

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

STEPHEN I ZETTERBERG

California Democratic Council
Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee
Democratic Party Politics

November 29, 1990, March 7, 1993, May 9, 1993
Claremont, California

By Enid Hart Douglass
Oral History Program
Claremont Graduate School

HEALTH CARE

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the California State Archivist or the Director, Oral History Program, Claremont Graduate School.

Requests for permission to quote for publication should be addressed to:

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

or

Director, Oral History Program
Harper Hall 155
Claremont Graduate School
150 E. Tenth Street
Claremont, CA 91711-6160

The request should include identification of the specific passages and identification of the user.

It is recommended that this oral history be cited as follows:

Stephen I. Zetterberg, Oral History Interview,
Conducted 1990 and 1993, by Enid H. Douglass, Oral
History Program, Claremont Graduate School, for the
California State Archives State Government Oral History
Program.



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 (prior years)	(916) 445-2832

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.



Stephen I. Zetterberg

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii

SESSION 1, November 29, 1990

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

 Early political background--California State Democratic Party Convention of 1948--California Democratic State Central Committee--Shift to California Democratic Council (CDC)--Raising funds for CDC--CDC 1954 State Convention endorsements for lieutenant governor--Campaign of Edmund G. (Pat) Brown for attorney general--Nature of local congressional district--Gubernatorial campaign of 1958.

[Tape 1, Side B] 32

 Resource committee for Pat Brown's 1958 election--John Anson Ford campaign for secretary of state--Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles--1950s television debates--Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee meetings--Resolutions Committee of Central Committee--Nature of Republican and Democratic county committees--Helen Myers' organizational work to form clubs in Los Angeles County.

[Tape 2, Side A] 63

 Precinct work of Democratic clubs--Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee--Party endorsement of candidates--Adlai Stevenson--Beginnings of CDC--Preprimary endorsing convention (San Mateo Plan)--George Miller, Jr. and CDC--Dime A Day for Democracy--Alan Cranston as first CDC president.

[Tape 2, Side B] 91

Joseph Wyatt succeeds Cranston as CDC president--
Thomas Carvey and CDC--CDC vis-a-vis state Democratic
Party--Jesse Unruh and CDC--Senator Clair Engle--Simon
Casady and CDC--1968 Lake Arrowhead conference--Impact
of abolition of cross-filing--Airing issues.

SESSION 2, March 7, 1993

[Tape 3, Side A] 109

Review of Pat Brown's advisory committee for 1958
gubernatorial campaign--Zetterberg's position paper
on medical care--Committee's mode of operation--
Governor's 1959 small committee to study medical
care--Committee's composition, mode of operation,
and report--Zetterberg's lack of interest in
judgeship or administrative position--Lester
Breslow's role on Governor's study committee--Roger
Egeberg asked to chair successor Governor's
Committee on Medical Aid and Health.

[Tape 3, Side B] 143

Members of Governor's Committee on Medical Aid and
Health (1960)--Representation of California Medical
Association--Task Forces of Committee--Task Force on
Financing--Implications for federal health care
programs--Chair of Rehabilitation Subcommittee--Casa
Colina rehabilitation hospital--Impact of Hill-
Burton funds--Rehabilitation Committee's report--
Final report of Governor's Committee and its impact.

[Tape 4, Side A] 172

Significance of Governor's Committee report--CDC
Health Care Issue meeting--1966 lawsuit to enforce
State Department of Health study of smog--1961 CDC
Issues Conference--Mechanics of issues conferences--
Health Care committee--Issue Study paper--Nature of
discussion sessions--Helen Myers and group dynamics
--Report on health care issue--Relevancy to Hillary
Clinton's task force on health care.

SESSION 3, May 5, 1993

[Tape 5, Side A] 201

Charge to Governor's Committee--Dissenting opinions in committee report--Appointment of California Board of Health--Oversight of Department of Public Health --Water quality questions--Members of Board of Health.

