who advocated the northern monopoly and were ready to split the state in two.

VASQUEZ: Was that a serious movement?

GARRIGUS: Yes, there was even talk of that because of this water matter.

VASQUEZ: What was your position?

GARRIGUS: Well, my position was to bring the water where it's needed most, that it belonged to all the people, and that California as a divided state would be an economic disaster. Of course, that view prevailed. I'm glad to say I was working hand in glove with the committee chairman, [Assemblyman] Carley [V.] Porter of the Water Committee. We were close personal friends. In fact, I wrote a poem for him at his retirement. He was always having me write little snatches of poetry for the Water Committee.

III. LEGISLATING EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Education as a Political Issue

VASQUEZ: What other issues were prevalent in your first campaign?

GARRIGUS: Well, there was the big educational issue.

VASQUEZ: What was the educational issue?

GARRIGUS: The educational issue at that time was the [Senator Hugo M.] Fisher bill,[1] which was to try

---

1. S.B. 57, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 848 (1961). The Fisher bill aimed primarily at providing uniform credentialing guidelines for certificated teachers.

to do the very thing that's still so desperately needed today and hasn't been done right. That was to put the liberal arts curriculum back into full force for the education of students, from the grammar grades up through high school. In other words, to get people so they could write a decent paragraph, so they could spell decently, so they could solve a decent mathematical problem without any problems, so they could handle simplicities of their own financial problems deftly and with intelligence, and so they could increase the success of their relationships.

One of the great tragedies of our fragmented society today is personal relationships. We do not have and have not had in our curriculum the proper amount of stories that advocate good relationships, heroic relationships, relationships of loyalty, fidelity, and achievement on the part of family members for each other. We don't have those kind of stories.

You watch a television drama today and, usually, a father's against a son, brothers

against brothers, and sisters against brothers, the whole family's fighting. That's the outgrowth of a deficiency in having the right novels, the right poems, the right short stories, and the right plays showing how people interrelate successfully with each other.

So the Fisher bill was to [insure] a better understanding of history, to give us a perspective we need to make proper value judgments, and to give us the understanding of those qualities of character that make for a successful relationship which you get out of good stories and good plays and good poems.

The Importance of Literature in Education

VASQUEZ: You see a relationship between literature, Western literature, and the consolidation or holding together of the family?

GARRIGUS: Well, you see, Shakespeare has Hamlet say to the players who've come to the castle that the purpose of all speaking and acting and really all art as well, because there's no use drawing a line there, and these are Shakespeare's words: "To hold the mirror up to nature. To show virtue her own features, scorn his own

image. And the very age and body of the times its form and pressure."

In other words, in the words of Howard Cosell, who has almost ruined good English, "Tell it like it is," you see.[1] Tell it like it is. If literature is presented properly and with the right choice, it gives you stories that increase your appreciation of and respect for loyalties, courage, endurance, cooperation, spirituality, and reverence. These things are all brought out in good literature. This is the best chance for students to have an association with these things that, as one writer says, "moved me by its beauty and its power to the brink of tears."

We all know there are certain plays and certain poems and certain stories that can do that for us. [They] teach the values of life through history and literature. There is nothing more neglected today in our educational system than history and literature.

VASQUEZ: Now, the Fisher bill also . . .

---

1. Howard Cosell, the noted sports announcer.

GARRIGUS: The man who influenced Abraham Lincoln was Mentor Graham. He taught school in Illinois for sixty-five years. Abraham Lincoln lived one winter with him, and he was the man that introduced Lincoln to good books and made Lincoln a philosopher with this simple line, "The things I need to know are in books."

Five hundred years before Christ, there was an old Greek philosopher and poet named Hesiod who wrote this poem: "Best is the man who can himself advise. He too does well who harkens to the wise. But he who lacks and will not heed another's wisdom is a fool indeed." Well, education means harkening to another's wisdom. When you harken to another's wisdom, you get the insights and the guidance and the inspiration that you need for your own problems.

The Fisher Education Bill of 1961

VASQUEZ: And you feel that partly is what the Fisher bill was trying to do?

GARRIGUS: That's right. The Fisher bill was trying to give the liberal arts its proper place in education.

VASQUEZ: It also had to do with the qualifications or the

certification of teachers and uniformizing these?

GARRIGUS: Oh yes. Sure. You're not going to get any help from the curriculum if you don't have the teacher that understands it and knows how to present it.

VASQUEZ: So you feel the Fisher bill was a watershed in California education?

GARRIGUS: It was a great step forward, but it's never been implemented properly.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think that is?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think it is because the leadership in education today, especially at the administrative level, has neglected to have a concern for curriculum and has neglected to give the teacher the right freedom and direction to go with that curriculum. I think it's largely an administrative failure and the lack of teachers to take the initiative without administrative leadership.

VASQUEZ: When you were teaching and before you got into electoral politics, were you active in teachers unions or teachers associations?

GARRIGUS: No, no, not at all.

VASQUEZ: Why not?

GARRIGUS: Because they didn't do a thing for me. I mean, I wasn't interested in that aspect of it. What I wanted to do was to teach, and that's what most dedicated teachers want to do.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

Interests and Goals in the First Term

VASQUEZ: When you were elected in 1958, you came in with a Democratic sweep.

GARRIGUS: Yeah, they were in charge of the assembly. They were in charge of the senate.

VASQUEZ: What did you feel your mandate was as a freshman assemblyman from Fresno [County] when you took office in 1958?

GARRIGUS: Really, I had only won by 3,600 votes. I didn't feel like I had any mandate. What I wanted to do was to understand the areas in the water problem and the educational problem where I could really lend assistance.

VASQUEZ: Those were the two areas you were most interested in?

GARRIGUS: I was interested in agriculture, but agriculture didn't have a big problem then that wasn't connected with water. I also felt that there

was an area in the educational system where agriculture needed help. I worked on scholarships, special scholarships for agriculture students.

I thought the liberal arts scholarships were unfair to agriculture students because they hadn't taken the background material for it. They should have the type of examination which would disclose their qualifications as agricultural students. I got that program through, but the Farm Bureau opposed it.[1] I never have quite understood why, and after a few years they repealed it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me, as you were running for your first term, did you get any assistance from the statewide Democratic party organization?

GARRIGUS: Not very much. I got a lot of encouragement and advice, but no financial help.

VASQUEZ: Nothing in the way of financial help?

GARRIGUS: No.

VASQUEZ: You were not a recipient of some of the . . .

GARRIGUS: Well, you must remember everything then was on a

---

1. A.B. 345, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2049, (1959).

much smaller scale than it is now, and there wasn't the big organization. The CDC [California Democratic Council] was just getting organized, which was going to put money in it.

VASQUEZ: Did CDC ever help you at all?

GARRIGUS: They helped me a little bit, but not very much. Nothing decisive there.

VASQUEZ: Did you get any help from the young, liberal Democrats?

GARRIGUS: I got help from them. For instance, one of our former congressmen, John Krebs, worked hard on my campaign as a young Democrat. The Fresno County Democratic Students worked on my campaign. There are a lot of them that are now fathers, grandfathers, and householders, but they worked hard for me. I got a lot of student help.

Efforts as Chairman of the Committee on Education

VASQUEZ: Then you went right on to the [Committee on] Education?

GARRIGUS: Immediately, yes. I was vice chairman. I took over as chairman when Dorothy [M.] Donahoe--she was one of the co-authors of the Fisher bill--and I had to take the Fisher bill through the

assembly. I had to preside on the Fisher bill. In fact, I saved the Fisher bill from being destroyed, I single-handedly saved it. We called a night meeting on the Fisher bill. Senator Fisher was there to present the bill with the understanding that there would be no vote taken. That was the agreement between the chairman, [Assemblyman Richard T.] Dick Hanna at that time, and I as vice-chairman. Dick later went to Congress.

The agreement was that there would be no vote taken that night. Well, some of the powerful members were being supported by the California Teachers Association [CTA], which was opposed to the bill. They decided on a little treachery and brought the bill to a vote that night [with the intent] of sending it to an interim committee study until the next [session] and have more study done on it, using the argument that it shouldn't be passed.

VASQUEZ: And basically kill it?

GARRIGUS: Basically, for the time being, kill it, yes. At least to delay it for a year. They were all set to take this vote when there was a telephone

call for one of the members that represented the Pasadena area, a Republican who was going to vote to send the bill out.

While he was gone, I said to the chairman, "Dick, right now we haven't got a quorum with this man's absence, and I'm going to move to dismiss the committee, to adjourn the committee for lack of a quorum under the rules." Which I was allowed to do. I said, "You immediately take a voice vote and with an evenly divided voice vote you rule that the motion passes and we're adjourned." He did that right quick, and we did it and just left everybody gasping. When the guy who would have made the quorum came back from the telephone, the committee was adjourned.

VASQUEZ: He was the assemblyman from Pasadena?

GARRIGUS: The assemblyman from Pasadena. He was a fine old gentleman. His name was [Bruce V.] Reagan. No kidding. [Laughter]

Opposition to the Fisher Bill

VASQUEZ: What was the CTA's opposition to the Fisher bill? And do you remember who their lobbyist was [then]?

GARRIGUS: Well, their lobbyist was [Robert] "Rocky"

McKay. I'm not sure what the CTA's chief concern was. I never did understand why they should be opposed to it.

VASQUEZ: Do you think maybe they felt government was getting into an area it didn't belong?

GARRIGUS: No, I don't think that was it. I think it was the feeling that it would unsettle the present curriculum too much. The status quo would be too much disturbed and that that would have a harmful effect on education.

You see, it was going to change the whole structuring of degrees. Teachers were going to have to have entirely different majors than they had had previously. I think a lot of the establishment was against this. That's the only explanation I can give for it. Philosophically speaking, I just think their opposition was unsound, because the bill was headed in the right direction. I've never claimed it was perfect, but it was a step to arrest a serious neglect in education, [the lack of] history, reading, and English [literature] in education.

VASQUEZ: Which continued to deteriorate, didn't it?

GARRIGUS: Yes, it continued to deteriorate, up until the

present time. I told you about Mentor Graham. You had never heard of Mentor Graham, had you?

VASQUEZ: No, I had not.

GARRIGUS: Well, you're just about the same as 98 percent of all Americans. Here was a man that was the greatest single influence on Abraham Lincoln, one of the saviors of our country and our system, one of our great political idealists. Now, every American schoolboy and girl should know the name of Mentor Graham. And it should ennoble the teaching professor.

Here's a man that taught for sixty-five years. Many of the students that came out of his little country school were the most prominent men in Illinois and other states. When Lincoln was inaugurated he had Mentor Graham sitting right up there on the inauguration platform. Mentor Graham was always a friend of Abraham Lincoln's. He was right there to see his pupil.

Lincoln never went to school, he was too big and too old when he got to New Salem where Mentor Graham was teaching. But he was always up at Mentor Graham's house talking over

important books and [reading] Shakespeare. Lincoln went fishing with the town drunkard only because when he got drunk he spouted Shakespeare, and Lincoln loved it. Shakespeare was always one of Lincoln's delights. He used to bring Shakespeare into the cabinet meetings and talk about certain passages of the plays. Well, Mentor Graham was a man that opened Lincoln up to all these great things in books.

The Decline of the Liberal Arts in American Education

VASQUEZ: Do you think that the decline of interest in the liberal arts came as a result of, to pick a specific event, Sputnik and the great concern for more technology and getting American education geared towards the sciences?

GARRIGUS: That was a very important impetus, a very important impetus in that decline. Of equal importance, I think, was World War II and the shift of the family away from home-centeredness into the marketplace, the acquisition of goods, and the proliferation of commercial entertainment.

One of the saddest aspects of our culture today is that the lives of our people in terms

of what they do, in terms of how they make their living, and in terms of their basic interests, are unsatisfied and lonely. They don't like their jobs enough and they're desperate for a diversion that makes them forget the fact that they don't like their jobs enough.

That's why you have great stadiums for basketball, football, and baseball, with great crowds every day forgetting the fact they don't enjoy their work. Their home life is not what it ought to be and their relationships are deteriorating. That's why you have heroes and heroines constantly parading across our media, constantly being interviewed by all the networks, because they're actors and dancers and singers.

VASQUEZ: And presidents?

GARRIGUS: Presidents. But not because they know how to live life. Not because they're victorious in relationships. Most of these entertainers are our heroes because they have the high life-style, because they have the great homes, because they have the great cars, the great clothing, and the tremendous popularity.

For most of these people, their personal lives are disasters. They've been into drugs. They've failed at parenting. They've failed at marriage. They've failed at family relationships. They've failed at neighboring. But they've succeeded as a dancer or a singer or a movie actor or a stage actor.

Of course, there are exceptions, and thank goodness for those. But the great majority of these people are nothing when it comes to living life. They are our heroes and heroines. They're the role models for our youth.

VASQUEZ: Is it what the sociologist David Riesman calls the "lonely crowd?" Do you think that's what's happened to us.

GARRIGUS: That's a good phrase.

IV. POLITICS IN THE ASSEMBLY

Affinity Groups in the California Assembly

VASQUEZ: Getting back to your freshman term in the assembly. When you got to Sacramento, did you a group of assemblymen that you had a pronounced affinity with? Did you get invited into a small group? I'm thinking of some of the young, liberal assemblymen who were already beginning

to make their mark.

GARRIGUS: No. But there was a natural association among those of us who had college educations and who, as a result of our liberal arts experience, read a lot of similar books and articles and had an interest in reading.

VASQUEZ: Who might those people be, for example?

GARRIGUS: Well, that would be [Assemblyman] Robert [W.] Crown, who was chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the man who carried the legislation that designated me the poet laureate eight years later. Bob was always interested in the best of music and the best of literature. He was a fine student of history and geography, [he was a] tremendous guy to play trivia games with, about geography and history and this and that. There was [Thomas M.] Tom Rees. But, of course, Tom was close to the [Jesse M.] Unruh clique, and I never was. There was just too much difference in my values and those of Jesse at the political level.

Opposing Capital Punishment and Jesse M. Unruh

VASQUEZ: For example?

GARRIGUS: Well, for example, I made a speech on the floor

one day in support of [Assemblyman Lester A.] Les McMillan's bill abolishing capital punishment. I thought I brought in some very pertinent facts and figures on the matter and brought out some points in connection with capital punishment that were factual. For instance, those countries which have abolished capital punishment didn't have as high a rate of homicide as those that had kept it. It wasn't a real deterrent, and no one that could hire a good lawyer ever went to the gas chamber. Things like that and the fact that it violated the Christian ethic, because Jesus said, "You've been told an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, but I tell you love your enemies and do good to those that hate you."

I said that capital punishment was certainly a violation. Well, anyway, when I finished the speech, Jesse came back and sat on the top of his desk and he faced me there. He looked at me and he grinned and he says, "Gus, you really believe all that crap, don't you?" [Laughter] It showed there was a tremendous gap between what I believed and what he believed.

VASQUEZ: On the other hand, you were in pretty good company, weren't you? [Governor Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] took a lot of heat for the very same beliefs.

GARRIGUS: Absolutely. Of course, his son [Edmund G. Brown Jr.] Jerry followed him. And many of the top law enforcement officers. You see, we had testimony before our Criminal Procedure Committee and before the Education Committee by wardens that had spent thirty and forty years with capital crime prisoners. They just told us, "There is an inherent injustice in capital punishment."

First of all, the environments [from] which some people have come are such depraved environments. Second of all, at the other end of the scale, most capital crimes are committed by friends and relatives in a fit of rage--anger or some silly thing that [makes them] lose control. They said, "You don't gain anything by killing this type of person."

Of course, the issue in punishment for homicide is not letting the serious criminal go. If you don't kill him, you don't let him

out to do the damage again. If our psychiatrists are supposed to do their work, we won't let these people out. On the other hand, it's been definitely proved, and they don't get the publicity, that some capital prisoners released on probation after serving part of a life sentence become positive members of the community.

Most notorious was a fellow that was convicted in the famous [Nathan] Leopold [Jr.] and [Richard] Loeb case where they murdered their little cousin, [Robert] Bobby Franks. Clarence Darrow, the great criminal lawyer, got them off on the grounds that society was responsible for their attitudes and was the real accomplice in their crime, because of the way they'd been reared. They both got life imprisonment. Well, one of them was killed in prison after a few years. The other became a doctor. He associated with the medical research program in the laboratories of the prison and was freed on probation. He went down to the Bahamas and spent the rest of his life as a doctor helping poor people.

How much better was that than to have killed him? He was a young man at twenty-four who had in anger and ignorance [committed] a terrible crime. But he later became a different man.

There are sociologists who believe that when Caryl Chessman, our famous [California] case, was finally killed by capital punishment after twelve years, he was not the same man that had committed the crimes he had been accused of. He'd undergone an educational and moral rehabilitation during those twelve years. But yet we killed him.

Agriculture's Opposition to Garrigus in the Assembly

VASQUEZ: We'll come back to that case, in strictly political terms, regarding the Brown administration. I want to get back to your first term in the assembly. You were a freshman assemblyman from a "cow county." Did you have a [greater] affinity with the other "cow county" assemblymen than you did with, say, urban representatives? Or did your affinity go to other things?

GARRIGUS: No, no. I had a great friendship with one of the prominent members that represented the agriculture community up there. I think it embarrassed the Farm Bureau. That was [Assemblyman] Lloyd [W.] Lowrey, who represented the northern California farmers. Lloyd was a real Stetson-hat and cowboy-boot assemblyman. We were good friends and helped each other.

As I said, I think he had friends among the south county farmers who were just opposed to me solidly. But he still remained my loyal friend. He found out that their fears of me were really groundless, but they never did find it out.

VASQUEZ: What were their fears of you?

GARRIGUS: The fact that I was a teacher, mainly. And that I just wasn't conversant with agriculture. It didn't matter that my ancestors had all been farmers and that my wife had been reared on a tiny farm and her father was a farmer. [He was] a man whom I had a tremendous respect for and from whom I learned a lot about farming. They wanted somebody who was a farmer to be in the legislature, not realizing that farmers in the

California legislature were a lonely group. They didn't speak the language and make the kind of contacts that were really helpful to [pass] legislation. Whereas I could make those contacts and talk to that legislature.

I never did a thing during my eight years up there that was hostile to agriculture. And an awful lot was helpful. But I wouldn't get credit for it. It was a strange thing, it was mental prejudice, pure and simple prejudice against an educator without a direct farming background going in to represent the richest agriculture county in the United States.

VASQUEZ: Who else were you in affinity with in the assembly?

GARRIGUS: Well, I had a close association with Assemblyman [Edward E.] Ed Elliott, who represented the Eastside, the area around the turnoff to Route 5 on the way to San Bernardino. That area of Los Angeles which is largely a Mexican-American area. East, Southeast Los Angeles is where it is. He represented that area, and because he was a man who was a keen student of the liberal arts, we had that affinity.

Then, I had a close association with a Republican. I don't think we ever voted the same on any bills on the floor, but we had this affiliation and common interest in art and culture. He was a representative from San Diego by the name of Hale Ashcraft. Hale is retired now on that beautiful Lake Coeur d'Alene in Idaho. He represented San Diego for years.

I had a close association with Dick Hanna, who was also highly [educated]. He was chairman of the Education Committee, I was the vice-chairman. He represented a Democratic island in Orange County and was a very fine assemblyman. Bob Crown I think I mentioned. We were close on the same basis of liberal arts interests. Then, I was a close friend of Bruce Sumner, who later became a judge down in the [Orange County] area and was chairman of the Constitutional Revision Commission for fifteen years. Bruce and I liked to talk on the same levels of cultural issues. He was a liberal Republican.

I can remember when [Joseph C.] Joe Shell used to rush back and reproach him for voting with the Democrats on some liberal issue because

he wasn't voting the straight Republican line. But he was on the opposite end of the structure from Hale. Hale was a conservative Republican who was right in line with the basic Republican points, whereas Bruce would stray occasionally. And then Carley Porter, the chairman of the Water Committee, and I had a close relationship.

The Advantages of a Commuter Assemblyman

VASQUEZ: Did you commute to Sacramento?

GARRIGUS: I commuted. I was one of the few assemblymen who commuted. I usually left the legislature on a Thursday noon and came back early Monday morning when the session resumed. I'd be with my family on weekends. We had a close family and we looked forward to that reunion every week.

VASQUEZ: Do you think you were disadvantaged not living in Sacramento and going out with the boys drinking and carousing?

GARRIGUS: Oh, no. Not at all. I think that was an advantage for me. I kept in touch with my district when I'd go home on weekends. I could meet people and heads of groups and organizations that wanted to talk to me. Then

I had my family life, which was a moral uplift. It charged my batteries again for my values and everything and gave me strength. To associate with my children and my wife on those terms was so much pleasure. I would go back refreshed.