[Tape 5, Side B] 231

Members of Board of Health continued--Department technical staff--Expanded concept of public health--Reagan's speech in early sixties--Service on CDC board of directors--Role of CDC issues program--Interpretation of stands on issues to form consensus--Additional comments on 1968 CDC Arrowhead Conference with state legislators--Participatory discussion of issues by local clubs--1954 election of chairman of Democratic State Central Committee

[Tape 6, Side A] 261

Congressman Chet Holifield and CDC--CDC and legislators--CDC presidents Carvey, Casady, and Hill--Spin-off from CDC to grass-roots activity--Status of national health policy today and comparison to work of Governor's Committee and CDC issues report (1961)--Sustained interest in health care.

APPENDIX 280

- A. Introduction to Health Care for California, Report of the Governor's Committee on Medical Aid and Health, December 1960.
- B. "Proposed Draft Statement on Medical Care," 1961 California Democratic Council Issues Conference.
- C. Exhibit J, California Democratic Council Issues Committee Report, estimated date of August 1961.

INDEX OF NAMES 286

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer/Editor

Enid Hart Douglass
Director, Oral History Program and Lecturer in
History
Claremont Graduate School
B.A., Pomona College [Government]
M.A., Claremont Graduate School [Government]

Interview Time and Place

November 29, 1990
Mr. Zetterberg's home in Claremont, California
Morning Session of 3 hours

March 7, 1993
Mr. Zetterberg's home in Claremont, California
Morning Session of 2 1/2 hours

May 9, 1993
Mr. Zetterberg's home in Claremont, California
Morning Session of 2 1/4 hours

Editing

The interviewer/editor checked the verbatim manuscript of the interviews against the original tape recordings and verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed.

On various dates, the edited transcripts were forwarded to Stephen I. Zetterberg, who made only minor emendations. He returned the approved manuscripts in 1990 and 1993.

The interviewer/editor prepared the introductory materials.

Papers

Stephen I. Zetterberg holds several boxes of private papers relating to his political activities.

Tapes and Interview Records

The original tape recordings of the interview are in the Oral History Program Office, Claremont Graduate School, along with the records relating to the interview. Master tapes are deposited in the California State Archives.

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Stephen I. Zetterberg was born in Galesburg, Illinois on August 2, 1916. His family moved to Claremont, California when he was in high school. He graduated from Claremont High School and earned a bachelor's degree in Government at Pomona College in 1938. He was awarded a fellowship for 1938-39 with the National Institute of Public Affairs in Washington, D.C. He married Connie Lyon December 26, 1940. They are the parents of four children. In 1942, he received his law degree from Yale Law School. He served with the Coast Guard during World War II.

In 1945, Mr. Zetterberg served as administrative assistant to Senator Scott Lucas. In 1946, he returned to California to study for the bar. That year he worked for Congressman Jerry Voorhis in his losing campaign against Richard M. Nixon. In 1947, he became a member of the law firm of Carter, Young and Zetterberg in Pomona, California. He later formed his own law firm, now Zetterberg and King.

In 1948, Mr. Zetterberg was the Democratic candidate who ran against Congressman Nixon.* Because of cross-filing he was defeated in the primary. He ran again in 1950 but was defeated in the general election by Patrick J. Hillings. From 1948 to 1954 he served as a member of the Democratic State Central Committee, including service on the executive committee. He is still a member of the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee, on which he has served since 1948

Stephen Zetterberg was active in Edmund G. Brown's successful campaign for governor of California in 1958. He was a member of an advisory committee for the campaign. In 1959, Governor Brown appointed him to the State Board of Health, and he served as a member until 1966. Governor Brown also appointed him to head a seven-member panel to plan a study of the health needs of California and then to serve on the Governor's Committee on Medical Aid and Health, which executed the study.

Mr. Zetterberg actively participated in the formation of the California Democratic Council [CDC] in the early 1950s and the ensuing work of CDC. He served on the CDC board of directors as representative of the Twenty-fifth and

* See: Stephen I. Zetterberg, "Congressional Campaign of 1948," typed transcript of tape-recorded interview conducted by Enid H. Douglass, Claremont Graduate School Oral History Program (Claremont, California, 1946).

Twenty-fourth Congressional Districts. He focused his energies on the CDC issues conferences which began in 1959. In 1961, he chaired the Issue Committee on Medical Care. The recommendations of this issue meeting were a further refinement of the previous work on health care he had participated in.

Mr. Zetterberg practices law in Claremont, California. He is still active politically and is following with great interest the current national debate on health care.