I always used to feel kind of sorry for the guys that stayed up there so much. I remember one old assemblyman from Napa Valley told me, "Don't ever go home, Gus. Stay up here, because nobody down there appreciates you. If you go down there, they just nag you to death." [Laughter] But, of course, I never followed that advice and I never got nagged either.

Third House Influence

VASQUEZ: Did the Third House still have quite a bit of influence?

GARRIGUS: It had a lot of influence.

VASQUEZ: One of the people who is often identified as having been under their influence is Lester McMillan, whom you mentioned a while ago. There was a group [forming] around Jesse Unruh, and part of the reason that they wouldn't take him [McMillan] seriously was that they couldn't

trust him because of the many deals he made. Do you think that had something to do with how certain assemblymen were looked upon by their peers?

GARRIGUS: Well, in time, not when I first went up there, but in time. After Jesse had his lines of organization down. . . . And, of course, you've got to remember that Jesse did the legislature a tremendous service in reorganization.

He turned what was a strictly old courthouse routine with inefficiency into a political science laboratory of research with some of the brightest young men and women in the state working as interns, assistants, and consultants. The fact that it hasn't turned out as well as it should have is not a discredit to Jesse. It's not been used properly. It's been used, to a large extent, as a political incubator for future assemblymen.

Instead of coming out of their districts they come out of the staff of the legislators, which is not the way it was supposed to be at all. It was simply supposed to bring to bear more intelligent organization, more effective

and efficient organization for enacting legislation that had qualified information behind it. That's what it was supposed to be. But it hasn't worked out that way.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it's negative that interns work their way to administrative assistants, then become sort of heirs to the [legislator's] throne?

GARRIGUS: It's hard to pass a judgment there, because there has been so much improvement in so many areas of efficiency and knowledgeability in a growing and complex society. On the other hand, it's been turned into an incubator for political ambition and political advancement by some people in some areas.

But don't forget, when you went up there as a freshman, you were lucky to know where the restrooms were and you didn't [command] any great respect on anything. If you did anything up there as a freshman, besides really orient yourself to what you can do in the future, you had made some progress.

VASQUEZ: Your freshman year, who oriented you? What oriented you? How did you find your bearings?

GARRIGUS: Well, I did it just on my own initiative by asking questions of the right people, by being very observant.

VASQUEZ: What did you observe? What were your impressions of the speaker, of groupings around different individuals or issues?

GARRIGUS: Well, you had different groups that were very susceptible to certain organizations.

VASQUEZ: Outline some of them for me.

GARRIGUS: You had certain men, for instance, that the Railroad Association controlled. You had certain men up there that the doctors, the American Medical Association, the California doctors, controlled.

VASQUEZ: For example?

GARRIGUS: Well, I don't want to give an example because some of those men are friends and their families are still living. It would be unfair to draw a distinction.

But you had other men, like the men I ran against, who were doing the Farm Bureau's bidding, you know. You had men up there whom the dairy industry owned. And this was true because these organizations poured great amounts

of money into their campaigns and gave them special treatment while they were there: restaurants, shows, trips to [Lake] Tahoe, reservations, fund-raisers, parties, things like that.

There was one man who would come around often and tell each of the assemblymen, "We're having a great big dinner tomorrow night. So-and-so wants you to be there. The railroads are throwing the dinner." So we'd be there, everybody would be there having a good time. Most of the influence of the lobbyists was not from passing money or favors directly for a piece of legislation.

Most of the influence was in contributions at election time, in taking you out to dinner, taking you out to a show, a fight, entertainment, or something. Picking up the check wherever you went and just treating you like a good friend. The philosophy for Unruh was, "If you can't take their money, eat their food, have sex with their women and still vote independently, you have got no business up here." That was his philosophy. [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: How did that strike you at the time?

GARRIGUS: Well, it struck most of us as very humorous and, of course, some of us felt like we qualified. I'm sure others didn't.

Impressions of Jesse Unruh and Ralph Brown

VASQUEZ: What was your impression of Jesse Unruh at the time, as a freshman assemblyman?

GARRIGUS: As a freshman I was greatly impressed by Unruh's handling of his committee. He was not the speaker then. Ralph [M.] Brown was the speaker, and Ralph Brown was a personal friend of mine. We got to be very close. We'd go to football games together, and I'd stay at his house in Sacramento.

VASQUEZ: What was your assessment of Ralph Brown as a speaker?

GARRIGUS: [He was] an absolutely superb speaker.

VASQUEZ: What made him a superb speaker?

GARRIGUS: A student of the game. He said, "Before I was speaker, I used to sit back there and analyze every ruling the speaker was making in terms of what I would have done and what he should have done." And he said, "This qualified me. I was ready to step into the job."

VASQUEZ: So he was preparing himself?

GARRIGUS: Right. He was preparing himself. He was a student of the speakership and a real gentleman. He had a tremendous sense of humor.

Impressions of Carlos Bee

VASQUEZ: How about Carlos Bee, who also was a student of the speakership?

GARRIGUS: Carlos Bee, of course, did not have the policy clout that the real speaker had. But, as a presiding officer, Carlos Bee was matchless because he had a tremendous vitality and a marvelous sense of humor. He had a way of dealing personally from the rostrum that made the assemblymen feel at ease and feel like they were getting a fair shake all the time.

Carlos was also a fine student of the liberal arts. We were close personal friends. I have his memorial right there that I wrote and read at his memorial service for his family. Carlos was one of those tragedies that Shakespeare plays up so much in a great man who has a fatal flaw. As I said, Carlos was one of the most capable presiding officers that I've ever known. And he was speaker pro tem of the

assembly longer than any other man. And that was by popular approval. [Garrigus recites:]

IN MEMORIAM

CARLOS BEE

To have known this man, one has to wish
That others could have known him too.
His wit, like sparkling water in a drink
Would make dull duty palatable for you.
Often he lit our intellects with sense
Jocularly or caustically conveyed.
In hated fires of partisan debate,
His chief concern was how the game was played.
He had the power with dignity to trifle,
Yet never in such action was absurd.
He spoke to make communication valid,
And was a master of the appropriate word.
He valued knowledge first for serving needs,
Then used it as a tool for social grace.
He had the art of showing men their foibles
To help reach toward improvement in his place.
For him his family was life's dearest meaning,
And this sustained him in his arduous task.
To have the love of family, friends and colleagues
Is surely blessing, full as he could ask.
Walk down his anxious days of pressured tension;
Walk through his troubled nights of sleepless care;
Then measure out your judgment on your comrade.
But send it off to heaven with a prayer.
Death is a mystery men may never solve,
And life goes on, our fond hopes to beguile.
But if beyond there is a place for judgment
Carlos will help us there, to help us clear the file.[1]

VASQUEZ: How would you assess the speakership of Jesse Unruh? You were there when he was a

1. Delivered before the legislature in session, December 3, 1974.

speaker.

GARRIGUS: Well, the truth of Jesse Unruh as a speaker is that he rarely presided. Only when there was a very important and special piece of legislation that he was concerned with would he preside. Most of the time Carlos presided. Jesse would be back in the office or walking the floor, which he did frequently, discussing the issues, the different bills, or the different problems of assemblymen. I would say, while Jesse was speaker, Carlos presided 90 percent of the time.

VASQUEZ: Jesse was working the floor and working people?

GARRIGUS: Yes, working the floor and back in his office interviewing people and just leaving everything up to Carlos. Now, if there was an important piece of legislation on the docket, on the file, Jesse would preside. He would preside for special occasions when there were dignitaries present and things like that. When he had an important announcement to make on organization or committee work, he would preside. But the day-by-day curbstone operation was done 90 percent of the time by Carlos.

The 1959 Hawkins Versus Brown Speakership Race

VASQUEZ: There was another race that I think is interesting, and that was when Gus Hawkins wanted to be speaker in 1959.

GARRIGUS: Oh, I was right in the thick of that.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

GARRIGUS: Gus wanted to be speaker because he had so much seniority and, of course, a lot of ability. But he also had alienated certain groups. I can't remember which now because, remember, I was just coming into this out of the classroom.

The other most prominent black member in the legislature was [William] Byron Rumford, the author of the Rumford Act. Byron and Gus were on opposite sides. Byron was supporting Ralph Brown. Gus had a strong base of support from the Los Angeles area, from southern California assemblymen.

VASQUEZ: But not all of them. Tom Rees for example?

GARRIGUS: No, no. Well, you're talking about a later date. I'm not sure where Tom was at this time, I kind of think he was with Ralph Brown.

VASQUEZ: He didn't support Hawkins and he was from Los Angeles.

GARRIGUS: All right, yes. Well, Brown had a stronger lineup in the central and northern [California] group. But he didn't have the seniority that Hawkins had. But Hawkins had some Republican support that Brown didn't have. The Democrats were in enough of a majority, and Ralph Brown had, with the help of fellows like Tom Rees, done enough work. For instance, I was contacted by Brown and never contacted by Hawkins. That was typical.

I was all lined up for this speakership vote for Brown before it ever came to a vote, [as was] my associate, Bert DeLotto, who represented the hole in the doughnut. [the city of Fresno] Bert DeLotto was for Brown and he was also contacted for Hawkins. [But] Hawkins didn't try to reach us until it was too late.

VASQUEZ: Who reached you for Brown? Do you remember?

GARRIGUS: It was either Tom Rees or [Philip A.] Phil Burton. I'm not sure which. But it was one of those two.

VASQUEZ: What were the arguments for Brown over Hawkins?

GARRIGUS: Well, there were no real strong arguments. It was just a matter of being approached and told

what a fine man Brown was and how he had a wider base of representation than Hawkins would have, and would I support him? I had no reason to say no.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that Hawkins, having been there so long and identified by some as someone influenced by the Third House, had any influence on his losing the speakership?

GARRIGUS: I don't know. I really don't know enough about that. I simply know that Ralph Brown represented a much wider range of the political spectrum in California than Gus did and that there was a unity between central and northern California against southern California interests. I think this was probably the deciding point. I know it wasn't with me. I just felt that Brown was more qualified, even though Gus had more seniority. Gus was a man of fine ability and he's been a good congressman.

Carrying Legislation as a Freshman Assemblyman

VASQUEZ: Tell me, as a freshman assemblyman, how did you line up support for legislation that you thought was really important?

GARRIGUS: You must remember that under the California

system your real work on all legislation was done in committee. By the time a bill reached the floor of the house, you usually didn't have to line up support for it if it had good committee clearance.

Now, if it was highly controversial, and if there was a lot of opposition in committee, then you had to work the floor in the house. You did that simply by going from desk to desk and telling a man why you were interested in this legislation, making clear to him that you would appreciate his help, which said to him indirectly, "And when you need me next time, I'll be there to help you."

It was a matter of trade. But this was only done on highly controversial bills. Where you did your hardest work was when you had a piece of legislation which was a vote or two short of passage. Then you issued a call to the house. You worked that floor hard to get somebody to change their vote to help you and you tried to do a selling job.

Now, remember, a freshman rarely has anything like this to do. He isn't carrying

that kind of legislation. He doesn't have that kind of acquaintance with the floor. He's dealing with strangers for the most part. We're talking about something that comes along a little later, when you know the house better and know the legislative process and when you have some friends.

By the time I put in my four terms up there, it was really wonderful because every time I had a bill on the floor, I had so many friends out there among those assemblymen that my bills just went sailing through. This was true of so many others. Carley Porter never lost a bill on the floor, he had so many friends out there. This is one thing that people don't realize, that the quality of personality and character makes friends. There were some fellows up there that didn't have many friends. They had an awful time getting their legislation through, especially when there was a point of controversy. There was no feeling of warmth or affection to help these persons. On the basis of my own experience, I had a lot of that [affection] by the time I was ready to

leave the legislature.

VASQUEZ: What was your biggest triumph and your biggest disappointment in your freshman term?

GARRIGUS: My biggest triumph my freshman term was not gaining too much weight from all the wonderful dinners that I had. [Laughter] To get serious about the matter, I didn't have any big triumph my freshman term. And I don't think any other freshman up there had a big triumph, and we had an outstanding class. Out of my class, there were about seven who later went to Congress, and they had good records. Some of them are still in the legislature. But you just don't have big triumphs as a freshman. The system doesn't work that way.

I had one friend who was a highly qualified legislator in Congress and left Congress because of the seniority system. He said, "It will take me five more years, at least, and I've been here eight. It would take me five more years, at least, before I'd be able to get my legislative program in." That was Assemblyman Jerome [A.] Waldie, who was a very capable man and congressman. He's now a lobbyist in Washington,

D.C. He also ran in the primary election for governor.

VASQUEZ: Congressman Tom Rees left the Congress for the very same reason.

GARRIGUS: That's right. Other congressmen have left because of that awful seniority system. Now, for my sophomore year, I did have a great triumph.

VASQUEZ: What was that?

Community College Legislation

GARRIGUS: I put through a bill that remedied a long-standing deficiency in community college curriculum, and finance. That was the bill that said every high school district in California had to belong to a junior college district.[1] To do this, it had to conform itself with a contiguous junior college district. It couldn't skip over. This meant that there would be a sound financial flooring under the community college system, and it led immediately to the beginning of about five new colleges the following year.

---

1. A.B. 2641, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1333 (1961).

They had three years to implement this requirement. You see, you had high schools running junior colleges. The people that sent students there would just pay a seat tax for the students, but they had no say in its policy, organization, or management. This bill reorganized the whole community college system in terms of geography and finance, it was a big bill. It immediately affected my own college, which had an assessed valuation. This bill was not put in for the sake of my college, it was for the sake of the whole community college system. But my college was one of the chief beneficiaries of it.

VASQUEZ: This was in the 1961 session?

GARRIGUS: Yeah. This meant that my college immediately went from last in assessed valuation in the state to second. It got all those wonderful, expensive properties of the Southern California Edison Company that were located up in the mountains, power generating plants and all that, to put money into the tax base of my college. It's been prosperous ever since.

The other interesting thing was that the

only way Fresno City College, which is one of the oldest community colleges in the state, could tap into the same tax base was to join with Reedley Junior College. Then it became contiguous through Reedley to this tax base. It couldn't get there before because the Fresno Unified School District was in the way, and Fresno Unified wasn't about to join with it. This made the formation of a whole new junior college district called the State Center Junior College District, operating campuses in Reedley and Fresno. That was a direct result of that legislation.

VASQUEZ: Why did you feel the junior colleges were so important?

GARRIGUS: Simply the availability of education to every student in California. Unless some students had a junior college within reach, they would not get a higher education. The junior colleges were functioning in two ways. One was preparing people for a liberal arts and, secondly, providing foundational education in local communities to [let people] become intelligent members of their communities.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

VASQUEZ: We were talking about your 1961 Community College bill.

GARRIGUS: It's gone on through the years being responsible for the constant growth of the junior college system by the inclusion of more high school districts and creating junior colleges.

The Defeat of Proposition 4 in 1966

You wanted to know my greatest disappointment in my legislative career. My greatest disappointment was when I succeeded in getting as a constitutional amendment onto the state ballot to lower the requirement for the passage of school bonds from a 66-2/3 percent majority to 60 percent. That was Proposition 4 in the election of 1966.

I worked for two years to get that, because one of the most serious problems we had at that time in California was the lack of sufficient educational facilities for the growing student population.

Small communities were simply not able to marshall a 66-2/3 vote, they were having to hold

these elections over and over and over again. And every time at great expense. By the time they held ten or twelve elections and paid for these elections, that money could almost have taken care of their construction budget.

It was just common sense to have had this accepted, and I hated to see the people be snowed by the Taxpayers Association. What [the defeat] meant was that it would just simply delay the ultimate construction over a period of years at a much higher expense because of inflated costs. So it was a defeat for common sense, and it was a defeat for me. It was my biggest loss.

VASQUEZ: Why do you think it lost?[1]

GARRIGUS: Well, I think it lost because a lot of people didn't understand it, didn't realize its importance. Another reason it lost was because there was a very active, intelligent, well-educated group of taxpayers that didn't want to support the construction of new schools in their areas. Their attitude was, "What we've got is

1. Proposition 4 lost 153,665 to 155,383.

good enough."

VASQUEZ: Yet many of those people came to California specifically because it offered excellent educational opportunities.

GARRIGUS: That's right. There was nothing consistent. But a lot of their children were already through the schools, see. They didn't have kids in school. The people that were to benefit most by it didn't go out and vote for it, and the people that were going to benefit the least by it did go out and vote against it.

VASQUEZ: Do you suppose that the student demonstrations at the University of California, Berkeley, and some of the campus activities against the Vietnam War had something to do with public attitudes toward constructing schools?

GARRIGUS: Not very much, because the people that did most of the defeating of school bonds were local people that were primarily governed by local interests, by the pocketbook.

VASQUEZ: What was your interpretation of the defeat of Proposition 4 on the state level?

GARRIGUS: Well, on the state level, it was simply that most of the voters were conservative property

holders, and they just did not want any increase in school bond taxes, that's all.

Accomplishments and Defeats on Education Legislation

VASQUEZ: What other accomplishments do you think stand out in your legislative career?

GARRIGUS: Well, I had a very broad legislative program. I like to think that the personal things I did for classified school employees and for teachers were of value, working with Assemblyman [Edward E.] Elliott to get the duty-free lunch period passed for teachers so they could have a morale-builder in the middle of the day instead of having to tend to kids while they were trying to eat their lunch. And the personal sick leave for teachers that I put through.

One of my greatest legislative accomplishments was ruined during the Reagan administration, everything I'd accomplished was repealed. That was my 50 percent law, which said that 50 percent of the current operating budget of a school district had to be spent on teachers' salaries instead of the bureaucratic hierarchies that administrators were building up

in their districts and costing the taxpayers a lot of money.[1]

I wanted that money to go to teachers' salaries instead of for counselors and assistants and advisors and consultants and all of this. I wanted it to go to teachers' salaries because I thought that would improve education. Of course, this was an advance shot of a big battle. Because since I fired this shot, teachers' salaries have been greatly improved today.

VASQUEZ: But it was still fought every foot of the way?

GARRIGUS: Well, that depends. You're getting some teachers that are overpaid, and you're getting others that aren't paid enough. You have such relative differences in the teaching field, in the abilities to educate kids. Some teachers, you can't pay them enough for the influence they have on the character and the direction that they give kids, the role models they are. Others are just simply there to pass the time as quickly as possible and collect their checks.

---

1. A.B. 1786, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2194 (1961).

This is a sad feature of the system. And to devise an appropriate merit system, of course, has been one the great challenges of education, it's very difficult.

VASQUEZ: What's your opinion of current conservative views on merit pay for teachers today?

GARRIGUS: Well, I'm for merit pay, but when I say that I have to immediately qualify it by saying that I'm for setting up a committee outside of the school system for the judgment of a teacher's merit. There's too much politics inside the system to trust either the administrators or some teachers to pass a qualified judgment.

I hate to think how I would have fared, and I count myself as an excellent teacher. I do that on the validation of two generations of students who passed through my classes. But I know that if some of my colleagues and some of my administrators had had the power to judge my teaching ability on their estimates of my merit, I would have fared very badly because there was jealousy. There was envy and there was out-and-out indifference.

For instance, I had one administrator meet

me in the hall once, and this was a man who if there had been a merit system would have been in charge of my teaching area. He told me, "You really get a lot out of this fellow Shakespeare, don't you?" He said, "I never cared much for him. I couldn't understand him." And this was a liberal arts dean telling me that he was surprised I got a lot out of Shakespeare. Now, I wouldn't have fared very well under him simply because of my concern for Shakespeare.

V. RELATIONSHIP WITH GOVERNOR EDMUND G. BROWN, SR.

The Governor Vetoes Garrigus's Physician Certification Bill

VASQUEZ: In 1965, Governor Brown vetoed your bill, A.B. 1096, which had to do with physicians' qualifications in the education code.[1] Why was that?

GARRIGUS: Well, I've always had my suspicions about that veto, and I can't, of course, validate those suspicions. But I've always felt like the governor's office was under such heavy pressure --with a campaign on the horizon--from the state

1. A.B. 1096, 1965 Leg. Sess., vetoed by the governor.

organization of California physicians and the American Medical Association [AMA], that he vetoed that bill because they were against it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about the contents of that bill.

GARRIGUS: The contents of that bill meant that if you were a doctor who had had experience and an education in Germany or Mexico or Peru or somewhere else, and you came to California, you could not get a license here until you had undergone a qualifying curriculum. It's the same thing that caused me as a very young teacher just out of college to leave Kentucky, much to Kentucky's loss, much to Kentucky's great loss.

I had taught one year in Illinois and I went down to teach in Kentucky in a little rural high school. I had the only master's degree in the school, but I did not have the fifteen hours of educational subjects required for certification in Kentucky. The state superintendent of public education, even though I had the only master's degree and a year's successful teaching, would not give me a credential in Kentucky unless I went back and took a semester's courses, which I refused to do.

I could write that superintendent, that old fossil, and I could say to him, "Do you realize under this requirement that Dr. [Albert] Einstein couldn't even teach fifth-grade mathematics in Kentucky?" And I could get a reply from him saying, "If you don't like the way we do things, you can leave Kentucky, and so can your friend, Dr. Einstein."

VASQUEZ: So your bill would have made it possible for people coming from another country and who had been trained as physicians to practice in the state?

GARRIGUS: Right, to be given a license to practice in California.

VASQUEZ: And this was vetoed, you feel, by pressure put on Governor Brown?

GARRIGUS: That's what I believe. I don't know, but that's what I think. Because they opposed it in committee. The bill came about because there was a doctor that had practiced three or four years in Oregon. [He had] a successful practice, was educated, I think, in Germany. He came down to California and wanted to practice here but couldn't get a certificate.

VASQUEZ: Do you remember his name?

GARRIGUS: No, I don't.

VASQUEZ: Now, how did it get out of committee if it was opposed by the AMA and these other forces?

GARRIGUS: Because I had the strength in the committee to get it through.

VASQUEZ: So they had to cut you off with the veto?

GARRIGUS: Right. I had the strength on the floor to get it passed. But I didn't have the strength to get it past the lobbyists who were talking to the governor, I think. I'll have to qualify that, the governor and I were good friends.

Garrigus's Relationship with Brown

VASQUEZ: Tell me how you got to know Governor Brown initially and about your personal relationship.

GARRIGUS: [Laughter] I got to know Governor Brown when he came into my area campaigning and when I was running for the assembly the first time. Then I got to know him better the second time he came down.

He was an active supporter in both the election efforts of Adlai Stevenson. Later on, he was not a supporter of Adlai Stevenson, and we split the California delegation three ways

because the governor supported John F. Kennedy. I was a supporter of Stevenson. Our congressman [Bernard F. Sisk] was a supporter of [Senator] Lyndon [B.] Johnson, so the delegation split into three factions. But Governor Brown and I immediately had a close affinity on the basis of his interest in the liberal arts and education.

VASQUEZ: How about the death penalty?

GARRIGUS: We also had an affinity there. I'll never forget, one day he was scheduled to have lunch with a group of us for an educational luncheon, I think it was for the Fisher bill, at the Sutter Club in San Francisco. My seat was right next to his. I was sitting to the right of him, and he was sitting at the head of the table. He was late, and so we went ahead.

When he came in, he was kind of distraught. "Governor," I said, "we waited for you like hungry cowboys at a round-up breakfast." And he laughed. He said, "I don't have too much appetite anyway, Gus." He said, "I just came from a clemency hearing." He looked me right in the eye and said, "How would you like to have to decide whether two men die or live?" His face

and his eyes were full of distress. And I said, "Well, Governor, I wouldn't like it at all." He said, "Well, that's the kind of decision I've got to make." He said, "These two fellows, they were hired by a woman to kill a man. They're ignorant. They're minorities. They've had no education."

VASQUEZ: This is the famous Ventura County case where the two Mexican farmworkers were hired by a woman to kill a man?

GARRIGUS: Yeah, that was the case. I don't know what the name of it was.

VASQUEZ: The Elizabeth Duncan case, I believe it's called.

GARRIGUS: Well, he had just come from a clemency hearing with [Clemency Secretary] Cecil Poole on this, and he asked me how I'd feel if I had decided it. He made me lose my appetite too. And I said, "Governor, that's a terrible ordeal." I've even forgotten how he decided on it.

VASQUEZ: It was a triple execution.

GARRIGUS: It was? Oh, he let it go on then. He didn't grant the clemency, but I'll tell you, he was really upset. I never forgot that.

Garrigus and the Brown-Unruh Rivalry

VASQUEZ: When he had his falling out with Jesse Unruh, were you more inclined to support the governor?

GARRIGUS: Oh, yes. Jesse had no valid reason at all for opposing the governor. Jesse's objection to the governor was a basic intellectual difference. Jesse felt about Governor Pat Brown just like [William H.] Seward and [Salmon P.] Chase felt about Abraham Lincoln when Lincoln was elected president by a minority of the people in the country because of a split in the Democratic party. Seward, from Lincoln's first term, felt that he should be president, that he was more qualified by education, by association, by knowledgeability, by everything, than Lincoln was.

Unruh felt that he should be governor. He wanted to be governor so bad. Of course, later he ran for governor and almost made it. But he disliked being unable to do things that only the governor could do. His power, the legislature, the speakership, was restricted in some areas, especially on appointments.

Just like the example I gave you. I was

appointed to the Compact for Education to serve with the president of Occidental College, Dr. [Arthur H.] Coons, and [Thomas W.] Tom Braden, who runs a political discussion program in Washington on TV, who was then the editor of the Oceanside Blade Tribune. We three were commissioners to go to this Compact for Education where [North Carolina] Governor Terry Sanford was the chairman. He was just recently elected senator of North Carolina.

This was following through on the [James B.] Conant Report on high schools [calling] for changes that should be made throughout the states to achieve a uniformity in curriculum and teacher certification in higher education.[1]

VASQUEZ: This was a conference held in Kansas City in 1966?

GARRIGUS: Yes. And the governor [Brown] appointed me without consulting Jesse, which the governor often did on things that were within his prerogative. Jesse was offended, and so he told

---

1. **The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens.** New York: McGraw-Hall, 1959.

the Rules Committee not to honor any of my vouchers for my expenses to Kansas City and back, which was unheard of. I mean, committee chairmen were always having to go places for study, and some of them would go places not studying anything but the local restaurants and shows. But I was sent on very serious business, and it's the only time I ever went out of the state in my eight years [in the assembly]. And he [Unruh] told the Rules Committee not to honor my vouchers.

I went down to tell the governor. I said, "Governor, I can't afford to take this trip. I'm not a wealthy man. I've got a large family, and it's just outside my household budget." I said, "Jesse has refused to allow to have my vouchers honored by the Rules Committee from the contingency fund." And I said, "You're going to have to appoint another commissioner." "Oh, no, Gus." He said, "You're going to go. Jesse isn't going to get away with this." He said, "I have a contingency fund, my governor's fund. And I'll pay all your expenses out of it. You go right ahead." And I did. Of course, this

didn't please Unruh, either.

The governor stopped me one morning in the garage when we were coming into our offices. He had a special elevator, and I was going over to the legislative elevator. He said, "Gus, hold on a minute." So I went over and said, "What is it, Governor?" He said, "Would you come up to my office for a minute? I want to talk to you." So I said, "Sure, I'll be very happy to." I went with him up in his elevator and we went to his office.

He said, "Sit down there." And so he sat down in his chair and he said, "Gus, what does Jesse want?" He looked just like a little boy that was puzzled over having something done wrong to him. And I said, "Well, Governor, what Jesse wants is to be sitting right there in that seat where you're sitting."

He was silent for a moment, and he said, "I guess that's it. I've done everything to try to cooperate with this man. I've placated him. I've honored his requests on many things, and he still insists on blocking me on legislative issues and other things that are in my

program. He does things, just deliberately going out of his way to inconvenience me." And I said, "Well, Governor, Jesse is a highly intelligent and ambitious man. He just doesn't always agree with the way you see things, and instead of recognizing his own limitations, he simply believes he should try to influence you where you can't be influenced." And he said, "Well, he's not going to do it." He thanked me for stopping by and I went on.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

GARRIGUS: This would be in '66.

VASQUEZ: Now, I'm sure you've seen James Mills's new book.[1]

GARRIGUS: No, I haven't.

Supporting Jesse Unruh's Bid for Assembly Speaker

VASQUEZ: Well, in his book on the Unruh-Brown years he talks about the meeting that was held at [Assemblyman Thomas C.] Tom Carrell's house.

GARRIGUS: Oh, that was a wonderful meeting. We had a great weekend there.

---

1. **A Disorderly House: The Brown-Unruh Years in** Sacramento. Berkeley: Heyday Books, 1987.

VASQUEZ: It was a preview to the vote on Jesse Unruh's speakership. Tell me your remembrance of that meeting.

GARRIGUS: Well, we had formed the Tuesday Morning Breakfast Club. We met every Tuesday morning for breakfast together, it was a group of nine legislators [assemblymen].

VASQUEZ: Who were they, do you remember?

GARRIGUS: I don't know whether I can remember all of them or not. There was myself and Jim Mills and Tom Carrell and [Edwin L.] Ed Z'Berg and Jack [T.] Casey and John [C.] Williamson and [Alfred E.] Al Alquist and George [A.] Willson. There were one or two others I can't think of right offhand. I'd know in a minute if I had a list of legislators I could look at.

VASQUEZ: Was Myron [H.] Frew also in that group?

GARRIGUS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Just to go through them real quickly. Carrell and yourself, Garrigus, James Mills, Edwin Z'Berg, Jack Casey, John Williamson, Alfred Alquist, George Willson and Myron Frew?

GARRIGUS: Alquist today is chairman of the Senate Finance [Committee]. Every one of them had distin-

guished careers as legislators. But we would meet on important issues of policy we were concerned with; we would support each other.

VASQUEZ: What was the basis of your affinity?

GARRIGUS: The fact that we weren't part of the power structure that was there. We weren't a part of the other cliques that were established. See, we were, for the most part, newcomers. We were all freshman assemblymen for the most part. We had personalities that meshed well and got along well with each other.

VASQUEZ: Some of the people around Jesse Unruh were pretty junior people, but you weren't in that group?

GARRIGUS: No, no. I wasn't in that group at all. They were a group that was also highly intelligent but could get along with Jesse's personality better. Jesse had a dominant, strong personality. You could act as his peer as long as you just didn't disagree on basic things with him. If you did, why, it was a different matter.

VASQUEZ: You couldn't be his peer?

GARRIGUS: You couldn't be his peer, that's right. Then they had some [Laughter] areas of conviviality

on their associations with entertainment facilities and with women that the rest of us were out of because of our very straight adherence to our marital standards. [Laughter] You read between the lines there. All right. So, we all met at Tom's one weekend just for the purpose of deciding who we were going to support for speaker.

VASQUEZ: Why, did you see Jesse becoming speaker?

GARRIGUS: Well, we saw that we had reached [a stage] where we were the deciding factor. We saw that. And we wanted to see which way we should go. We could either go with a coalition of Republicans for another man, I believe it was Gordon Winton, or we could go for Jesse.

This was kind of a Democratic debate between nine power brokers as to how we would ultimately bestow ourselves. We did. We discussed pros and cons and finally decided that we'd invite Jesse in and hear what he had to say to us about our future and our interests. Tom had lined him up in the area, and Jesse probably had put him up to it, but Tom wasn't controlling us or influencing [us]. He was getting us into

an area where Jesse could talk to us. So Jesse came over and talked to us.

VASQUEZ: That same day of the meeting?

GARRIGUS: Yes. Well, the meeting lasted three days. Tom had wonderful steaks for us, we had some great card games. Our wives did a lot of visiting and, I think, little shopping tours. Everybody had a good time.

Tom had a beautiful estate right there as you enter Los Angeles, up on a high hill. I don't know what's happened to it. He had a tragic life because he lost his son on a motorcycle that he had given his son, which he always reproached himself for doing. [He] felt guilty.

Anyway, Jesse came over and we talked to him. Z'Berg was the man in the group that was needling Jesse for a give-and-take commitment there, that for his support, [a guarantee that] we would be [committee] chairmen.

VASQUEZ: How did Jesse react to that?

GARRIGUS: Well, Jesse was not the kind of guy that would make that kind of a commitment, he had too many other areas [of concern]. But he said, "Now,

look, I'll tell you this. And I mean it. I'll say to you that if you guys will support me, you'll not regret it." That was the way he put it. After Jesse left, we were discussing what was said. Z'Berg was lukewarm in his support, whereas the rest of us were inclined to go along with Jesse.

Z'Berg was arguing because Jesse wouldn't give a commitment, a definite commitment. So Tom asked me, "Well, what do you think, Gus?" And I said, "Jesse, as far as I know, has never broken his word to anybody. He's always proud of his word. And he's told us we won't regret it. That's general, but let's go with that." Tom asked the rest of them what they thought, and they followed [me] on that. So we went with it.

I became chairman of [the Committee on] Education. Z'Berg became chairman of something, and Myron Frew had a chairmanship of some little thing off to the corner. . . . I don't know what it was. It had to do with licensing, I think. So we all fared well.

The Role of an Effective Committee Chairman

But I don't think that that's why I was made chairman. I think I was made chairman because of my seniority as vice-chairman, my service, plus the fact that when I had handled the committee as vice-chairman on important bills, Jesse liked what he saw. I could clear that file faster than any chairman in the legislature because I didn't fool around. I made sure the right questions were asked, that everybody had a fair hearing, and then I had people move for passing the bill.

VASQUEZ: How did you come to learn how to do something like that?

GARRIGUS: Being a student of civics and government in my training. My political science courses.

VASQUEZ: That usually gives you a larger conceptual understanding and appreciation of things. But the kind of chairing that you're talking about requires a certain affinity with personalities and knowing how to handle people, knowing how to move things.

GARRIGUS: That's absolutely right. Well, part of it was by watching how poorly other committees were handled in the legislature. You contrasted

yourself to other chairmen, you said, "Well, I wouldn't do it that way." Or, "What's he wasting time here for?" Or, "Why doesn't he go over here to this point?" Or, "What's he letting this fellow waste the committee's time for?" Or, "Why doesn't he make a suggestion here?" You could see those things.

You see, I was serving on other committees, and not only that, but I was presenting bills in other committees. I was doing this long before Robert's Rules of Order. A couple of times, I cleared the floor on controversial issues right in the assembly because I knew a point of the rules that nobody else had invoked on the use of quorums and minorities, etc.

VASQUEZ: Procedure?

GARRIGUS: Procedure, you see. I loved being chairman, and they loved me. I was a very popular chairman because I moved that file and because I wouldn't let things drag.

VASQUEZ: Did you spend a lot of time off the floor and out of committee meetings studying some of the measures?

GARRIGUS: No, I was too busy on my legislative program. I

always had an active legislative program, plus I had a district that wrote me a lot of letters. I was the kind of fellow that wanted to make some kind of reply to every letter.

VASQUEZ: You didn't have much of a staff. Who took care of that?

GARRIGUS: Well, I had very, very effective secretaries to do that for me. They would come in, and I'd dictate for a solid hour, one letter right after the other. They would have the letters stacked there for me, and I'd go over [each] letter and dictate answers to them. That would take a lot of time.

I would get in the morning early, sort my letters, and put the ones that were important in order of priority. When my secretary came in, I'd start dictating. When I arrived at my legislative office in the morning, [mine] would be the only office open in the corridor. Everybody else would be somewhere else. But I came to work early. And I stayed late to work.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that made a difference?

GARRIGUS: I had no nightlife. I spent most of my evenings either going to a movie, to which I had free

passes, with another legislator--I'd go with Ed Elliott, Bruce Sumner, or someone--or we would sit in the legislative lounge and watch television or play cards. I'd go to bed pretty early. After the 11:00 P.M. news, I headed to my hotel room.

I had the cheapest room in the legislature. I lived the most, what you might call, monastic life in the legislature. I'm not sure of that point, but it was pretty close to it because I'd just go to my hotel and go to sleep, get up, go to the legislature and do my work, come back to the hotel and go to sleep.

Carlos Bee told a funny story one time when the Education Committee was holding a hearing in the city council [chamber] in the L.A. city hall. He said, "When we get ready to come to Los Angeles for a committee meeting," this was my second term up there, "Ernest [R.] Geddes," who was chairman of the committee, "Ernest always goes and gets on the daylight [train to Los Angeles] to go down the coast on the train. I go out to the airport. And Gus goes to the Greyhound station." [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Is that indicative of how you operated?

GARRIGUS: Yeah, indicative of the different life-styles that we had.

VASQUEZ: What do you think made a good committee chairman in those days, and who did you think were especially good chairmen?

GARRIGUS: First of all, the ability to study the bills with what you might call a scan-read discernability, giving you very quickly [a sense of] what was really serious and what wasn't. Having at least a familiarity with the basic thrust of whatever the legislation was.

The second thing was getting your witnesses to abbreviate their testimony, and rather than going into details, and not spend time on material that could be summed up very quickly for the committee.

VASQUEZ: How would you do that? Would you meet with them personally?

GARRIGUS: Well, I would do it by my familiarity with the bill and with the fact that I'd quickly ascertain if there was any opposition in the hall to the bill. And if there was no opposition to the thing, I would not spend any

time on it.

I'd [ask], "Is there any opposition in the audience out there? Does anyone have an objection to any feature of this bill?" Well, if no one did or came forward, then I'd say, "Well, have the committee members, who I'm sure have studied the bill well. . . ." with a smile, an ironic smile, knowing half of them hadn't even looked at it. "Do the committee members have anything to object to in this legislation? Well, hearing no objection from either the committee or the floor, is there a motion?" I'd always have someone make the motion and move the bill out, and it was gone. Whereas other assemblymen delayed.

VASQUEZ: Some did not handle this as effectively?

GARRIGUS: There was a lot of fooling around with personality intrusion, editorial comments, and [taking] sides. It took up time, delayed things.

VASQUEZ: Do you think sometimes people got caught up in their own egos?

GARRIGUS: Absolutely. The legislature was a great place for a man to try to compensate for his

insecurities.

VASQUEZ: Give me some other examples of people that were excellent chairmen in your view.

GARRIGUS: Carley Porter was an excellent chairman. Carley insisted on having aides that were experts, and he conferred closely with those aides. He had men that knew water [issues] and he conferred with these men. He listened to them. He asked questions. He was an excellent chairman. John [C.] Williamson was a fine chairman of the Committee on Agriculture for the same reason. He asked penetrating questions. Robert Crown was a splendid chairman [of the Committee] on Ways and Means. Jesse Unruh was an excellent chairman on Ways and Means.

VASQUEZ: Why was he excellent?

GARRIGUS: Because of the fact that he was so intelligent and he could get to the heart of the issue and sound out really quickly the arguments for and against by the appropriate experts. He would move along and not allow too many interruptions. It was a very large committee. It was the largest in the assembly. Both he and Robert Crown were excellent chairmen on Ways and Means.

VASQUEZ: Do you think part of their effectiveness came from doing their work in advance and knowing the answers before they asked the questions, as it were?

GARRIGUS: Yes, that's undoubtedly an important part of it. But another part was just simply skill and good-naturedly not allowing different individuals to introduce extraneous and unnecessary material.

VASQUEZ: And take them off on tangents?

GARRIGUS: Yeah, take you off on tangents, right.

The Relationship Between the Assembly and the Senate

VASQUEZ: When you were in the assembly, what was the relationship between the assembly and the senate?

GARRIGUS: It was very unstable. I'm not quite sure why at that time it was, except that we had a lot of new infusion into the assembly, whereas we had an awful lot of crony old-timers in the senate. There was a resentment in the assembly by younger members at the way the senate conducted its business. Maybe a little envy, also. They kind of operated as a club over

there, where we were not operating as a club. We were operating as a lot of individuals.

The members of the senate would enter into agreements for either acceptance or rejection on legislation that we never entered into among ourselves.

VASQUEZ: And those agreements had to do with what? Cronyism? Friendship?

GARRIGUS: Well, yeah, they had to do with give-and-take on their part plus personal friendship, favoritism for men that had been associated with each other for years. [They] partied together a lot and helped each other back and forth, they owed each other different obligations.

We didn't have that to a large extent. There was some of it, but not nearly as much. There was a tendency for senators to be high-handed because they had more of an absolute power than we did as assemblymen. They had been corrupted by this absolute power, as Lord Acton says.

For instance, one of my finest pieces of legislation was a little securities exchange act

for California, which was for the benefit of stockholders who were not getting a yearly accounting on their invested money.[1] They were not getting a summary sheet. They were not getting an annual report. They didn't know what was happening to their company and what was happening to their investment or their stock.

I simply put through a little security exchange act modeled on the Security Exchange Act at the federal level. It would have made every company have an audit once a year, give that audit's report to the stockholders, and have a [stockholders] meeting.[1]

I had a university professor of economics working hand in glove with me. We had witnesses that were coming up and talking about how they didn't have any idea where the money they had put in a company some time ago went. They didn't know what happened to it. They weren't getting any kind of reporting on it. I got it through the assembly. I got it over into a senate committee. I worked the senate committee

1. A.B. 2289, 1965 Leg. Session.

until I had the votes. I had a one-vote majority in the senate committee.