[Session 1, November 29, 1990]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

DOUGLASS: In prior interviews with you we have covered your background. But to set the stage for this interview it ought to be made clear that you are a Pomona College graduate in the field of government and eventually received a Yale Law School degree. In the interim you were on the staff of [Senator] Scott Lucas as an NIPA [National Institute of Public Administration] intern from 1938-39. Then after World War II, during which you served in the United States Coast Guard, you served as an administrative assistant to Lucas from 1945 to '46.

You came back to Claremont, California, the town where you had grown up, to take the bar and join a law firm. As I understand, you did immediately become involved in [Congressman H. Jeremiah] Jerry Voorhis'

reelection campaign in '46, in which he was defeated by Richard [M.] Nixon.

Unless there is any inaccuracy in that overview, I thought we would start with 1948, which is when you first personally became active in that you were a candidate for the Congress for the seat that Voorhis had occupied and that Nixon now held. Is that correct that this was your first active political involvement as a candidate?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That is correct.

DOUGLASS: You were defeated by Nixon in the primary through the cross-filing process in '48. Then you were elected Democratic nominee in the '50 primary, but you were defeated by Patrick [J.] Hillings, a Nixon protégé, in the November election.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I was less pure in '50. In '48, I only ran on the Democratic ticket. I didn't take "advantage" of cross-filing. In '50, I did cross-file on both tickets in the primary, but I indicated I was a Democrat. Actually, I came out third out of five primary candidates on the Republican primary ballot in 1950.

DOUGLASS: It was on the basis of principle that you did not cross-file in '48, as I recall.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: You have mentioned that in 1948 you were involved in what might be considered the beginning of the notion of issues being discussed outside of the capitol, that is, by citizens.

ZETTERBERG: That is true. Except you say "outside of the capitol." [Laughter] Literally, we were in the capitol.

DOUGLASS: Yes. My question was based on a meaning of the people who are elected to state offices, whether legislative or executive.

ZETTERBERG: Should I give you a short background on that?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

ZETTERBERG: After an election there is a meeting of the state convention of both parties in Sacramento and then after the conventions there is a meeting of the state committee. The convention consists of the candidates and nominees. I was not a nominee in '48, but I was selected to fill the place of a nominee because of my run against Nixon.

So I was there ahead of the state committee meeting as part of the convention. The main duty of the convention is to make a platform. I recall that--I don't know how it came about--there was Dyke Brown, who was, later on, the attorney who drew up the Ford Foundation (actually planned, as a lawyer, its incorporation). He was a Yale Law School graduate who was a few years ahead of me, and he had run for congress and been defeated, up in the Berkeley area. Then there was Erma Roth, who ran in one of our local assembly districts, and Jean Charles D'Olive, assembly candidate from our west district, who was a Dartmouth [College] graduate and who later was editor of the Glendora Press. Then he went on a [George C.] Marshall Plan assignment in Europe.

We cornered something like four typewriters and were in a part of the rotunda. There was no door, I remember, just a little alcove. We sat there with the typewriters and paper and we knew the Platform Committee was meeting in a room just down the hall. The Platform Committee was chaired by a very

intelligent and interesting person,
[Assemblyman] George [C.] Miller, Jr.

We decided who would type up the platform on which subject. As I recall, Dyke Brown took foreign policy, and then we took various topics. We would type them out, cut the paper, and then we would slip them under the door where George Miller and various legislators were drawing up their platform for us, the Democrats. [Laughter] We didn't hear anything. It was like dropping a pebble down a well but nothing splashes. Finally, after we had been sending several slips under the door, a message came out, "Will the drafting committee please hurry up. We are getting ahead of you." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: So they were listening to you.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. They were hearing. Because George Miller was a person of various broad views he was willing to accept all this stuff that was coming in from these four amateurs.

DOUGLASS: As far as you know, this sort of thing had not happened before?

ZETTERBERG: No. That was the reason, I guess, the door was locked. They wanted a closed session.