Now, the day they met, I presented my bill. I had my expert testimony there. I had the professor from the University of California. I had witnesses from people who had suffered from it. This is an example of the kind of thing that happened in the senate which we resented so much.

The chairman said, "Are there any other arguments on the bill?" No other arguments. "All those in favor?" "Aye." He said, "All those against?" "No." "No. The noes have it." And clearly the ayes had it. I had my votes. The chairman said, "Well, Mr. Garrigus, we don't like your bill. We just don't like it."

VASQUEZ: Who was that chairman, do you remember?

GARRIGUS: The [chairman was the] guy that later went to jail on a financial collusion scandal. Dolwig!

VASQUEZ: Senator [Richard J.] Dolwig. I understand even reporters who were present felt you had the vote?

GARRIGUS: Oh, they knew I had the bill.

VASQUEZ: But there was nothing you could do?

GARRIGUS: No! And the senate did this all the time. Voice vote and a gavel, and that was it.

The Effects of One Man, One Vote on the Legislature

VASQUEZ: You were in office when the one man, one vote ruling came down. How did that change the senate?

GARRIGUS: Well, that made the senate much more responsible to its constituency. And it ultimately got a new breed of senators.

VASQUEZ: Hadn't many of them been assemblymen?

GARRIGUS: That's right. Many of them had been assemblymen.

VASQUEZ: Did that loosen up the [legislative] process?

GARRIGUS: It loosened up the process, and then, of course, you had some [like] Hugh [M.] Burns, who was the dominant factor then. Hugh was part and parcel of the old-club syndrome, you know, and conducted business on that basis.

We had an armed truce between us because we were very different. He didn't like to carry my legislation very much because some of it was a little too liberal and too controversial. But there was always a senator over there in the

area of education that was glad to carry it, so Hugh never made an issue for me. Sometimes I'd give him a bill and he'd turn it over to another senator.

VASQUEZ: He was the senate president pro tempore all the time you were there.

GARRIGUS: That's right. But it never hurt me, and Hugh really came through for me on the poet laureate designation. He could have killed it if he had wanted to, but he didn't.

The "Responsible Liberalism" Program

VASQUEZ: Were you part of the [Governor] Brown's "responsible liberalism" program? Did you see yourself as supporting the administration?

GARRIGUS: Yes, I did. I was on very good terms with the governor. That 50 percent bill, which all the education administration and bureaucracy was opposing vigorously, brought pressure to bear on the governor. He resisted that in my favor because he was convinced of my arguments. Even though he knew that he was going to alienate an awful lot of school people on that. And he did, he alienated a lot of people.

VASQUEZ: This was for the school bonds?

GARRIGUS: No. This was for current expense spending. Fifty percent of the current operating budget was to go to teachers' salaries instead of to bureaucracies which administrators were creating at the time. Still are.

VI. A LEGISLATOR'S POLITICAL AGENDA

Legislators Who Have a Legislative Program and Those Who Don't

VASQUEZ: I want to come back to the responsible liberalism program and the elements that composed it. There seemed to be some people who got to the assembly with an agenda, a long-range legislative program in the back of their minds, or they were putting one together in their minds. Then there were those people that got to the assembly with one issue or purpose in mind, whether they were in somebody's back pocket or not. Then there were those people who were enamored with the position and prestige that came with it, played it on a day-to-day basis according to what came up, according to what they owed X member for X reason.

GARRIGUS: I'd say you've made some excellent and valid distinctions there. That's true.

VASQUEZ: Well, they are distinctions meant to get you to give me your impressions. As you think back now, who were the people that, in your mind, most fit the three categories?

GARRIGUS: Well, you see, I'm up against a problem here. A lot of these people, while I had no respect for their positions and their affiliations, I still liked them. I blamed the fact that they were there, in that position, on their constituencies. They were who they were. After all, they didn't get there except by people putting them there. I can think of the kind of people you're talking about, but I don't like to name names.

VASQUEZ: Well, let's put it this way then. Do you think that much more capable men than what they appear to be sometimes have to play the roles they do because of their constituency?

GARRIGUS: To some extent that's true, that's a modifying factor. It's one that challenged me, and I think it challenges every legislator.

I never let it overcome me. I always had friends of mine rushing over to tell me, "Look, you shouldn't vote yes." Or, "You shouldn't

vote no on this, because of your people. You're going to hurt yourself." And I said, "That's not the point. I'm not a follower of my people. I'm a leader here. I'm supposed to take a position that I believe is best for them, whether they agree with me or not." And that was my position.

VASQUEZ: You found yourself having to go above and beyond your constituents?

GARRIGUS: Right. Sometimes I was out of step with my constituency.

VASQUEZ: For a politician, is that wise?

GARRIGUS: It may not be wise on a strictly political basis, but from the standpoint of getting what's best for the people, it's wise. You see, I had more education. I had more experience. I had the testimony of some of the best experts in the state on water, on agriculture, on manufacturing, mining, on education. These were men who were paid to be experts, to come before the committees and give evidence as to the worth, merit, or demerit of any issue or situation. My constituents didn't have that advantage.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

Leading Versus Following One's Constituency

GARRIGUS: My constituency just simply did not have all the resources that I had for being well-informed on an issue. I had a responsibility of leadership.

Now, the man who followed me in office [Ernest N. Mobley] sent out a questionnaire every year to certain key members of his constituency listing issues and asking them how they thought he should vote on these issues. I would never do that because I never believed that anybody out there was as qualified to make that decision as I was.

If they were, they should be running for my place in office. This got me into a lot of controversy. I was always very controversial. I never had a free run, ever. All around me, my associates had free runs, but I never did. There were too many people who would tell somebody, "Run against him, because I disagree with him and I'll support you." There were enough of those people to always give me opposition, and sometimes very strong opposition.

VASQUEZ: What issue was consistently brought up against you and your independent-mindedness, your liberal program?

GARRIGUS: Well, one of the consistent issues, of course, was the Rumford Act, the fair housing act which the real estate lobby was against, which California manufacturers were against, and so many [other] powerful organizations.

VASQUEZ: Why were you for it?

GARRIGUS: I was for it because I absolutely believed that human rights came ahead of property rights. When there's a conflict, human rights have to prevail. No man has a right to be turned down for a place of shelter for himself and his family on the basis of his religion or his race just because another man happens to own the property.

VASQUEZ: How did that play in Fresno County?

GARRIGUS: Well, it wasn't a popular position. It wasn't the popular position, professor, all over the state of California. I was told not to speak out on it, but I did. And it didn't defeat me. It didn't bother me at all.

It's always been one of the delights of my

memories that I retired voluntarily, by choice, and was never defeated. Of course, when I tried to come back eight years later, I was defeated, but that was when [Ronald W.] Reagan was governor and the conservative tide had set in.

VASQUEZ: Then you were really going against the tide?

GARRIGUS: Yes, I was really going against the tide.

VASQUEZ: Let's go back to this question of people who served as legislators with a long-term commitment, or vision, of certain legislation, of where they wanted to go with their legislative efforts. And those people who just sort of played it as it came along.

GARRIGUS: The first thing I can tell you in connection with that observation, professor, is that there were very few such people that came into the legislature, very few. There wouldn't be over 2 percent that ever came through with that type of a mission because they simply knew there were too many unpredictable areas of opposition and entrenched traditional forces connected with their vision, whatever it might be.

You never knew how long you were going to be there. What you found, generally speaking,

is that people in organizations had goals that they had lots of time to create, and they would bring them there for you to vote on. Then you tried to decide whether to support, reject, or amend those goals to suit yourself. That is, I think, the great medium of the whole process.

Today, it's almost pitiful. It was bad enough in my day, but today it seems the first concern of every legislator is to start working on his next campaign as soon as he gets in office. That's his long-term goal, [Laughter] to get reelected.

VASQUEZ: So then, what you're telling me . . .

GARRIGUS: When I went in there, I had such a goal. I wanted a uniform junior college system, and I attained it. I was lucky. I got it within four years.

VASQUEZ: You had set this specific goal for yourself?

GARRIGUS: I had that as a specific goal. The other thing I had as a specific goal my freshman year was to liberalize teacher credentialing, for the simple reason that California had a teacher shortage, especially of qualified and experienced teachers.

All over California there were qualified,

experienced teachers from Iowa, Connecticut, Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, who had moved out here. But they could not teach in California, even with good resumés, good recommendations, qualified teaching experience, and confidence. They couldn't teach here because they didn't meet the California qualifications for certification.

I tried to liberalize that. But the CTA came in to kill my bill. [The bill] simply said that if a school board examined a teacher and she had five years of qualified teaching experience, regardless of what state she was from, if the school board she applied to wanted her, they could hire her for a limited period and renew her contract. This was common sense. This would make available, in communities all over California, experienced teachers.

The CTA came in and said that because my wife was not qualified to teach under the emergency credential system in California--she had taught in Illinois--I had put in this bill

so my wife could teach in California. They made it a personal issue, which was completely false.

It would have upgraded the teaching quality in California immediately with experienced teachers from other states, my wife included. She was an excellent teacher.

VASQUEZ: They were able to defeat it?

GARRIGUS: Yeah, they defeated it. The CTA came in and defeated it on that basis.

VASQUEZ: What year was this?

GARRIGUS: That was my first year in the legislature, '59.

VASQUEZ: Then, you'd assess that maybe 2 percent of the people serving in the legislature, especially the assembly, had a long-range vision of what they wanted to accomplish.

GARRIGUS: Yes, and that would be a liberal figure [Laughter]. I had a lot of good personal exchanges with legislators that I made friends with. I don't remember a single such goal as you define it, because it wouldn't be practical.

VASQUEZ: Do you think Jesse Unruh had a long-range vision?

GARRIGUS: Well, Jesse Unruh did, and he got it. He wanted to reform the legislature in terms of more

qualified staff, better accommodations and procedures, and he got it. He reformed the legislature on that basis.

The Legislature as a Stepping Stone

VASQUEZ: What percentage of the people in the legislature do you think were there as a result of liking the prestige, the honor, the position, or as a stepping stone which the assembly represented?

GARRIGUS: I'd say about 90 percent.

VASQUEZ: What was the assembly a stepping stone to? Higher office?

GARRIGUS: Well, certainly. History's proved it. For a lot of those fellows, it was their first position with status in their local areas, at the state level, and [with the opportunity] to meet prominent people, and so forth. That was enough. They didn't want to go any further.

They just wanted to be reelected and reelected and reelected. Of course, some of them wanted to go on later to be judges, and a lot of them did. Some of them wanted to go on to be congressmen, and they did. And a few of them wanted to run for state office, and they did, notably our present governor [George S. Deukmejian].

VASQUEZ: What is your opinion of the value of a legislative career to judges and the way by which judges are appointed? Do you think a legislative background prepares them for being good judges, and do you think the best way to elevate people to a judgeship is through political appointment?

GARRIGUS: Well, I would have to deal very thoughtfully and qualitatively with that question. I have seen so many fine judges become judges through that system, and I have seen so many poor judges become judges through that system. How are you really going to intelligently sum that up?

There's no doubt that you get a tremendous educational experience in the assembly. You meet such a variety of people. You have such a parade of experts before you constantly. You associate with so many prominent people in all fields: entertainment, business, politics.

I think very preciously of--and I know it's a very educational factor--the personal conversations I had with [Senator] Hubert H. Humphrey, with Adlai Stevenson, with Lieutenant Governor Glenn [M.] Anderson, with different

state senators, with [Senator Robert F.] Bobby Kennedy, with [President] John F. Kennedy. I would never have met these men [otherwise] or had the benefit of their intellect in conversations. That picture up there on the wall [motions to photograph of himself and John F. Kennedy], I spent a whole afternoon with John F. Kennedy discussing the economy of my district, which he wanted to know something about. That evening, in the speech he's making in the picture, I found him [addressing]--without any notes--all the main points we had [covered in] asking me questions and listening to my answers that afternoon.

That kind of thing is very educational for somebody that's going to be a judge, somebody that's going to be a lawyer for a big firm, or somebody that's going to go to congress. It's all a valid stepping stone for improving their range, their confidence, their knowledge.

The Process of Judicial Appointments

VASQUEZ: Do you think the [most qualified] people become judges in California?

GARRIGUS: Some do, and some don't. I know in my own area,

where I personally had a heavy influence in appointing seven judges, all seven of my appointees were good judges. I don't say that just because I was behind them. But I also know that I lost two or three appointments in the same area that would have made splendid judges, but were taken by some very mediocre people. I'm going by the record and by my own convictions at the time.

Carrying Legislation Designed by Others

VASQUEZ: Moving from judicial appointments to another area that was always central to your concerns and which you have already discussed to some degree, and that's water. You were responsible for legislation that affected local flood control districts.

GARRIGUS: And irrigation districts.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

GARRIGUS: This is strictly in the area of local implementation. You don't devise this. The people that are organized in the various irrigation districts of your [assembly] district--there are maybe two, three, or four in your area of representative responsibility--know their needs. They

have their source problems. They have their replenishment problems. They come to you with a program and all you do is marshall their forces of knowledge and support, write up their legislation, get behind it, and then just lead it through the legislature.

This is not something of your vision. It is representing the people who know best what they want. You do this with the poultry people. You do it with the hay and pasture people.

VASQUEZ: I notice you had some bills concerning dairies.[1]

GARRIGUS: Yes. You do it with the dairy people. You simply try to get their program for them, trusting that they know best. Sometimes you're in an area where there's a selfish, very pivotal and particular interest involved, and they're using you. In this case what you have to do is just simply say, "Well, I'll give them the vehicle, but they've got to get the support for it." And that's what you do.

VASQUEZ: How does that work?

---

1. For example, A.B. 2506, 1961 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 843 (1961).

GARRIGUS: It works simply by going to your counsel, you've got the outline of what they want. You may suspect it's a selfish interest. If you don't introduce it, somebody will, and you're their representative. So you introduce it. This doesn't happen very often, but it does happen once in a while.

Most of the time they bring you some valid need that needs legislation. I put through a bill, for instance, where people were complaining about the hazards of irrigation water getting onto the public county roads.[1] One woman hit a pool of water like that, lost control of her car on a dark night, went into a telephone pole, and was paralyzed for the rest of her life.

Farmers don't want these things to happen. But they will happen. And insurance companies don't want them to happen either. So they will bring you legislation that says something like this: If a farmer is careless with his irrigation water and lets it break out over the

1. A.B. 1092, 1965 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1656 (1965).

highway and somebody has an accident, he's responsible. In this kind of legislation, you simply follow through for the people.

Another group comes to you and says, "We've got to have a new source of water supply. We're running out. We don't have enough." Or, "Our groundwater table's falling too fast, and we think that if we put a reservoir here, it would replenish the different aquifers in this area and give us new ground water for the future. We want legislation allowing us to bond a district for a new reservoir over here."

You just put that legislation in. But they have got to bring the people to demonstrate the need. That's what's called the nuts and bolts of your assembly district.

As I said, if your poultry people have got a problem with the big feed manufacturers or something, they bring you their program. On the other hand, if the dairy farmers have got a problem, whatever it is, you implement [legislation] for it. I never failed to implement any piece of legislation that was brought to me for agricultural interests,

whatever the area of agriculture, or the water situation. But it never did ease their prejudice against me.

VASQUEZ: You still got a lot of opposition with the farmers?

GARRIGUS: That's right. I always did. They never gave me credit. I remember one bill I put through which [stopped] the bringing in of so much water-soaked poultry from Georgia and Alabama into California.[1] It was undermining our poultry industry because it was not true-weight poultry and it wasn't fresh, yet it was competing favorably. All I did was write legislation that said if it had a certain water content, it couldn't be sold.

VASQUEZ: This is the first time I understand that bill.

GARRIGUS: It made sure that your chicken wasn't part water, you see. Being soaked in certain cold storage over a long railroad or highway haul makes that chicken full of water and doesn't give you its true value and gives [the sellers] a false profit, one they don't deserve.

---

1. A.B. 2813, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 2009 (1959).

VASQUEZ: You were starting to outline, a while ago, what you do when you got legislation proposed by valid concerns but which may have been self-serving or not necessarily salubrious to the entire community, how you help--and yet don't help. How does that work?

GARRIGUS: That didn't happen often, I've got to point that out. But when it did happen, I just went along with the group. I would say, "Well, if they can get the support for it and they work hard for it, they deserve the benefit of it. Even though it may be very profitable to them and may be not justified, it's my duty to give them the opportunity." But I'm glad that I never had a real crisis on anything like that.

VASQUEZ: In such a case, you don't go out of your way to pull in IOU's from any of your colleagues?

GARRIGUS: Oh, no. That's right. I've gone to other fellows on this issue rather than have them come to me. I would say, "Do I have to vote for this bill for you?" And have them say, "Nah, you don't have to vote for it. I put it in here for so-and-so. I don't think too much of it, but I've got to carry it. If it gives you problems,

why, it's all right with me if you don't vote for it."

VASQUEZ: So, there are subtle levels of communication, are there? There are formal channels and informal channels that one can resort to?

GARRIGUS: Oh yes. This goes on all the time. It's just like soldiers fighting a war who have a sense of communication and brotherhood and common danger that nobody else has.

VASQUEZ: Even though they're on opposing sides?

GARRIGUS: I wouldn't say it's on opposite sides because, basically, you all feel you're on the same side. You've got to feel that. You've got to say, "It's the people of California and the state of California that we love and that we want to help." Now, I may differ with you on how to do it, but I respect the fact that what you do, you do in good faith, what you think is for the best.

If we differ, well, we just differ. Tomorrow may be a whole new day on a new issue. There is a sense in the legislature of a brotherhood formed on the basis of an experience that nobody else understands, that you share

together. As I said, it's like soldiers in a war. Like the Vietnam [veterans] have often said, anybody who wasn't there and underwent it can't understand how they feel toward each other.

More on the Water Issue

VASQUEZ: Getting back to the question of water, you had a governor who had worked for many years to bring about a comprehensive water plan. In some areas, including the area where you were from, there was a lot of resentment toward his success in that area. Did that affect you?

GARRIGUS: We're talking about Governor Pat Brown now. Don't forget, Pat Brown knew more about basic water [issues] than probably any man in California, except maybe one or two experts like Charlie Waters or somebody that spent their life doing it. As attorney general, Pat Brown had been in all the litigation over the Colorado River distribution, which was so vital for California. Pat Brown, as attorney general, had been in so much litigation over [Lake] Tahoe and the other big lakes, the Imperial Valley, and so forth.

I was at a dinner for Pat Brown with a

prominent Republican the year he got elected. This man was a life-long Republican from one of the most prominent families in Fresno. I went up to him after the meal and said, "How is it that you, one of the most prominent Republicans in this state, a personal friend of the Republican governor and the Republican senator, are chairing Pat Brown's candidacy in this county?" He said, "Well, the answer's simple. Water is the life of this county. And there's no man in this county who knows water like Pat Brown. The man that's running against him doesn't know anything about it. And I've got to be for the man that can help my county the most as governor, and Pat Brown's that man." That simple.

VASQUEZ: That simple? People know how to read their self-interests?

GARRIGUS: I think he was the brother or the cousin of the the famous director [Sam] Peckinpah that does the Hollywood movies. He was from the old Peckinpah family there in Fresno. He [Denver C. Peckinpah] was helping Pat Brown after being a life-long Republican.

I'd have to say on this point that there were two men who were very close friends in California. And they were on opposite political sides. One of those men was [Governor] Earl Warren, and the other was Pat Brown, they were close personal friends. They went camping together. They corresponded. They advised. They'd call each other on the phone. They ate together. And yet, they were the heads of different parties. [President Harry S.] Truman told Pat Brown once, "You know, Earl Warren's really a Democrat. But he's never found it out."

VASQUEZ: "He doesn't know it."

GARRIGUS: "He doesn't know it." [Laughter]

VII. PARTISANSHIP IN STATE AND NATIONAL POLITICS

Partisanship in California Politics

VASQUEZ: I think that's a good lead into a question that I want to pose, and that is the question of partisanship, or nonpartisanship, in California politics. You've been able to observe this phenomenon in California for nearly half a century. Tell me what your assessment is of whether or not partisanship has been good for the state.

GARRIGUS: Partisanship is bad for the state.

VASQUEZ: Why?

GARRIGUS: Because it divides allegiance and it divides influences and thinking on issues on the wrong basis, on the basis of a traditional affiliation with a party instead of on the basis of the merits or demerits of a particular issue. It's just real sad that it does that.

So much of partisanship is tied into personal ambition. So much of partisanship is being a Democrat or a Republican in order to get certain advantages as a Democrat or a Republican instead of measuring the issue.

I've always respected George Washington's position on that. [He] recognized--with just his brief two terms as president--the personal ambition, rivalry, and disruptiveness [possible] on the basis of the differences between the members of his cabinet. The Democratic Republicans, represented by [Thomas] Jefferson, the Federalists represented by [John] Adams and [Alexander] Hamilton. He recognized that there wasn't clear thinking on this. There was selfish, biased thinking on the basis of partisanship.

You've got to have a two-party system. You've got to have it.

VASQUEZ: What's the value of a two-party system if it's not going to be expressed?

GARRIGUS: Well, the value of having two parties is that you've always got the confrontation and the opposition that is the life of democracy. You only find the truth through argument and discussion, by bringing to bear upon a particular subject all the facilities you have in your experience, knowledge, and belief. Then letting the outcome result because of whom you've influenced with this confrontation. When you stop to think of all the great things that have come out of the confrontation and debate of issues by men who have been sincerely wrong. . . .

For instance, think of a man like Daniel Webster almost losing control of himself on the floor of the Senate and denouncing the purchase of Alaska, which is one of the best things we ever did. It's in this type of confrontation--in this case, with Secretary of State [William H.] Seward--that we got Alaska. It came out beyond the prejudice and the partisanship, that

this was the thing to do. Look at all the benefits we've [derived] from it.

Think of the agony of General [Robert E.] Lee when Lincoln offered him the command of the Union armies, and the state of Virginia offered him the command of the army of northern Virginia. Here was a man who had been trained at West Point. Here was a man whose father had been one of the big men in the Revolution, "Light Horse" Harry [Lee]. All right, this man was partisan, and he was wrong. He went with Virginia. He was partisan and wrong. But he is an absolute symbol of integrity to any student of history. In spite of his wrongness, he did what he thought was right.

VASQUEZ: Let's take another case. Take the war in Vietnam, that was a bipartisan war, and many feel it was a mistake.

GARRIGUS: Excellent, good example.

VASQUEZ: Why didn't nonpartisanship correct that erroneous commitment?

GARRIGUS: Because there were too many factors there involving tradition. It's hard for great numbers of patriotic Americans to admit they're

in a war they shouldn't be in. They've always been in the right war. They've always been on the side of the right. What are you going to do? Admit you've made a terrible mistake, that you've got no business there? Too many imponderable factors there.

VASQUEZ: Let me ask it another way. Most California Democrats were happy when party designation on the ballot was required in 1954 and when cross-filing was outlawed in 1959. Many candidates, in fact, owed the success of Democrats in '58 to that. This was an expression of partisanship. Democrats, especially liberal Democrats, saw it as a positive thing.

GARRIGUS: Well, you've got to have it. You've got to have that two-party system. On the other hand, I always loved what Adlai Stevenson said: "Let us not lose sight of the fact in this political debate there are more things of value that unite us than divide us."

This is where bipartisanship comes to the fore. There has to come a time when people say, "America comes ahead of any Republican or Democrat, and the welfare of the people comes

ahead of any Democrat or Republican. And we've got to cooperate in this manner." For instance, take an issue like this: our desperate need today in the work force for nursery schools for working women. There should never be any party division on that.

VASQUEZ: Yet, there is.

GARRIGUS: There is, but there shouldn't be. There should be bipartisanship there. You're going to get the majority of Democrats for it and the majority of Republicans against it, platform-wise. It's an issue which should get bipartisan support because we desperately need this.

Minority Versus Majority Interests

VASQUEZ: You may have already implicitly stated your position, but which do you think is better for democracy--democracy in this case referring to the active, thinking, discriminating position-taking by the average voter--the voter pushed by partisanship or an alternating between the positions of different parties, taking positions according to what unites people?

GARRIGUS: I think we should always go back to the great differences brought out between those two

protagonists: Alexander Hamilton and James Madison. I'm going to paraphrase, I'm not going to use their exact speech.

Hamilton says, "Mr. Madison, your government should always be by your most qualified individuals. It should be by men who have breeding, education, and property, because they will be the most diligent to look after the interests of the nation. They will conduct the business best for employing people and for creating new jobs and industry. The men of breeding and education should be our government, and this will always be a minority. Your majority, Mr. Madison, will seldom do the right thing."

Mr. Madison comes back and says, "Yes, it's true that your majority will seldom do the right thing. But among the people, you're going to always have some people that aren't interested in money. Out there in that vast majority there will be some people who want to go fishing. There will be some people who aren't interested in making money. There will be some people who want to be artists and musicians. There will be

some people who will want to raise families more than anything else. And these people, who are the majority and the true strength of our country, are our yeomanry. They're our greatest defense in times of danger. But they're not interested in money or power. They're interested primarily in living relationships of satisfaction.

"Now, these other people that are interested in money and power are going to accumulate enough to make slaves out of those people that want to go fishing, read books, play music, have fun, loaf, and rear children, unless it's always in the power of this majority to put any of these [individuals] out of office that would tyrannize them.

"So regardless of the fact that the majority will seldom do the right thing, when the majority's freedoms are in danger, when their opportunity is in danger, when their lives are in danger, they must be able to act and have the [necessary] will." And that's your basic premise right here. It has divided the two parties ever since.

VASQUEZ: The two-party system acts as a check and

balance?

GARRIGUS: Right. In that very instance of checks and balances. Your Democrat position has always been, "Human rights, human freedom, human pursuit of happiness is the important thing." Whereas your Republican position has always been, "Yes, but you can't have these except by accumulating power and property and money and defending them." So there is a basic division there.

The majority seldom does the right thing, I'll have to admit that. I resented it as a college student, but Mr. Hamilton was right. The evidence is overwhelming. When the majority gave a mandate to a [Vice President] Spiro Agnew and a [President] Richard [M.] Nixon, there's something wrong with the majority's judgment. But they always have the power, thank goodness, to put a [President James E.] Jimmy Carter in office. Or a Franklin D. Roosevelt.

VASQUEZ: On the whole, do you think that the [Governor Hiram W.] Johnsonian progressive reforms against partisanship were better for the state of California, or [the increasingly pronounced

partisanship] which recently seems to represent a move in the opposite direction?

GARRIGUS: I think they were better for California, although there were some pitiful examples of mismanagement, of clumsiness, of too much expense involved. Franklin Roosevelt recognized that, just as Hamilton saw, money is going to concentrate in the hands of those who are more interested in making money than anything else, and with money goes the power.

You've got to have a check on that. Roosevelt's method of checking was to devise legislative programs that reached out to this money and power and said, "Look, you've got to share it [wealth] with the poor through these programs. You've got to pay taxes that will give these programs the money to help with housing, to help with medical care, to help with social security. We've got to take it, Robin Hood-like, from the rich and give it to the poor. When we give it to the poor, they have a purchasing power which will ultimately come right back to you guys that are giving it. It's just going to be a big cycle. There may be some

depressions, but there are going to be some accelerations and prosperity, and that cycle's going to go along as long as we keep the money supply moving into programs that redistribute the wealth."

Now, that was his philosophy, and he did it. That's why we have a tremendous bureaucracy out there redistributing the wealth.

I remember a group of merchants came to me who wanted me to wage a fight against state welfare programs. I said, "Gentlemen, you only put in about 30 percent into that [program] from this area. The federal government puts in about 50 percent. The state puts in the rest." I said, "It adds up to about $57 million worth of purchasing power that these welfare people are spending in your grocery stores and clothing stores. You want me to take that away?" There were some sober-looking faces. "Well, I never thought of it that way."

Franklin D. Roosevelt's Legacy

VASQUEZ: Some people argue that Franklin Roosevelt saved the nation. Others argue that he saved capitalism.

GARRIGUS: Right.

VASQUEZ: Which did he do?

GARRIGUS: Neither. He didn't save the nation. The people of the United States saved the nation. And although I hate to admit it, at that particular time and place Adolf Hitler did his bit. He turned this nation [around] at a time when the methods used to solve the Depression had not solved it. But they certainly alleviated the distress of it. He turned that into a powerful machine to be. . . . What was the phrase Roosevelt used?

VASQUEZ: "The armory of democracy."

GARRIGUS: Our factories started up and our shipyards started up. Everybody went back to work, and the women went out of the home. . . . Which did great damage to the family. America has never really turned back from that prosperity. We've had our little cycles, our little breaks, but we rally from them.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's Warning

VASQUEZ: Do you think maybe we've become, on the other extreme, what a Republican warned us about, a country with an economy that depends on war and

building of an armory for prosperity?

GARRIGUS: Well, there is no doubt. And I think any elementary student of economics knows this. There is no doubt that a tremendous amount of our national prosperity is tied up to all the various aspects of our defense industry. Even though one of the wisest things General Eisenhower said when he left office as president was, "Beware of the military industrial complex." It is [now] a terribly powerful and effective complex.

There's no doubt that is a very dangerous thing, it has contributed strongly to our economy because there are just too many jobs tied into it, too much purchasing power there, and the general public is tied into it. It's a shame that it's that way. It doesn't have to be. There are other ways.

This is a highly controversial area, but it's one of the basic areas of our public life. We need a tremendous public works program right now. We're getting gridlock on our highways, and they're going to get steadily worse. We need a means of fast, light, effective transpor-

tation. We need bridges repaired. We need a public works program that would put thousands and thousands of men to work.

But the only place we can really get the money for that would be to knock this tremendous defense industry and shift the appropriations away from defense into public works which are desperately needed. We've got this phobia of the Russians. We think that any time we start reducing our military establishment, the Russians are going to start taking advantage of us by moving into areas of weakness in Central America, Africa, and the Middle East. If we're not strong, they won't be afraid to go there. If we're strong, they will be afraid to go there.

I think it's a specious argument. I think it's an illusion. Ultimately, warfare has to be nuclear war. It's not going to be conventional. It's not going to be fought with airplanes off aircraft carriers. It's not going to be fought with aircraft carriers and missiles. It's going to be fought with intercontinental ballistic missiles that nobody can control once they're

gone, in a war nobody can win. It's impossible. I think that's the realistic business about it. I think as long as we keep nuclear war at a continual balance, all the other money we're spending is on slingshots, bows and arrows, and rocks, as far as military significance is concerned.

Third World Nationalism and American Interests

Take a little country like Panamá right now. What good did it do to throw 3,000 soldiers down there in full battle equipment? [General Juan] Noriega just thumbed his nose and laughed. Yet, this is a conventional force that's supposed to be so effective. Actually, we're caught in a hard place.

This man, Noriega, is a terrible man. But on the other hand, the people of Panamá have felt all their lives that this great gringo neighbor to the North does nothing but exploit and use them. And [Noriega] has stood up to that man. Now that he's stood up to him, he's shown them that Panamanians are really tough people. They feel good. It's very foolish, because Noriega will ruin them. We can't do

anything against him violently because then they will all immediately unify to defend the man who represents Panamá.

VASQUEZ: Hasn't he already effectively done that by our inability to distinguish between hurting all Panamanians with economic pressures and hurting only one man, whom we've allegedly been in bed with him and selling drugs for the last five years?

GARRIGUS: Good point. Yes, I would say so.

VASQUEZ: To round out the analysis, do we sometimes underestimate the importance that nationalism plays in other parts of the world?

GARRIGUS: Oh, we do. We do. We certainly misunderstood it in Iran, completely. I think we're misunderstanding it in Chile right now.

VASQUEZ: I raise that [point] to lead into something else.

I don't want to dwell on this too much, but some argue that, in fact, there is an alternative to nuclear war. It's already been laid out, and the rules of the game are being fine-tuned. It is something known as "low-intensity warfare" which takes place in Third

World countries. The Soviet Union and the United States can confront each other using surrogate troops. That postpones any nuclear holocaust; therefore, war is still a very profitable industry.

GARRIGUS: I think that's just a terrible illusion, that's a dangerous illusion. I think it goes contrary to human nature. Nationalism, of course, is nothing but an extension of human nature, in the last analysis, individualism. And, of course, the highest expression of individualism is piracy.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

VIII. GARRIGUS, THE LIBERAL ARTS, AND DEMOCRATIC POLITICS

[Session 2, May 15, 1988]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

The Master Plan for Higher Education

VASQUEZ: You came to the state legislature the year [1959] the Democrats had swept most state offices, and they had a program that dealt comprehensively with education. It dealt with restructuring or the reorganization of state government. It was referred to as "responsible liberalism." Did you feel yourself a part of this program, and what did you understand by that term?

GARRIGUS: Oh, yes, I felt myself a part of it. I think every Democrat felt himself a part of it at that time. There might have been one or two exceptions. We had a kind of a chaos, especially between the community colleges, the state colleges, and the branches of the university. There was a lot of competition going on, especially for the budget. There was a lot of overlapping and duplicating in the state college and university systems. There was a lot of envy and political ambition on the part of the state

colleges to get more recognition and to get more status. They felt they were not only serving the same function for students, but even doing it better than the universities.

One of the big scandals, at the university level, was that professors weren't doing the teaching. Graduate assistants were doing the teaching. You were getting the best teaching in the junior colleges, but you weren't getting the proper amount of state support for junior colleges. The junior college function wasn't clearly defined. The state college function wasn't clearly defined. And the university function wasn't clearly defined.

What [we] wanted to do was to get these three areas of higher education into proper classifications and organizations so that they would be more efficient. They could be supported financially with a better understanding of where the money was going and what it was to be used for. Unfortunately, even though this was the chief reform, it didn't go in the right direction. There's been a tremendous decline, both at the state college

level and the community college level, in the role of the liberal arts.

Formerly, it was very important for the junior colleges to prepare students to leave their sophomore year and go into one of the branches of the university with an academic standing equal to any university junior or state college junior. That meant a good liberal arts background. But, unfortunately, communities and corporations have exerted so much pressure under a modern economy that the liberal arts declined steadily in their offerings in the junior colleges. They became more and more vocational training schools.

There are some arguments for this. But the argument against it is: considering the small number of students that go on from the junior college into four-year colleges, you're losing one of the strongest influences you have for developing a cultural unity in appreciating the American heritage, American values, and understanding the perspective of American development. You're losing the emphasis on history and literature that formerly had a

strong emphasis in those colleges.

Most of us wanted to do something to create a better organization for this division of higher education. The Fisher bill was the core of that, and it was the core of what was called the Master Plan for Higher Education, which created a system of junior colleges and a chancellor in charge of that area. This led very quickly to the renaming of the state colleges and the state universities.

VASQUEZ: What were the biggest hurdles you had to overcome in trying to implement, or convince people, that the Master Plan was a good idea?

GARRIGUS: The establishment, the status quo.

VASQUEZ: Within the . . .

GARRIGUS: Within the people. They wanted things kept as they were because this would mean more control and less latitude. It was a matter of discipline versus freedom of choice and development and policy. This was going to define policy and make it impossible for a lot of people to do some things they had been doing freehandedly.

VASQUEZ: In addition to the intrasystem opposition and conflict, did you also have regional or

sectional opposition throughout the state?

GARRIGUS: Oh, yes. Yes.

VASQUEZ: Where was the opposition most evident?

GARRIGUS: Well, in our big cities. Your opposition was where the strongest educational bureaucracies were established, and this was in the large cities. Then we had some--but it wasn't as well organized, or it wasn't as strong--out in the smaller towns, which were afraid they were going to lose control over their colleges.

VASQUEZ: Was that the main concern they had?

GARRIGUS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Were you able to count on the support of federal leaders?

GARRIGUS: No, this was largely a state and local concern. This was not a concern of the federal government, and nobody was looking in that direction. All they wanted from the federal government was money needed for special projects that would benefit state government and the locale. Especially in areas like the handicapped and special education for disadvantaged students. There was some federal money coming from those areas, but most of this reorganiza-

tion was strictly at the state and local level.

VASQUEZ: You've had exactly thirty years of hindsight on that master plan. How do you assess it?

GARRIGUS: It hasn't been implemented properly.

VASQUEZ: Why not?

GARRIGUS: It hasn't been supported. The establishment is organized and has kept up a vigorous resistance to it, while the great general public doesn't understand the issue and hasn't put any pressure on it at all. The little bit of pressure that has been put on has been by the federal government and some of the commissions appointed by independent educational [entities] to sound out, analyze, and test what's happening.

The results show that there's been a tremendous deterioration in the liberal arts. Most Americans don't understand the essential facts of their heritage. They don't have any perspective on their historical development. They are a failure in their human relationships. Drugs have made great inroads into the schools, much more than there were, and with a steady increase. There's more drinking among students. There's less discipline in the schools.

VASQUEZ: [Were] the last three items that you mentioned related to the implementation of such a plan?

GARRIGUS: Oh, yes. Yes. It was part of it. There has been a great neglect of general interest by the public in the schools. They know something's wrong and they don't like what they see, but they're too willing to accept the excuses and rationalizations that the establishment gives for those errors and weaknesses.

VASQUEZ: We have had six administrations since Governor Brown left office, three different governors. How would you grade them, to use an educational term, in their commitment to and furtherance of a unified educational system?

GARRIGUS: Yes, there is no doubt that under [Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] in the sixties, there was a much greater interest in education, a much greater concern for the condition of education and for the enhancement of educational programs. The turning of majors to the liberal arts for teacher preparation has deteriorated steadily instead of increased.

VASQUEZ: To what do you think that's owed?

GARRIGUS: It's due to public apathy, and it's due to the

entrenched establishment. It's those two factors. You've got the people willing to think they don't know enough about education to take a stand on things.

Fortunately, in certain local areas there are groups of concerned citizens who have stood up and insisted on reform. But these are little islands, little oases in a desert of public indifference and educational entrenchment in the status quo. People don't like to change, especially in education. Teachers have a certain way of always doing things and are used to a certain type of curriculum. They don't want to change it.

The two greatest evils today in education are, first, the educational bureaucracy, largely established by administrations to enhance the power and the authority of administrators. Secondly, the greatest hindrance to education is a poor curriculum, the wrong kind of curriculum, a curriculum that specializes almost in trivia, that neglects all of the essentials of history, literature, art, and government. The average high school student doesn't know much about his

government and his economy or his personal relationships.

If education were doing the proper job, we wouldn't have this drug and alcohol problem among our youth. They would have enough emotional [uneasiness] about those issues to say, like one young black boy I saw on TV yesterday who was right in the heart of one of the drug areas of Los Angeles, "I've seen my friends die and others gone to jail. And that's not for me. I want something better than that." If education were doing its proper job, there would be more boys and girls saying exactly the same thing that disadvantaged black youth said.

Liberal Arts and California's Growing Diversity

VASQUEZ: The pattern goes back even further--but it's been more pronounced in the last thirty years. The population of the state of California has become ever more diverse in terms of nationalities, races, language. Both at the University of California and now at Stanford University there have been movements to move away from

exclusive attention to Western ideas and Western traditions. In fact, in California's top universities--both in the UC [University of California] system and at Stanford--there have been efforts to incorporate literatures other than the Western tradition and the American tradition. Do you see that diversity and those kind of reforms as positive or leading to greater division in the state?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think they're fine, but I think they're very unnecessary. I'll give you an example of what I'm talking about. If you were to have a graduate student in Spanish literature right here in this room, if you were to have a graduate student in German literature, if you had a graduate student in French literature, a graduate student in English literature or American literature, and you asked that graduate student, "Who is the greatest literary influence on your literature?" the answer would be universally, William Shakespeare.

What I'm saying is, Shakespeare is good for all cultures. There has been no writer that has ever matched him in his insight into human

nature and his scope of showing the weaknesses and strengths of human nature in relation to the essential problems of life. So you don't need a diversity of literatures. That's fine, [but it should] come later.

What you need is an emphasis upon some literature that will give a common basis, a common heritage, a common appreciation to all these diversities, these ethnic differences that you're talking about. One of the most interesting discussions I ever had on Shakespeare was with a German exchange student from Dresden who was delighted to talk with me about Shakespeare. He was his hero. The German people like Shakespeare better than the English people do. You will find Englishmen that adore Cervantes's Don Quixote.

VASQUEZ: But we're still talking about Western European culture. The contributions that some feel have been slighted are the non-Western.

GARRIGUS: Well, I will get interested in literary authorities other than [those of] Western culture when I find that the average American understands Shakespeare.

VASQUEZ: At least?

GARRIGUS: At least. Because if he can make a successful start there, then he's ready for some of these other literatures. Right now, it doesn't exist. The average student has no appreciation of Shakespeare at all.

The Costs of Neglecting Literature

VASQUEZ: What do you think the cost of neglecting the literary is to American culture, and even to the American political system?

GARRIGUS: It's terrible, the cost is terrible.

VASQUEZ: Give me an example.

GARRIGUS: Well, first, let me give you a generalization. You cannot have inspiring and effective leadership without a person--someone, a president, a senator, a congressman, an assemblyman, a mayor--that doesn't understand and appreciate the important elements of his heritage. [He should have] a truly appreciative and inspired view of where all the good things of his culture have come from and at what price they have come.