- DOUGLASS: And basically the Platform Committee was controlled by the elected officials.
- ZETTERBERG: By the legislators, actually.
- DOUGLASS: What I meant is not just by people who were candidates to the convention, but the elected segment.
- ZETTERBERG: That's true. We got our first dose of the difference between the legislators and the hoi polloi when we went in to take our seats in the assembly chamber to have the meeting of the state convention. I remember I just picked any old chair and table up in front, and some person came up to me and said, "Sorry, but this is my seat." The legislators came in, and they kicked us [out]. We were just supposed to sit in seats like we were going to church and picking any pew. But they came in and kicked us out. We were sort of second-class citizens. But you can understand that. They were familiar.
- DOUGLASS: Where did you get this idea of writing topical statements for the platform? How did you happen to do it?
- ZETTERBERG: I really can't remember. I remember that we were sort of. . . . We weren't spoofing, but

we sort of thought it might be a good idea because we were members of the state convention, and we were supposed to get a platform. There didn't seem to be any formal meeting of the convention people, aside from the legislators themselves.

DOUGLASS: Did you have a particular subject you were writing on? Or was it scattergun?

ZETTERBERG: It was scattergun. These were all Dyke Brown and Erma Roth, who was a candidate for the assembly who was defeated, and Chuck D'Olive. They were all very bright people. We just decided to sit down. I think we would sort of cross-review the paragraphs as they came out.

DOUGLASS: How much of what you did actually got into the platform?

ZETTERBERG: I think it pretty much followed the stuff we sent in. I don't know. It is like decorating a Christmas tree. I don't know exactly where they hung these paragraphs. It was kind of fun. It was sort of the raising of the idea of the importance of program and of issues.

DOUGLASS: And of having them discussed widely and not just within the inner sanctum?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. You see, the Democratic legislators were very much in the minority at that time.

DOUGLASS: You had some figures here. It was a heavily Republican-controlled senate and assembly in the later forties, early fifties.

ZETTERBERG: In 1952, there were twenty-six Democratic assemblymen and fifty-four Republicans. Then eighteen years later it sort of reversed, which we will get into later, I take it.

DOUGLASS: Yes. After 1958.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Tell me. Was the fact that you weren't the official candidate--that you didn't make it past the primary because of cross-filing--mean that you weren't officially a member of the Democratic State Central Committee?

ZETTERBERG: I was a member. You see, in those days approximately 80 percent of the candidates for congress and the state legislature were elected in the primary. Because of cross-filing there was no contest in the fall ballot. So the system had worked out that the state convention would fill vacancies. Then once your vacancy was filled, you had the

right to appoint three members to the state committee.

DOUGLASS: So they filled you in, and you could appoint three more.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So you had equivalent status as the top-running Democrat in that primary?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And that was true in the other districts throughout the state.

DOUGLASS: Let's talk about your service on the State Central Committee. I have that you were on it from 1948 to '54. Of course, you ran in '50, so that would put you on the State Central Committee. The other years you must have been appointed by people who were candidates?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I can't remember now.

DOUGLASS: You were on in 1958 again. Those are the dates I have, and there may be other terms.

Let's talk a bit about how the State Central Committee functioned during the period from 1948 to 1954. It was a large body.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. If you took all the members of the convention and multiplied it by four, it does become a large body.

DOUGLASS: So the State Central Committee includes the membership of the convention, or is it the other way around?

ZETTERBERG: Well, the convention only lasts for one day. And then each convention member becomes one of four members from their respective assembly or congressional district on the State Central Committee. So the committee is four times as large. The only thing is that you had to have equal division on sexes. If I were appointing, I had to appoint only one man and two women to the state committee. You see, the state committee--it's kind of foggy in my mind, largely because of CDC [California Democratic Council]--the ball shifted to the CDC about this time.

DOUGLASS: And there is crossover. Some of the same people involved in both.

ZETTERBERG: There is crossover. But, as you talk, I do remember James Roosevelt. I remember being in an Oakland hotel where James Roosevelt was, I think, the chairman of the state committee. I had been appointed counsel--I was pretty innocent at that time, maybe I still am--because there were some disputes on procedure.

They had put me on to argue the dispute because here on the phone was somebody over in San Francisco. But the CDC had so much of the center of gravity in these days that the state committee was, in my mind, a little foggy for this period.

DOUGLASS: It seems like such an unwieldy body. Was the state committee an effective organization?