VASQUEZ: Is this the old adage of "Know thyself?"

GARRIGUS: Yes. And in order to know yourself, you've got to know--to use a cliché--your roots. You've

got to know the men and women who have given you the good things that you enjoy. If you don't understand the price of something, you don't value it. If your uncle gives you a bicycle, you don't value that bicycle as much as when you can look back and remember all the lawns you had to mow for fifteen cents [each] to accumulate the money to buy that bicycle for yourself.

In this country, we have a heritage to be proud of. Most countries do have a heritage to be proud of. But we're not concerned right now with their problems. We cannot possibly treasure, protect, defend, and promote our heritage unless we know what it's worth. The only way we can know what it's worth is to understand the price that's been paid for it by the brave, courageous, determined, and talented men and women who have done it.

This is what the liberal arts do. They give it to us in novels. They give it to us in plays. They give it to us in poems. And they give it to us in the long thread of history.

I have a lecture that I sometimes give service clubs. I stand up and I tell them,

"Your educational system has failed you, gentlemen. You can't possibly appreciate your blessings. And I'm going to show you why." Then I give them five names of great Americans. All I get is blank stares. They don't know who I'm talking about. Yet every one of these men whose names I give them has put them under obligation for some feature of the American heritage they're enjoying. They have no appreciation of the price [paid] for it.

VASQUEZ: What are those five names?

GARRIGUS: Well, I could give you more than five. I gave you Mentor Graham. Well, [Laughter] I'm trying to think of his name now. Wait a minute. . . . Israel Bissell. That doesn't mean anything to you. Israel Bissell, what a heroic man, and what a great thing he did for America. Now, it doesn't mean a thing to you. And I could give you Mr. [W. T. G.] Morton, that name doesn't mean anything. You probably think of salt when I say Mr. Morton . . .

VASQUEZ: Well, maybe. Or a famous lobbyist for the independent oil industry in California [Harold C. Morton]. [Laughter]

GARRIGUS: I'm talking about the man who has given millions a better life, and, literally, a life they otherwise wouldn't have, because he was the inventor of anaesthesia. He was the first man to practice anaesthesia. Every American schoolboy should know that. They don't.

Israel Bissell rode three days and three nights across four states alarming the Minutemen to get up to Boston so that when, two weeks later, George Washington came up there, he had an army to command. He wouldn't have had it if Israel Bissell hadn't ridden his horse, reeling in the saddle from exhaustion.

Every American boy should know that story and appreciate that man. It should be a point of courage, like the Dutch have this wonderful story of the little boy who was passing the leaking dike and stuck his finger in it and saved the whole countryside. Why don't we have more and more stories of people, about Mentor Graham and people like Mr. Morton?

The Value of Social "Myths"

VASQUEZ: Some people argue that social myths like that are something that . . .

GARRIGUS: They're not myths! They're realities!

VASQUEZ: Yes, I know, but "myths" used in the general sense of something that binds a culture together.

GARRIGUS: Yes, but a myth is not a truth. These are truths.

VASQUEZ: Using the term myth in the sense of something that is true, but something that takes on a life of its own and becomes a sort of cement or mortar that holds together a culture. Some argue that those kinds of things were fine for the nineteenth century. But in the twentieth and the twenty-first century, because of instant communications and the relative smallness of the world, what becomes more important is that one have an appreciation of the ability to manipulate the latest technology. What's your reaction to that?

GARRIGUS: My reaction is just to ask you where happiness has always been. Happiness has always been not in a manipulation of the environment but in a relationship between two or more people. Our concern in our curriculum should be those studies that promote a harmonious and happy

relationship between people. It doesn't matter how many machines you devise to do how many things.

Ultimately, you're going to either be happy or unhappy, and you're not going to be happy on the basis of machines. Nobody ever summed that whole problem up better than Jesus. He said, "What profit is it to a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?" There's never been a culture where so many people have gained so much of the world as ours has.

We've gone out and gained part of the moon, put men on the moon. But we use more psychiatrists, more aspirin. We have more alcoholism, more divorce, more infidelity, more people living without marriage, more delinquent children, and more drugs. In other words, more unhappiness and failure in relationships than any other culture on the face of the earth.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that to the degree that certain elements of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California were implemented . . .

GARRIGUS: If they had been implemented properly, we would be in much better shape than we are in today.

The liberal arts just never got their proper implementation. When we say liberal arts, we're talking about the ability to write correctly, write succinctly and clearly. We're talking about the ability to do simple mathematics. We're talking about an understanding of our heritage and the price that was paid for it. We're talking about the beautiful emotions, love, endurance, self-sacrifice, hope, faith. These things can only come across strong, one-on-one relationships or the stories, plays, and novels that describe one-on-one relationships so well you can feel what you're reading.

Reorganization of the Executive Branch Under Governor Edmund G. Brown, Sr.

VASQUEZ: Moving to another area that was important to Brown's "responsible liberalism program." It had to do with the reorganization of state government. As you know, there was an overhaul of the executive branch. How effectively do you think this was thought out and what impact do you think it had?

GARRIGUS: Well, there were some splendid resource men in on that from the different branches of the

University [of California] and some good economists. I think it had an excellent effect, especially on state finances and on budgeting. The disappointing thing is the lack of proper correlation between the finance committees of the legislature and the administration. It's improved. One of the biggest things that took place--and just previous to it--was the appointment of a special finance officer to oversee the whole direction of the budget.

VASQUEZ: The director of finance?

GARRIGUS: The director of finance, to give a report to the administration and the legislature. This was fine. There had been a tremendous improvement. Of course, one of Unruh's greatest achievements was the reorganization of the legislature. But, as we said yesterday, it hasn't worked out the way he wanted it to, but that's not the fault of the organization. It's the fault of the type of people who have used the organization. Part of the fault is, once again, the failure of the educational system to produce the right people to use it correctly.

VASQUEZ: Give me your impression of some of the finance

officers that served in that capacity when you were there. Let's take, for example, Hale Champion.

GARRIGUS: Hale Champion, I would say, was an excellent finance officer. I think he was very capable and went into some new areas very successfully. He was a well-educated man and he had experience. I would just have to say that, generally, I thought his record was good.

Civil Rights, the Legislature, and the Brown Administration

VASQUEZ: Another area that the Brown administration may not have been responsible for, but did commit itself to promoting, was civil rights. How successful do you think the Brown administration was in that area?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think it was very successful.

VASQUEZ: Why?

GARRIGUS: Governor Brown was firmly behind the efforts of [Assemblyman William] Byron Rumford to bring about fair housing and overcome the strong prejudices in the real estate lobby. Governor Brown gave his support to the Rumford Act, and it was enacted under his administration. It was

a tremendous stride forward. There was the strengthening of the [Unruh] Civil Rights Act[1] and the promotion of different ethnic groups in [new] areas of government. Brown was behind all these things and was for them enthusiastically. Of course, progress was slow because there had been too much entrenchment, too much money, well-organized and determined, on the other side.

VASQUEZ: What would you say to those people who argue that, in fact, civil rights, to the degree that it grew during the Brown administration, was the result of the legislature's initiative more than of the administration? They might cite examples like the Unruh Civil Rights Act.

GARRIGUS: That was fine. I'd have to qualify that by saying that many of the legislators were bitterly against any change in that situation. Some of them were very racist. I'm not going to name names, but they were racist. They fought the Unruh Act and they fought the Rumford Act to the hilt. And they were bitter when it was passed over their opposition. They represented

---

1. A.B. 94, 1959 Leg. Sess., Cal. Stat. 1866 (1959).

an entrenched tradition of discrimination in favor of real estate people and in favor of property owners, and they didn't want any change to take place.

I would say that the legislature did have strong initiatives in this area, and it was strongly influenced by the whole civil rights movement in the South. The legislature had some very capable black people who were great supporters of Martin Luther King [Jr.] and were great supporters of improved relationships among the races. They were highly intelligent men, like [Augustus F.] Gus Hawkins and Byron Rumford and [Edward F.] Ed Roybal, people like that.[1]

VASQUEZ: What about the criticism that the Brown administration was caught flat-footed, without the foresight or the insight to either have anticipated or dealt more creatively with the Watts rebellion? There is also the example of the United Farmworkers, when he refused to meet them after they marched all the way to the state

1. Edward F. Roybal never served in the state legislature. He served on the Los Angeles City Council and since 1962 has served in the United States House of Representatives.

capitol. What's your view of that?[1]

GARRIGUS: My view is simply that we were having a revolution taking place in civic relationships, and this government was not prepared for that revolution. It just wasn't ready for it at all. It couldn't react intelligently because it didn't have an understanding of the problem or the roots of the problem.

It didn't understand the background of what was taking place at all. You must remember, in that type of situation, with a new administration, the administration is going to react largely to the way the general public reacts. That's another way of saying it's going to react the way most voters are going to react. This can be a very unintelligent and very backward reaction.

I think there were a lot of areas in government where the administration and the legislature were guilty of this. It just came too fast and it was something that they had not given proper attention to or study of. They

1. On Easter Sunday of 1966, the United Farmworkers Organizing Committee arrived at the state capitol ten thousand strong, after having marched from Delano, California. Governor Brown was vacationing in Palm Springs with his family.

went with the general public, which was upset by it too.

VASQUEZ: This may be a difficult question considering where you were in the process. Who do you think gave better leadership to what happened in the sixties--that's when you were in office--the administration or the legislature?

GARRIGUS: I'd have to say there wasn't much leadership in either area, but the legislature was more aware than the administration of the problems and was more closely concerned with them.

VASQUEZ: Why? Because they're politicians, they want to be reelected?

GARRIGUS: No, it's simply because you had large areas of a district that you represented and were closely involved with. I had busloads of angry farmers that didn't like farmworker organizations coming up to tell me how to vote. So I was a little more aware than the governor was. He didn't have any busloads coming up to him. Some of the fellows from Bakersfield and Imperial County had the same thing. They also had. . . . Oh, this girl was in my office all the time, she was vice president of the Farmworkers.

VASQUEZ: Dolores Huerta?

GARRIGUS: Yes, Dolores. Dolores and I got to be good friends. She certainly counted on me as being aware, but I was in a minority. The majority of my rural voters were against me on this. As I said, I worked hard to get an acceptable compromise on the minimum wage bill with Gus Hawkins from $1.25 down to $1.00. Then my farmers repudiated me, whereas 90 percent of them were paying $1.00 at the time. But they didn't want it in the books.

We're talking about a legislature that wasn't getting any support in the areas it represented for a revolution that was taking place. I tell you that there was more awareness there than in the administration, but there wasn't too much that we could do. All I could do was stand up and say, "No! You're wrong, guys." And have them tell me, "Well, we'll never vote for you again!" And they didn't. Fortunately I had enough support in other areas so I wasn't killed. But there were some people that were killed by it. I saw some that were killed in the other areas, who stood up for it.

VASQUEZ: Tell me something about that.

GARRIGUS: When I say killed, I simply mean politically voted out of office.

The Rumford Fair Housing Act

VASQUEZ: Tell me your perspective of the Rumford Fair Housing Act. Why do you think it came about at the time it did? And why do you think it was so successfully put down?

GARRIGUS: Well, it wasn't put down. It passed.

VASQUEZ: I understand that. But why was it repealed? Was it just simply the kind of power that the real estate lobby was able to bring to bear?

GARRIGUS: Exactly, doctor, exactly. That was what happened. You had immense financial resources in real estate and manufacturing. Power that was prejudiced and solidly entrenched against any change taking place and giving fair housing to people. It was an ancient struggle of human rights against property rights. There's always got to be an area of compromise in there. But there always should be a priority of righteousness.

VASQUEZ: One can understand the intensity of feelings in places like Los Angeles or San Francisco or

Alameda counties, but why was it such a hotly debated issue in places like Fresno, in rural areas where there were few, if any, blacks?

GARRIGUS: But you had real estate men who were filled with the prejudice of neighborhood intrusion. These men had clients and investments [and] it was felt that if minorities came into those areas, property values were all going to decline. This was a phobia. It was a fear. You didn't have to be in Los Angeles, you didn't have to be in any big city. You found it in every little town. You found it to a lesser degree, and you found it in smaller numbers, but it was there.

It was political pressure on local administrations. That's why we had to go to the state level. Remember that a liberal court gave the Rumford Act its strength. You see, we're back to that old essential premise that we mentioned yesterday in that argument between Mr. Alexander Hamilton and Mr. James Madison. You're always against the fact that the majority will seldom do the right thing because the majority is usually in the grip of bias and prejudice and tradition. They act on that level rather than

on the level of intelligence, reasoning, and logic.

I told you that when I was in the legislature I didn't think there was anybody in my district that could make better decisions on important issues than I could. I thought I was better informed, had better resources for information, had a better perspective than Joe Doe and Jack Smith in my district. So I wasn't really representing them. I was leading them. That was the difference.

I was trying to get them to higher ground, and this is what a leader has to do. He doesn't follow the people. He doesn't represent the people in terms of their selfishness. He represents them in terms of what they should be, not what they are, or else he's not a leader, he's a follower. Are we going to elect followers to office or are we going to elect leaders to office? That's the problem.

The Debate Over Entitlement Programs

VASQUEZ: There's another element that caused a lot of controversy during the Brown years, and that had to do with entitlement programs, as they are now

called, things like social welfare. How much impact did those kinds of debates and those kinds of problems have in an area like Fresno at the time?

GARRIGUS: Not very much, no, not very much. There would be pockets of local and intense interest in these issues, but the great majority of the people weren't concerned with them at all. Once again, these things were usually under the discretion and the interest of some special, organized group that saw the problem clearly and wanted to do something about it.

There was no general interest. There was no intensity there. Of course, there was always a lot of what you might call uninformed and ignorant opposition to the welfare programs. This was largely due to the fact that people never really understood the welfare programs at all. They had no real comprehension of what they were doing.

They would pick out situations where they knew there was an old Cadillac parked in the yard of a welfare family and they'd say, "That's what these people are doing and that's what

we're paying 'em to do, have Cadillacs and television sets." Well, they didn't realize that 85 percent of their welfare money went for children whose parents were unable to feed them and house them and dress them.

They didn't realize that 50 percent of the money that was being spent in their area was coming from the state and the federal governments. Not even that much, about 70 percent from the state and federal government and 30 percent from the local area. They were all benefiting from this money because most of it had to be spent right there in the communities. So you had a lot of misunderstanding of the problem.

VASQUEZ: Is this an example of what you were telling me yesterday, of people who were able to elevate themselves socially as a result of some of the New Deal programs, then eventually got wealthy enough to become Republicans and forget some of their roots?

GARRIGUS: That's true. It goes back to the fact that there was such widespread desperation in agriculture when Roosevelt took over. Through

the organization, the promotion, and support of federal farm aid agents, these farmers got back on their feet again.

VASQUEZ: What some people in those days called welfare.

GARRIGUS: Yes, that's right. Once they got back on their feet again, they did not want to remember their tough days and who gave them the helping hand. They wanted to have the prestige that goes with self-development and self-aggrandizement, and so they joined the Republican party [Laughter].

VASQUEZ: The term "responsible liberalism", to me, has a tinge of defensiveness in it. Where did that term come from, and what did it mean to you at the time?

GARRIGUS: Well, the term "responsible liberalism" simply meant carefully and intelligently organizing financial resources and opportunity, doing it carefully at public support so that disadvantaged people would get an equal shake. To get ahead and make progress leading a kind of life that other Americans with more advantages were having.

That's what responsible liberalism always meant to me. It meant an interest primarily in

human rights, not a careless or an extravagant interest but a sensible and careful interest. Of course, right there is where the problem developed. Because there was too much liberalism that was not conducted sensibly, thriftily, and reasonably. It was conducted extravagantly and carelessly and wastefully, and that's what the public saw.

VASQUEZ: Give me an example of that.

GARRIGUS: I could pick out almost any program that you care to talk about and give you an example. The whole social welfare system, [President Lyndon B.] Johnson's poverty program, had people in charge of the money that was supposed to be spent to widen the opportunities for people. They were using it for furniture, cars, increased staff, high living, trips and things.

They simply weren't doing for the people with that money what was supposed to be done. Contracts were let out which were scandalous because buildings were poorly constructed. They didn't work right. They didn't fit right. The people weren't supervised correctly. You've got skeletons of those buildings from the poverty

program all over. This was careless liberalism which was a very inefficient liberalism. The heart was right, the aim was right.

VASQUEZ: Was it?

GARRIGUS: Oh, yes.

VASQUEZ: What do you think the political motivation of someone like Johnson was to launch something like the Great Society?

GARRIGUS: I'll give him the benefit of the doubt. I'll say that his political motivation was to greatly reduce the number of people who were living at the poverty level. To greatly reduce the number of kids who were undernourished. To greatly reduce the number of people who had no educational opportunity, no chance to go to school, who couldn't afford it any other way, people who were living in houses that weren't fit to live in.

I think he was concerned about that. And I think that's what the purpose of the program was. The fact that it had to be implemented by people who weren't qualified, by people who weren't properly trained, by people who weren't properly motivated, gave a lot of discredit to

the whole bid.

VASQUEZ: On balance, do you think the Great Society programs were a success or a failure?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think they were a qualified success because they broke ground that hadn't been broken before. They said in kind of a failing way, "This is what we've got to do right sometime. We've made a start, we haven't done it right. We've got to do it right sometime." But I think that even if it's a weak and faltering step, if it's a step in the right direction, it's justified.

Comparing California Politics in the 1950s and the 1960s

VASQUEZ: We'll come back to that, but let me go to a question that helps set the stage for another discussion. Summarize, if you will, the difference in California state politics between the 1950s and the 1960s.

GARRIGUS: Well, the big difference in 1950s California politics was cross-filing. A man could run on both a Republican and a Democratic ticket and the voter could cross party lines in the primary and vote for either party. That was a tremen-

dous difference in the fifties and the sixties.

The other big difference in the fifties was that there had never been any proper laws set down to put reins on the lobbyists, the special interests. They were running wild in the fifties. Of course, the outstanding example of that was [Arthur H.] Samish, a man who could actually say that he had the legislature in his pocket financially. The other difference in sixties politics was a tremendous concern for civil rights that you didn't have in the fifties. There were little inklings of it, but it was not a dominating interest.

VASQUEZ: You mentioned that much of the influence in California for the civil rights impulse came as a result of the black civil rights movement in the South.

GARRIGUS: Yes.

VASQUEZ: Do you think the retrenchment that we experienced in the eighties came because of a lack of aggressiveness on the part of minorities to continue their protest movements?

GARRIGUS: No, I don't think so.

VASQUEZ: Was it what Governor [Edmund G.] Jerry Brown

[Jr.] called--if I can attribute it to him--"compassion fatigue"?

GARRIGUS: "Compassion fatigue" is a pretty good phrase. But I don't think that's it either.

VASQUEZ: What happened?

GARRIGUS: I think there was a natural reaction stemming from the fact that there had been so much improvement made. People who had been stirred up to bring that improvement about weren't tired. They just thought, "Well, the thing's been started in the right direction. She's been done. There's no sense in being stirred up about it anymore." You had a more subtle retrenchment.

You didn't have police dogs and fire hoses out there. Instead of that, you had disguised, unfair advantages taken by majorities against minorities, but nothing radical that would attract public attention.

VASQUEZ: Some people would call that "institutionalized racism."

GARRIGUS: Well, that's all right, that's a good phrase, "institutionalized racism" is alright. It was not overt and open and it did not stir up public

feeling. You couldn't get people to react to it in such a way as to make it become overt and stir up public feeling. It wasn't that bad.

There's a big difference, for instance, in somebody not getting a job that they should get or not filling a quota that they should fill in a certain area of employment, and not being allowed to get a hotel room or eat at a lunch counter or ride on a bus. You didn't have anybody turning you down in a violent and uncouth way.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

Garrigus Assesses Affirmative Action

VASQUEZ: One of the concepts of social discourse, and of government, that emerged in the transition period of the sixties was the notion of "affirmative action," which has now come under rather dubious repute. Some argue that it weakens rather than strengthens the efforts of minorities, that it's a false indicator of how well things really are. What's your assessment of affirmative action?

GARRIGUS: My assessment of affirmative action is that it's

been just a little bit--not too much, not discreditably--an overreaction to a great injury that was done for centuries to minorities, particularly the blacks. There should be a compensatory adjustment in employment and in consideration for educational opportunity and things like that for injustice that was done for so long.

I think it should be done with discrimination. I mean, there's a certain plateau where you don't want to give somebody an opportunity that they're in no way qualified to receive, to the extent that they can't harm themselves and the people around them. You've got to be careful.

Say there's a job opening in a fire station or someplace, and there are two candidates for that job. One of them is white and one of them is black. If that black is fairly qualified for the job, he should be given the preference on the basis of affirmative action because of the opportunities lost in the past. It might give him a better position today if he had those opportunities.

VASQUEZ: Even if he's less qualified than the white?

GARRIGUS: To a certain extent. But supposing the man is suffering from some kind of debilitating illness that really doesn't qualify him to be under the rigorous strains that a fireman has to go through. Then he shouldn't be given a job just on the basis of his color.

That's an extreme example, but that's what I'm saying. One of the earliest kinds of affirmative action were the privileges [rights] under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. During the Reconstruction period following the Civil War, in the late 1860s and early 1870s, blacks were given preference for election to the legislatures. With no education or qualifications to discharge their responsibilities, some of them did some very foolish, silly, terrible, and damaging things. They shouldn't have been in those positions just because they were freed slaves. That was the earliest example of that kind of thing.

VASQUEZ: So affirmative action is all right if it's tutored?

GARRIGUS: That's right, if it's used correctly, yes. It's

a compensatory element that is desired and deserved by people who have been deprived and denied so much in the past.

The Major Contributions of Garrigus's Political Generation

VASQUEZ: What do you think is the legacy of your political generation? Let's use the years '58 to '66 in California politics. What did you contribute most to California life?

GARRIGUS: Well, I would have to say it was the California water plan. Most people don't understand the scope of that diversion of northern water to the south. The great benefits that have been reaped by it were truly the implementation of a great vision.

Then, I would say, although it's been abused, the enhancement and encouragement of organizations to promote California agriculture. It made California the greatest agricultural state in the union. I was on the Agriculture Committee and I know how much development took place in this area and how much improvement there was.

There were some at fault. There was

organization for special greed, which is bound to take place in some of the great cooperatives. But there was also tremendous protection and improvement. You saw an example of that in the hysteria over the "med fly," [the Mediterranean fruit fly.] when it came in.

There was a tremendous scientific increase in laboratory development for agricultural benefit. The University of California at Davis, for instance, was given legislative budgeting and bolstering and encouragement to improve dairies and the wine industry. A great variety of crops were developed that hadn't existed, through the agriculture experiment stations. I was responsible for one, along with [Senator] Hugh Burns, in the Parlier area in Fresno County. It has grown and has performed all kinds of services through its extension division.

Then, I would have to say, the consolidation of school districts, the reorganization of school districts, increased facilities and standards, giving kids the Head Start programs, the reduction of the size of classes, and things

like that. Great improvements were made in educational reform, educational organization. Not as much as should been, but at least things got started. That would be my general assessment.

VASQUEZ: What were the greatest shortcomings of your political generation?

GARRIGUS: Well, the greatest shortcomings of that period were, I would say, the failure to properly see some of the drainage problems in agriculture resulting in that Kesterson mess.[1]

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that.

GARRIGUS: That's an area where farmers were allowed to drain all their waste water, their contaminated water, and it just destroyed all the wildlife over there. It's a stinking place and it's a dead place and it's a festering place. And that shouldn't have been.

VASQUEZ: Why was that allowed to happen?

GARRIGUS: Well, because it was too expensive to do anything else about it, and because of the fact

---

1. The pollution of the Kesterson Wildlife Refuge due to agricultural waste water run-off became a cause célèbre during the 1970s and 1980s.

that the big farmers, who would have had to bear the expense over there, were strong enough to keep things as they were.

VASQUEZ: And influential enough in the legislature?

GARRIGUS: Yes. Plus the fact that there was generally no public interest in the thing until it got so bad. It was just like a kid neglecting a splinter until finally it started throbbing and infecting the area of his arm around the wound. It was that kind of a thing.

Then, there was a failure to upgrade teacher qualifications in education and a reluctance to give the kind of discipline necessary in the schools. A tremendous resistance on the part of parents, the you-can't-touch-my-child business, "I don't care what my child becomes or how much damage he does or how much he disrupts school. You can't touch him." California's reaped a terrible harvest for that.

I couldn't blame any teacher for not wanting to teach in the Los Angeles area, because of the amount of unruliness, the drug picture down there, the violence, and the failure of the schools to properly integrate the

different ethnic diversities. You have group animosities among the students. It's been a big failure. And it will continue to be a failure until the public concerns itself and makes some genuine efforts to do something about it.

The Reasons for the 1958 Democratic Sweep

VASQUEZ: Let's talk a little bit about state Democratic politics. What do you see as the causes for the 1958 sweep of the Democratic party, apart from cross-filing?

GARRIGUS: [Laughter] It was the division in the Republican party between the leaders of the party. There's no mystery about that. You had two very strong Republicans with enthusiastic followings. You had Senator [William F.] Knowland and you had Governor [Goodwin J.] Knight. Their ambitions conflicted and that split the party right down the middle.

VASQUEZ: Then it was not so much the doing of the Democrats as it was of the Republicans.

GARRIGUS: That's right. I've never given myself too much credit at that time for being elected, because of the fact that the Republican party was divided.

VASQUEZ: What about those Democrats who argue that it was due to the rise of the CDC and the rationalization of fund-raising? I think, for example, of the group around Tom Rees and Jesse Unruh that began consolidating Democratic campaign funds, the redistribution of Third House contributions to those they wanted to get into office. Some people feel that and cross-filing had something to do with it. Do you give much credence to that?

GARRIGUS: Yes. Of course, it's a very regrettable development, very unfortunate. It's one of those things that puts more and more emphasis on money as a deciding factor. Due to that, you can buy very high-priced exposure time on the media--television, particularly--and you can turn campaigns over to advertising agencies which charge exorbitant fees to package a candidate attractively. To do that packaging by an agency costs a lot of money. The only way you can get it [the money] is through this type of political organization, by putting all the monies together then apportioning them out where

you think is most effective for packaging.

It's a kind of political merchandising is what it is. And it's regrettable. It's really inexcusable, because it's so easy to see what should be right. Legislation should be enacted which says, "You can't spend more than this modest amount of money on a political campaign. Every TV station in every assembly and senatorial district, by public service, has to provide fifteen minutes of free time for each candidate." That's all they can have, at certain times. Once a week.

You can work out a simple schedule where every TV station must allow these two men to meet face to face before the public, like [Abraham] Lincoln and [Stephen A.] Douglas did on the debating platform. Each one gets this amount of time and no more to debate and rebut the other person on the issues of the campaign. That could be supplied so simply. It would be so fair for each candidate to have equal time. The special interest money would be outlawed, one couldn't get it at all. But greed, so far, is in the saddle.

VASQUEZ: Republicans might argue that they'd be at a sudden disadvantage since they have always had a minority of voter registration.

GARRIGUS: Well, they could also say, "We've always had more money to spend. We're at a disadvantage now because we can't spend our money." And they could always say, "The fat cats are in our party." But what good does it do the American people if they say it? The important thing is what is fair, what is most effective for good government? It's limiting the amount of money that can be spent in a campaign and it's giving each candidate an equal chance at the public.

VASQUEZ: Do you think the expensive packaging of candidates short-circuits the discretionary power of the electorate?

GARRIGUS: Exactly. I don't think there's any doubt about it.

VASQUEZ: What is your feeling about public campaign financing, systems like the income-tax check-off?

GARRIGUS: I think it's excellent if you put a limit on how much of that money can be spent in each campaign. I ran the cheapest five campaigns of

anybody in California. It was in a time when all I needed was an opportunity to present my case. I could get that when I made a speech. It would be printed and the people would read it.

Every candidate should have equal access to public television. Every candidate should be limited in that access so that he doesn't take advantage. It's not going to hurt any television station to give two candidates a half hour twice or three times during a campaign. It's not going to hurt them. It's not going to ruin them. This should be a free public service. But, of course, you know how they would resist that.

VASQUEZ: How are you going to roll something back that's become such a big industry? Elections have become an entire industry.

GARRIGUS: You can't roll it back until you get some leaders that go out there and make a case for it so that the public will back them up. You just can't do it. After all, in a democracy you get what the people give. It's the people that have the power.

If the people don't use that power, other special interests take advantage of it and use it. But anytime they [the people] want to, enough of them--and this has been proved over and over again--can have their way if they want it badly enough. What you have now is technological manipulation of the electorate. This is the packaging process of politics. It's a process in which the big advertising agencies manipulate the people in favor of one or another candidate through the use of a lot of money.

Pat Brown's Strengths and Weaknesses

VASQUEZ: You first got involved in Democratic politics on the county central committee. Did you serve as a delegate to the national conventions?

GARRIGUS: Yes, I did. I served as a delegate to the '60 convention that nominated John F. Kennedy.

VASQUEZ: Tell me about that convention from your perspective, specifically the problems that Governor Brown had in holding the California delegation together.

GARRIGUS: Well, he never held the delegation together. The delegation was split three ways, because in the district from which I was a delegate,

Congressman [Bernard F.] Sisk, who was a very influential congressman, was in favor of Lyndon Johnson as president. He was an associate of Johnson's back in congress.

Pat Brown had been converted to the Kennedy cause. And those of us that had been faithful adherents of Governor Adlai Stevenson were for him running a third time. Consequently, the delegation went their three ways and never did unite. But there was more unification, more slippage and compromise between Johnson and Kennedy than there was between the Stevenson people.

VASQUEZ: Some people argue that Paul Ziffren, among others, was involved in getting more delegates than what legitimately should have been on the floor in the Adlai Stevenson delegation as a means of deadlocking the convention, thus providing Pat Brown a dark-horse opportunity.

GARRIGUS: No.

VASQUEZ: You don't think that's much of an argument?

GARRIGUS: That might have been in the minds of a few individuals, but there was no concerted movement or support for that at all. Maybe it was part

of Pat's ambition at the time.

The last time I was with Governor Stevenson, when he was campaigning in Fresno for the Kennedy/Johnson ticket (I introduced him that night, and then I stayed with him until he caught his plane for San Francisco), I asked him, "Governor, when so many of us stuck our necks out for your candidacy in trying to draft you for a third term and were so loyal to you as supporters, why didn't you come forth publicly and give us help?"

He put his hand over on my knee and he said, "Gus, twice I had asked my party for the highest honor and privilege a man could have, and I failed to honor that privilege with a victory for my party. I deeply felt that I had no right to ask for anything more." There was a silence, and I knew that that's the way he felt about it. He felt that he had tried twice and failed and he didn't have the right to try a third time.

VASQUEZ: Do you think Pat Brown was weakened both at the statewide level and at the national level, within Democratic politics, as a result of his

performance at the 1960 national convention?

GARRIGUS: No, I don't think so. Because he came back strong when he defeated Richard Nixon for the governorship. Pat's big weakness, and everybody around him knew this, was that he wanted to be liked by everybody. You can't do this and be just. I saw him go out of his way to be nice to people who laughed at him and undercut him behind his back. Yet, because they were people in power, he would bow to them.

VASQUEZ: Do you think the term, "tower of jello" was a fair characterization of his political resolve?

GARRIGUS: No, no, I don't think that's a bit fair. It doesn't do justice to the great efforts that he made to help implement the Master Plan for Higher Education, the way he stood up against the bureaucratic educational organization. It doesn't do justice to the way he brought some of the northern senators into line to pass the California Water Plan. It doesn't do justice to the fact that he stood firm in his opposition to capital punishment, even though he knew that the majority of the people weren't with him on that. No, I think that's a very unjust criticism. Pat

could have given some people that impression because he wanted to be liked and he wanted to do things as best he could to make people like him. This gave some people the idea that he was weak.

VASQUEZ: Do you think it's a weakness in a politician to care who likes you?

GARRIGUS: No, I don't think so. You've just got to realize that you can't please everybody no matter how much you want to. If you are going to take a stand on something, you're going to offend somebody. You can't help it. Everybody doesn't agree on everything and you are right back again at the very hustings of democracy, which means confrontation and debate. That's the very heart of democracy.

You've got to confront each other and you've got to debate each other. You've got to reach consensus, which means what the majority wants. When the Constitution, which we all venerate and adore and which has done so much for this country, was finished, the majority of the delegates felt that each one could have done a better job if they had been left alone to do

it. What they had was very imperfect. Washington thought it might last thirteen years.

VASQUEZ: To what do you attribute its capacity to last two hundred years?

GARRIGUS: Because it essentially divided the powers of government in such a way that they constantly have to confront and debate each other before the public. You've got overlapping powers in the judiciary, in the legislative, and the executive, although they're always arguing about who has the ultimate power. That argument before the public keeps things balanced. There's nobody getting out of balance.

The Media and the System of Checks and Balances

VASQUEZ: Right now we have controversies both at the state and at the national level regarding whether the executive branch has garnered a bit too much power. Do you think that's a healthy sign, or do we do have a problem in that area?

GARRIGUS: I think it's a healthy sign. I think any time one branch demonstrates too much power, the other branches are going to be strengthened sufficiently by public opinion and the action of the people to compensate.

VASQUEZ: Some call the news media, especially the opinion-makers, if you will, the "fourth estate." But there's really no direct or specific check on that fourth estate in what is supposedly a checks-and-balance system. What's your assessment of that?

GARRIGUS: I think it's properly called the fourth estate because it does as much or more to influence public opinion than the action of the three branches of government. The French parliament was called the Estates General. The fourth member of that general parliament was enacting or getting results that affected the people. So it has a right to be called the fourth estate because we are very susceptible to the press. The media shapes the majority opinion mostly in this country.

But the media itself is divided. You get a very healthy difference every time you gather a group of media celebrities. They argue and they differ on points. You have these programs like David Brinkley and his group. On "Crossfire" they argue like the devil on a point, you can't get a uniformity there. This is very healthy

because people see these differences and make up their minds on the basis of what they think are the best arguments put forth.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that's an adequate check on the fourth estate, their own divisions among themselves?

GARRIGUS: Right. I was so grateful for this in the legislature. I saw a constant balance going on between different cliques and different representatives of special interests. It certainly overrode the process in their favor and to their advantage, if they hadn't been checked by others, including a free press.

VASQUEZ: In the time you were in office you got to observe the advent of television and the instant reporting of political affairs in the state. Do you think that's been a step forward or a step backward in the function of government?

GARRIGUS: Well, I think it's been a step backward. But it shouldn't have been. It's not the fault of television. It's backward because it's manipulative. And it should be open. It should be natural.

I told you a moment ago that candidates

should be made to face the public on television, not packaged and given a false and completely shined up image that isn't like the real person at all. That's the disadvantage of it. It's not that there's anything wrong with television. It's the way it's being used.

Just think how few people could be reached in the Lincoln/Douglas era by the human voice. Everybody in the state of Illinois could have heard Lincoln and Douglas debate on the television of today.

That's the way it ought to be. Everybody within a district, in any area or political division, should be able to tune in and listen to debate. But if one can afford a completely glamorous, packaged presentation of himself by a skilled group of advertisers, and the other can't afford that, you've got unfairness, discrimination, bias, and prejudice. That's what you've got today. But that's not the fault of television. It's the fault of the way it's being used.

VASQUEZ: And, primarily, the fault of those who can garner the resources to . . .

GARRIGUS: To be selfish. It's also the fault of a public that allows it. This could all be outlawed. We could pass legislation that gave a fair amount of time, that gave free time. Just like we've passed legislation that says you can check off so much of your tax, we could do that. But we won't pass those laws.

VASQUEZ: Has somebody got to mobilize public opinion for that?

GARRIGUS: That's right. Somebody's got to mobilize public opinion, exactly.

VASQUEZ: So there's a lack of leadership in that direction.

GARRIGUS: Well, there's a lack of leadership in all directions.

Differences Between the Democratic and Republican Parties

VASQUEZ: For that kind of direction and that kind of leadership, it seems to me because of the way the parties define themselves, it is the duty and responsibility of the Democratic party, your party.

GARRIGUS: It's the responsibility of the Republican party just as much.

VASQUEZ: But the Republican party, as you were defining it earlier, concerns those with the wealth, the minority. The Democratic party is the one that wants to speak for the masses.

GARRIGUS: Yes, but I thought we were talking about what should be. Don't forget that you have divisions within the Republican party as serious as you have within the Democratic party.

For instance, I grew up in an area--and I didn't realize this--of southern Illinois where the liberal party was the Republican, in the Lincoln tradition. Those people who had moved up from Tennessee, Alabama, South and North Carolina into southern Illinois were Democrats. They were southern Democrats, they were prejudiced, they were restricted, they were discriminating, and they were aristocratic. The Republicans were liberal.

When I moved out to California, I thought I'd find the same thing out here, but I didn't. I found just the reverse. I found that the Democrats in California were like my Republicans back in Illinois.

You even find that out on the floor of the

legislature when you're there. You'll find out that one Republican resents another one because he's too liberal. Another Republican gives back the same resentment because the other one's too conservative.

VASQUEZ: Maybe the labels aren't as precise as people would like them to be?

GARRIGUS: That's right, they're not.

The Roosevelt Coalition in the Democratic Party Today

VASQUEZ: Well, let's keep the labels for just a minute. And let's get to this question: the success, the popularity of the Democratic party, at least since [Franklin D.] Roosevelt, has been attributed by some as the coalition it built between minorities, organized labor, urban liberals, this sort of thing. It has come upon hard times recently because of the breakup of that coalition. In the current 1988 presidential campaign, you've got a person that not only wants to bring back the dynamics of that coalition, but in some respects represents and embodies that coalition, Jesse Jackson. Yet you find the Democratic party unable to deal with

that. What's happened?

GARRIGUS: What happened could be demonstrated very simply and graphically by the fact that the polls in the first gubernatorial race between [Mayor Thomas] Bradley of Los Angeles and [Attorney General George] Deukmejian showed that Bradley was going to be elected, but he wasn't.

The simple fact is that here is this subtle, unstructured, disguised prejudice, which you might call "disguised racism," an underground or undercurrent of racism which is ultimately decisive in the majority opinion.

You've got Democrats that certainly are a part of this coalition you're speaking of. Realistically, in terms of what they know about America and what they know about the people around them, they feel that Jesse is not electable because of racism.

VASQUEZ: Yet, he swept the southern primaries.

GARRIGUS: I know, but the South isn't going to decide the election. That isn't where the big population centers of the country or the electoral delegates are.

VASQUEZ: But we're made to believe that's where most of

the racists are.

GARRIGUS: Well, that is probably true. You must remember that John F. Kennedy was elected over Nixon by one vote per precinct in this country. The average Democrat seeing Jackson out there running sees a hell of a lot more than one vote per precinct to defeat him. And that's the problem.

They don't have confidence in the people to rise above racism for their own interests. Look how many years the Bourbon aristocracy of the South manipulated the white vote by telling the whites, "We whites got to stick together. It doesn't matter that I'm rich and you're poor and that my system is going to keep you poor. That doesn't matter. We're both white, and that means we're better than this black person. So we whites have got to stick together. You've got to elect me to keep this superiority." So the poor white did elect him, and he stayed right down there with the poor black, both of them together in the terrible economic slavery of the white aristocracy.

It's just like Martin Luther King [Jr.]

said, "If you're going to keep a man in the gutter, the only way you can do it is get down there and hold him in the gutter." And that's what happened to the whites. You had poor whites and blacks in the same class, but the whites compensated by feeling like they were part of a white aristocracy, which they weren't a part of at all. They were being used to keep the aristocracy in power.

Today, Jesse Jackson can have the best program and the best concerns as a politician and the best abilities for leadership. But simply because he is black, he is not going to be the candidate for president. He's not going to have the majority of delegates because he's black and because the great mass of the people in this country don't believe that a black can be elected because there's too much prejudice and racism abroad. That's it.

VASQUEZ: Shouldn't it be the Democratic party that offers leadership in that direction?

GARRIGUS: The Democratic party has offered leadership in that direction. It's not a coincidence that you get 85 to 95 percent of the black vote for a

Democrat every time. That's not a coincidence.

VASQUEZ: But it's also not a foregone conclusion anymore, is it?

GARRIGUS: I think it's pretty much of a foregone conclusion still. I don't think the Republicans have done enough yet to justify a transference.

VASQUEZ: There's a more fundamental criticism being made of the Democratic party, that it's lost its moral and ethical way. Instead of giving direction and having the courage to break away from some of the arguments that have predominated political discourse in the last decade, it is really following the Republican party. Democrats don't want to be responsible, for example, for "losing Central America" or for "losing" some other part of the world that we somehow think is ours or that we know best what to do with. Do you feel the Democratic party has blurred the differences that it once had with the Republicans?

GARRIGUS: No. I don't feel so at all. I think the very fact that you still have strong majority support for the Democratic party among minorities and ethnic groups is proof of that. I don't think

they would be that blind if that were the case. There may have been some decline in the amount of adherents to these principles of the Democratic party, but there hasn't been that much decline.