ZETTERBERG: No. Well, it did its job, but I guess you would have to resurrect Hiram Johnson to figure out what the job was. The county committee was--and still is--elected from local districts. The state committee is primarily appointed, and so you have these two different forces. The county committees were dispersed. Since they were centered in the counties, their power was very limited but very local and very down-to-earth. The state committee, with its ex officio members, was, of course, the establishment.

DOUGLASS: And then later there was an executive committee of the State Central Committee that really held the power. As I understand it, they made the decisions.

ZETTERBERG: That's correct. They would have made the decisions.

DOUGLASS: So your interest really gravitated to CDC? That is where your energies and interest lay?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. With the other Democrats throughout the state, the same thing was true. There were all these sort of shotgun marriages between the state committee and the CDC all along, but during the fight on cross-filing and getting people elected, the center of democracy in California did shift away from the statutory state committee to the CDC.

DOUGLASS: The nonstatutory organization.

ZETTERBERG: The nitty-gritty power of the state committee and also the county committee and the national committeemen came from the fund-raising function. You could not raise money for the Democratic party without being authorized by either the county committee, the state committee, or the national committee.

I remember during the days of Dollars for Democrats, we were scratching our head. Which of these three groups could we get to allow their names to be put on the little tickets we had to show that we could represent the party.

And we, of course, wanted it statewide, which would be either the national committee or the state committee. So the state committee had a real power over the CDC, or with the CDC. It always worked out. Publicly it was always fine. I remember trying to figure whether we had a backup with Paul Ziffren, who was the national committeeman. We felt if the state committee turned us down we could always rely on Paul Ziffren to allow his name to be used, the national committeeman for the national committee.

DOUGLASS: What body did you use? Did you use Dollars for Democrats? You had to have an authorizing name to raise money, is that correct? Or to authorize you to speak on behalf of the party?

ZETTERBERG: Let's separate that. The main thing was the raising of money.

DOUGLASS: What vehicle did you succeed in using?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, from time to time it was different, but I think basically it was the state committee.

DOUGLASS: It would vary. But if the state committee gave you its blessing, then you could function?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I seem to recall having--we really did go door-to-door raising money--a little card showing that you were really representing the Democratic party. We had the signature of some state Democratic official or the national committeeperson on all those cards.

DOUGLASS: So if you hadn't gotten the state committee to go along with you, then Ziffren, as the national committeeman, was your answer?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: Let's pick up on the whole CDC story shortly. Before we get into talking about the [Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] campaign, I did want to get the story from you, the anecdote you mentioned to me, about when Richard Graves was going to be the Democratic candidate for the governorship in 1954.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. There was a state convention of the CDC, probably in January or February of '54, that was in Sacramento or Fresno in one of those big halls. There were about 3,000 people who usually attended this kind of a CDC convention. People coming up from the various clubs and through the various chartered organizations. There was this official

umbilical cord of CDC at the grass-roots level. You had to be from a chartered club to be able to come to a convention. Locally, the chartering was done by the county committee.

DOUGLASS: People were appearing there for endorsement by CDC?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I mentioned, if you recall, the method of the Democrats at that time in fighting cross-filing was to endorse people in the primary. That had never really been done legally. So this convention was going to endorse a complete slate and see if for one time we could get a complete slate on the general election ballot for statewide office. Actually, we did. It was the first time in years of cross-filing. That was because of the endorsement process at this convention.

Richard Graves was endorsed by the convention. He had been a Republican and had been in, I believe, public administration.¹ He was a very distinguished nonpolitical kind of candidate. He was endorsed for governor in '54.

1. Richard Graves served as Director of the League of California Cities.

The next office to be filled was lieutenant governor, and at that point--I don't know how I got into it--I was going to be nominated for lieutenant governor. He had met with me privately and indicated that he would like to have me as his running mate. Also, there was talk about [Edward R.] Ed Roybal, who was, I think, a city councilman in Los Angeles then, running for lieutenant governor. Roybal and I were good friends. He had been on our Democratic Luncheon Club board. When I was president of the Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles in '52, he was one of three vice presidents. We were good friends.