VASQUEZ: What is the decline that has occurred owed to?

GARRIGUS: I think part of it is due to the fact that many Democrats feeling that there is a conservative tide, in order to stay electable they compromise with this conservative tide. They do not stand up for things because they're afraid that it will cause them to lose votes.

But I think we're in a position that reminds me of my sons during the Humphrey/Nixon presidential campaign. My boys wouldn't vote for Humphrey because he had stayed loyal to Johnson on the Vietnam issue. They thought the war was wrong and Humphrey should have denounced it. And I told them, "He cannot oppose his president. He is his vice president and he's got to keep quiet as long as he is vice president or resign from the vice presidency."

Well, that argument didn't [convince] them at all. So what did they get as a result? They

got the great Richard Nixon and the great Spiro Agnew because they condemned Humphrey for his lack of true liberalism on the Vietnam issue. If that's the way you want to do it, that's what you're going to get. You're going to get more Nixons and more Agnews.

VASQUEZ: Do you think that argument--and, again, we're dealing in speculation here, but it might be useful--is going to hold much water with blacks if they feel that Jesse Jackson, in spite of his strong showing in other than black areas, is shortchanged by the Democratic party in the elections of 1988? Do you think blacks are not going to reevaluate their adherence to the Democratic party?

GARRIGUS: No, Dr. Vásquez, I have a lot more confidence in black leadership than that. I think there may be some alienation and there may be some disappointment. But I do not believe that either alienation or disappointment will be sufficient to keep them from really knowing where their best interests are--in the candidacy of [Governor Michael S.] Dukakis.

VASQUEZ: You participated in the elections of 1966 . . .

IX. CALIFORNIA'S POET LAUREATE

GARRIGUS: Oh, that's when I bowed out. [Laughter] That's when I walked away.

Garrigus's Career After Leaving the Assembly

VASQUEZ: Let's get to that. When you left the legislature, what was your role in politics after that?

GARRIGUS: Practically nonexistent.

VASQUEZ: Why?

GARRIGUS: I gave some lectures to groups of young Democratic candidates, but I was going back to the field of teaching. I wanted to give my whole energies and ability to that. I had given that up largely--not entirely because I taught part-time--all the time I was in the legislature.

I had to to stay in there. A salary was needed at the time. Of course, everything's changed now. As quick as I left, they made it a really profitable job. But I had a growing family--five children, a mother, a young nephew, and a brother-in-law--that I had to support, and I couldn't do it on my legislative salary. I had to teach.

VASQUEZ: Yet less than a decade later, you made a comeback attempt. You ran for office in the

assembly. Why was that?

GARRIGUS: Well, by that time my children were out of college, my mother had died, my brother-in-law had died. I didn't have as much expense. The legislature paid enough to really live handsomely. I was disappointed at the fact that many of the educational reforms I had worked for had been outlawed, been defeated, had been reduced in their effectiveness. The direction wasn't right.

Frankly, I wanted to take on Governor Reagan publicly in the legislature. But I didn't have any financial resources campaign-wise. I wasn't taking any big money, and I no longer had the support of the Fresno Bee, who stayed with the incumbent. All the cards were stacked against me. I had been out of office for eight years, and on the basis of a comparatively cheap campaign, I just couldn't get enough votes.

VASQUEZ: You weren't able to call on some of your old colleagues in the legislature?

GARRIGUS: Oh, you don't do that. They're busy running themselves. They have their own campaigns.

They don't care about your campaign. Anyway, most of my old colleagues had either gone on to Congress or else were out of the legislature. I think there were only two or three left.

The Relationship Between Poetry and Politics

VASQUEZ: Let's shift ground. What is the relation between poetry and politics?

GARRIGUS: Well, it's chiefly the liberal arts relationship. It's chiefly the fact that all of our great leaders have been lovers of poetry, have been inspired by poetry, have been you might say, enamored of high language. The Greeks had a word for persuasive language. Our phrase for persuasive language is commercial advertising. But the Greek word for persuasive language was rhetoric, that's what they called it.

We still use the word, but not quite in that sense. They believed the highest and most persuasive rhetoric was poetry. Remember, I'm talking about the fellows who devised our system of Western education. They are the roots of our Western civilization. These Greeks believing that poetry was the highest use of language possible for inspiration and effect honored

their poets and their orators above all others. Their statesmen were all poets and orators and, I might say, philosophers, too. You couldn't achieve the position of leadership without one or more of these qualities.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

GARRIGUS: So, the poets and the orators were the most honored among men. Down through the history of Western culture we must think of poetry as the highest, the most influential, the most inspirational use of language. If it isn't that, then it's missing the boat. It should be that. Poetry, then, has always been an effective arm of leadership, an effective element in leadership.

It has boiled down to what Mentor Graham told Abraham Lincoln, "Abe, the men who control words control men." And it boiled down to what Lincoln said, "The things I need to know are in books." It's what old Hesiod, the Greek philosopher-poet, meant when he said, "The wise man is one who has hearkened to the wise. Listen to what wisdom has to say."

When you got a leader like John F. Kennedy, you got a man that loved poetry and used it. When you got a man like Winston Churchill, you got a man that loved poetry and used it. When you got a man like the president of France [François Mitterand], you got a man that loves poetry and uses it. And when you look down through history, poetry has always been an important element in the education of leaders.

Most people don't know that the ancient kings of Ireland were all poets. Most people don't know that the right-hand man who always had the place of honor right beside the leader in the great Viking community of exploration and achievement and courage was the poet, the scop. The leader had the scop there because he knew that if future generations were going to appreciate any worthwhile thing he did, this guy had to put it into words that they would understand and appreciate.

You've always had the highest political leadership identified, related to the highest use of persuasive language, which is poetry. Now, unfortunately, a lot of our modern poets

have corrupted that tradition completely.

VASQUEZ: How?

GARRIGUS: By writing stuff and calling it poetry, but it doesn't influence anybody. In fact, it leads the average person in the public to say, "Well, if that's poetry, I don't care any for that. That doesn't mean anything to me. That's just strange stuff, strange use of words."

Isn't it ironic that if you and I were to take a walking expedition through a simple Scottish countryside of villagers and farmers, and stop in any household and say these words: "Pleasures are like poppies spread. You seize the flower, the bloom is shed." Or, "The snow falls in the river. A moment white, then gone forever." That Scot's face would light up, and he would say, "Ah man! [Robert] Bobby Burns! Bobby Burns, I say! You like Bobby Burns too!" Or, "What some power, the gift it gives, to see ourselves as others see us." "Oh, that's Bobby Burns! Yes!"

Today, the thing [on which] the emperor of Japan [Hirohito] prides himself most is not his garden. It's not his tradition of power. It's

the poetry he's written over his lifetime and to which he is devoted. Poetry and great leadership have always been identified together.

VASQUEZ: What does that say about the political leaders in our times in this country? They seem so far removed from poetry.

GARRIGUS: It says two things. First, that our educational system has neglected the proper use of poetry in their education. And second, it says that the inheritors of that tradition, the modern poets, have written such lousy stuff that it hasn't influenced anybody.

Garrigus Becomes California's Poet Laureate

VASQUEZ: Now, you're only the fifth poet laureate of the state of California.[1]

GARRIGUS: That's right.

VASQUEZ: But you've had the longest tenure.

GARRIGUS: That's right.

VASQUEZ: Yet, when you were nominated for poet laureate, it seems the greatest opposition came not from politicians but from other poets. Why was

1. The California Poet Laureates have been: Ina Coalbrith, 1919-28; Henry Meade Bland, 1929-31; John Steven McGroaty, 1933-44; Gordon W. Norris, 1953-61; Charles B. Garrigus, 1966--.

that?

GARRIGUS: Well, that was simply because the poets didn't know me and the politicians did. I had been reading poetry in the legislature for eight years, and the legislators liked it.

Actually, you couldn't get a more critical or more uninformed audience on poetry than a group of legislators. Every time I got up before that legislature to read poetry, I could have gotten egg all over my face unless that poetry spoke to them in terms of inspiration, logic, intelligence, and meaning that gave them pleasure.

If I hadn't been a pleasant experience, I would not have ever gone back before that group again. You must remember that I have read poetry thirty-four times before the state legislature. No other poet laureate in California has ever read poetry more than two or three times at the most before his state legislature. The only reason I keep going back for another time is because they like what they heard the last time I was there.

VASQUEZ: What do you think is the significance of

California's poet laureate, and what do you think it should be? Is there a gap between the two?

GARRIGUS: Well, when our first national poet laureate [Robert Penn Warren] took office two years ago under an enactment that made it possible to have a national poet laureate, he said, "I will not compose any poetry on demand. I simply won't do it." Well, each of those thirty-four poems that I've read before the legislature has been poetry on command. That is, it's been a special occasion that the legislature could appreciate with poetry, celebrating or memorializing. I had to compose that poem for that special occasion.

The purpose of the poet laureate, as I see it--and it goes back both to the Greek and the English tradition--is to compose poetry that properly celebrates or memorializes very important events. Over there [Gestures] is a poem which celebrates the return of our hostages from Iran that I read before the legislature. That poem there on the wall was framed by the legislature, I read it there. I had to speak in

that poem [about] what the legislature felt was appropriate about the return of those hostages from Iran. I made the persuasive language of poetry do justice to that fact. That was my obligation as the poet laureate.

I have poetry on exhibition now in nine public places in California. The poem, in any one of those places, should be there only if the subject that it speaks of is written in such words that the general public has a good feeling of relatedness and pleasure in their own individual intelligences.

VASQUEZ: In most editions of the California Blue Book, when looking through the index, one finds the page number for the state rock, for the state bird, for the state symbol, for the state emblem, for the state song. It's often hard to find the state poet. Why is that?

GARRIGUS: For the same reason that we don't get Mother Teresa celebrated all over the world. It's just a matter of cultural ignorance in high places. Of course, I'm in the Blue Book for the period I was in the legislature, I'm there.

VASQUEZ: Oh yes, of course. I'm saying I don't sense

there is yet an appreciation for the significance that a state poet should command, the respect for the state poet laureate.

GARRIGUS: Well, that's true, but you've got to further than that. There isn't a proper respect or appreciation for the art of poetry in our culture.

You must remember that we're rather exceptional in this and that it's fairly recent with us. I couldn't make that statement a hundred years ago. A hundred years ago, every weekly paper in any little community was printing the poetry of local poets or was printing poetry of national poets. People enjoyed seeing it, people enjoyed writing it, and because they were encouraged to write. That's out of our culture today. It's out of our culture because our culture has shifted its values.

Education is neglecting the proper use of poetry in education, just like it's neglecting the proper use of history. There are no teachers properly trained to use poetry in their classes. It used to be that a part of every school's public program had kids reciting poetry

as a part of that program. That was true sixty years ago. It was even more true a hundred years ago.

Abraham Lincoln loved to tell the story about the schoolhouse having its annual presentation of children's abilities. One little boy in the seventh grade had a poem that he had memorized. His grandfather was out in the audience. The boy was trying to recite lines from Fitz-Greene Halleck's poem, "Marco Bozzaris," which had to do with the courage of the Greeks in fighting for their independence against the Turks. The third line in the poem went: "When Greece, her knees in suppliance bent, should tremble at his power." This boy went out on the stage and said, "When Greece, her knees in suh. . . . When Greece, her knees in suppl. . . . When Greece, her knees in supp. . . . When Greece. . . ." Then he paused, and the grandpa couldn't stand it any longer. He jumped up and said, "Billy, if you grease her knees one more time, I think she'll go!" [Laughter]

VASQUEZ: Why? Do we not understand or see it as

important, are we afraid of poetry?

GARRIGUS: The average person today just doesn't get the kind of poetry that makes any sense to him presented to him by editors. There's too much subjectivity and too much absence of discipline in the use of words, too much self-relatedness in what the poets are giving. We get tired of hearing about either their ecstasy or their agony in their terms.

You might ask, who memorizes modern poetry? It's just not there. And yet, as you look back through the great lines of poetry, you see that there were. For instance, take a poet of sixty-five or seventy-five years ago. Take [William Butler] Yeats when he says, "Things fall apart. The center cannot hold. The worst are filled with passionate intensity, and the best lack all conviction." What tremendously wise words they are. Can you think of a better rhetorical explanation for a terrorist than to say, "The worst are filled with passionate intensity"? Isn't that what a terrorist is?

When you saw the great lack of indecisiveness on the part of the people of Germany under

Hitler. Can you think of anything that describes them better than to say, "The best lack all conviction"? Those Germans lacked the conviction. Hitler was filled and the Nazis were filled with passionate intensity. . . . Here's a poet speaking to people in the highest terms of reality and inspiration, which should get and have gotten reaction in the past.

Or listen to a simple poet like [John Greenleaf] Whittier saying, "Of all sad words of tongue or pen, the saddest are these: It might have been." Think of how many regrets we've had over what we could have done that we didn't do, that would have given us a better result. That's where poetry is speaking.

VASQUEZ: You have read poetry before the legislature thirty-four times, both for happy and celebrative events and for sad and memorial events. Why is it that you were advised against reading a poem on the occasion of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr?

GARRIGUS: No, no. It didn't work that way at all. I read the poem before the assembly, and I read it on the invitation of Assembly Speaker Unruh, who

had wanted the poem read very much. It was enthusiastically received there. Over two thousand copies were printed and distributed in the assembly.

But there was one man in the senate that threatened to make a public scene, which at that time would have been a disgraceful thing. People were devoting themselves to a proper appreciation, in grief, of Dr. Martin Luther King. I didn't want a controversy to break out. So this man told me that if I tried to read the poem on the invitation of the senate, he would create a disturbance and would ask for a lack of unanimity on the part of the senate to support the reading of it. Rather than stir up that controversy, I backed off.

I've often wondered whether I should have or not. I'm not sure it was the right thing [to do]. But at the time, with the feeling that was present among so many sincere people, I didn't want to raise an ugly issue. That was it, and I'm not sure whether I should have or not.

VASQUEZ: Who was that senator?

GARRIGUS: That senator was John [G.] Schmitz from Orange

County. He was a racist. A very intelligent man, but completely off on the subject of righteousness.

VASQUEZ: What do you feel are your greatest accomplishments as poet laureate to date, and what are your greatest frustrations? What would you advise--and I'm sure that day will come--to whomever follows you in that honorable position?

GARRIGUS: I would simply say that the greatest obligation the poet has is to use language to give pleasure to people. To give pleasure to them in terms of deeper insights into the meaning and significance of reality. What is real about this situation? What is real about the death of this man? What is real about the return of the hostages? What does it mean for us? What is the interpretation of the heart rather than the prejudice of the intellect? Or the bias? What is truth in this situation?

Can I make the appropriate choice of words to give truth its best break, its best chance, its fairest opportunity for enlightening and inspiring other people? Or give pleasure simply on the basis of the rhythm and the cadence?

[Like the] simple lines of [William] Wordsworth after he'd gone out and looked at a field of wildflowers and enjoyed a field of wildflowers. And who doesn't? Who can't identify with that simple fact? He comes back and says:

"For oft when on my couch I lie, in vacant or in pensive mood.
They flash upon that inward eye which is the bliss of solitude.
And then my soul, with pleasure, fills and dances with the daffodils."

[Laughter] Or he says on another occasion:

"For I have learned
To look on nature, not as in the hour
Of thoughtless youth; but hearing oftentimes
The still, sad music of humanity,
Nor harsh, nor grating, though of ample power
To chasten and subdue. And I have felt
A presence that disturbs me with the joy
Of elevated thoughts; a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting suns,
And the round ocean and the living air,
And the blue sky, and in the mind of man;
A motion and a spirit, that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things."

Now that's beautiful language describing what a man gets from a close association with nature. Any Indian could identify with that, an Indian that's close to nature and reveres nature. Any member of the Sierra Club could identify with that.

But, you see, we're not writing that kind of poetry today. The greatest obligation of the poet is to give the same kind of pleasure through words that the musician gives through music, that the actor gives through acting, that the painter gives through painting, that any artist gives through his art. Pleasure is the principal meaning and justification for poetry, and if it doesn't do that, it's a failure.

VASQUEZ: What has been your greatest source of pleasure and your greatest source of frustration as the poet laureate of California?

GARRIGUS: Well, my greatest source of pleasure has been bringing poetry to the people and having them respond with appreciation and pleasure. Like, say, the night last year when I stood up before the five hundred people that were gathered in Dinuba [California] to honor the flight of the "Voyager." Miss [Jeana] Yeager and Mr. [Burt] Rutan had made that marvelous test of human endurance and spirit in that little tiny aircraft, a frail, fragile little moth, to go around the world nonstop in nine days and nights. Well, my pleasure would be an example

of the kind I've had. To get up and read that poem and have those two pilots there look at me with eyes full of pleasure and delight and take that poem and say, "Oh, that was beautiful. We liked that." And hearing the audience out there say, "Hey, you said just what we feel, and we enjoy it." It's public response. That's my greatest pleasure, giving pleasure to people with poetry.

I've never had an occasion where I've stood up before a group and read my poetry that I haven't felt that they were glad I did and that they would like to have some more.

The Frustrations of Being California's Poet Laureate

VASQUEZ: Have there been any frustrating moments?

GARRIGUS: My big frustration is that I have not been called upon enough by educational and social groups to give them that pleasure. I've not been in enough demand. There just is not the appreciation in this culture for poetry that there should be. As the state poet laureate, I should be much more in demand than I am.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

VASQUEZ: Mr. Garrigus, is there one poem in particular that you would like to have included in this oral history? Would you recite it so that we can transcribe it and include it? Title it as you see fit.

GARRIGUS: Dr. Vásquez, I'd be glad to.

Reveille for a New Day

Be still and harken to the truest voices of your memories.
Time is a fantasy, a kaleidoscope of swiftly changing days and years,
Soundtracked by laughter, as always close to tears.
The business of this world too often is a wedge that splits our best relationships.
Strutting and fretting we wear out our time,
Never quite certain just what is sublime.
Why do friends and lovers so often grow apart,
No longer vulnerable to what the other thinks,
No longer caring that the other cared?
Is it because we prostitute our feelings to money, fame, or power,
Those bitter-sweet illusions of a brief, deceitful hour?
Of course we can have money, fame, and power;
Have them, yes, but not for long to hold.
Then why not cultivate the richer ground,
For wealth in health and friends and family when we're old?
Those moments which for us are most complete
And filled with meaning for our pleasure, cannot last.
That is why our future surely needs the guidance of our past.
There always will be tears in the years that age,
A grieving for the best we had, but never could possess.
Then we drink more deeply our strong potions of regret,
And seek new cures to salve our loneliness.
We try so hard to live by bread alone,
While tracking feverishly mirages of our goals,
Carelessly unraveling the fabric of our souls,
Deaf to the Bell, insensible for whom it tolls,
Here, for a little while, we play our various games,
Make our tracks and stains, and then move on;

Too often yearning for tomorrow, weary of today,
Remembering wistfully that yesterday has gone.
If only we could live the best of what we know,
Keeping faith with the truth the past affirms,
Sustaining the vision of what ought to be,
Then we would have life on its noblest terms.
A renaissance of righteousness should be our goal,
Living these values which ensure the soul;
Humility that frees the active mind from care,
Concern that justice functions everywhere,
Faith, that life is but a portion of a Greater Plan,
Compassion that must serve another's need,
And constant vigilence to shackle greed.
Enjoying beauty's grace in nature's art
With reason governing wisely in the heart.
Through these our use of pleasure would be real,
And success no longer judged by what men have,
But by how men feel.
Thus in His Purpose then to be
Good, great, peaceful, joyous, and free!

VASQUEZ: I'm going to ask you to recite another poem, and I'll let you give the date and the occasion on which you first presented it.

GARRIGUS: This poem was read at the dedication ceremonies for the new state capitol. [May 15, 1978] It had been worked on for several years and had been restored to an artistic brilliance and fidelity which made it, I think, one of the most attractive, if not the most attractive, state capitol in the whole country. I was trying in this poem to reconcile the substance with the spirit of just what a state capitol is in government, in terms of service and dedication to principle and in terms of the structure as a symbol.

Dedication

Now history is tranfused with structural strength
That men might serve to make a better state.
Let citizens throughout its breadth and length
Rejoice that California is so great.
May all who labor here have worthy goals
To match this soaring symmetry of steel;
This vaulting dome, symbol of noble souls,
Portrays the aspirations we should feel.
The best of labor serves the human cause,
Uses with care the blessings of this earth.
Here waits the task of those who make just laws
Protecting and promoting human worth.
May reason rule emotion in this place
To shape our future with good acts of grace.