We were in back of the stage going out on the platform to accept the nomination, and he told me that he was going to be nominated but he was going to turn it down in favor of me. We were sort of David and Jonathan, you know, good friends, and so we sort of shook hands on that. Alphabetically, of course, he went in first. He got out there and there was this big roar of approval for him because there were, and always had been, a very exciting

group of Latinos in Democratic politics in California. He got a rousing hand. So when he opened his mouth, instead of turning it down in favor of me, he accepted. [Laughter]

So I went out--we each had said we wouldn't run against the other--and I had about thirty seconds and then I went on. Then I declined to run against him and asked my supporters to support him.

So he was then the officially endorsed candidate by CDC for lieutenant governor. I felt badly about that because, really, who particularly wants to be lieutenant governor, but, on the other hand, there were a lot of people campaigning very hard for me, and I felt that I had let them down. I have still felt that I probably should not have done that. But I felt I had a pledge that we would step aside. We are still friends and correspond occasionally.

DOUGLASS: As I recall, too, there had been quite a bit of infighting between Laurence Cross, who was mayor of Berkeley and one of the contenders for the governorship, and Graves. I think some of that went on behind the scenes also.

ZETTERBERG: Cross was very well-liked. Both of these people were very interesting people and had very interesting intellects. So we really couldn't lose. But Graves, because of his experience--I can't remember exactly what it was, but it was a public service experience outside of a city--was chosen.

DOUGLASS: This was seen as a year for Democratic opportunity, I believe, because the perennial winner, Governor Earl Warren, had gone to the Supreme Court, and Lieutenant Governor Goodwin [J.] Knight, who had succeeded him for two years, was running for the first time. Do you recall that there was quite a bit of optimism in the party?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Optimism and a lot of enthusiasm.

DOUGLASS: Let's go back now and talk about your involvement with Pat Brown. When was the first time you met Pat Brown?

ZETTERBERG: I can't remember a specific instance. I do remember when he was campaigning in 1950 for attorney general, he came to this district, and we had a breakfast for him at the Claremont Inn. We were sort of out in the boondocks here.

And you'll see, if we get into it, oftentimes candidates from Los Angeles would have someone out here who would attend and speak at various places, like out in the Mojave Desert. Literally, I have done that on behalf of the candidate. They didn't want to go that far.

But Brown made the rounds, and he came to this district. And I do remember--actually, I funded that breakfast--we invited all of the attorneys in this general area to come. It was well attended. It was in the dining hall of the Claremont Inn. But I must have known him before because it was by a personal invitation that we set this up for him. That is my first recollection.

Actually, I have seen the election returns. We ran, I thought, pretty well. We ran very close in our election in the general election in 1950. But he told me a year later, "You don't get many Democratic votes out in your district." Yet I thought we had raised the level of his vote. He didn't carry the district, but he came very close.

- DOUGLASS: When you say district, you mean the congressional district.
- ZETTERBERG: Our congressional district. It was pretty much Republican at that time.
- DOUGLASS: Which was certainly true and always sort of the amazing part of Voorhis' ability to win for so many years.
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. That is probably partly because of his New Deal heritage and because of his representation of the farmers of the area.
- DOUGLASS: By this time, 1950, you had really become pretty involved and committed to Democratic party activities in the state?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. That's true. I spent a lot of time. I showed you this morning before we started these great numbers of files I have. I guess it is because in a law office you always keep files. I have all these files going back to '48 and on. It is kind of interesting to look through all the correspondence and things of that sort.
- DOUGLASS: Again, in '54, you were involved with Pat Brown when he ran for reelection for the attorney generalship. I believe you were the Pomona Valley chairman for his campaign.

ZETTERBERG: That could be.

DOUGLASS: I guess again it was attorneys because you hosted a press breakfast and you chaired the attorneys' committee for Brown. Does that sound right?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: What kinds of activities did you conduct in that regard? Let's say personal contacts with Brown.

ZETTERBERG: Well, our feeling was at that time that the best way we could help a statewide candidate like Brown was to give him exposure with our local congressional and assembly district candidates.

DOUGLASS: Now he was looked on as a winner, I suppose, at this point. He had run successfully the first time, and this was a reelection campaign. In other words, his coattails would be helpful?

ZETTERBERG: We have always felt it was the other way around. We felt that this was a Republican district and if we could get votes for the candidate, then we would be helping the candidate. And, in fact, that was always the part of the reason that we got good candidates

running in a hopeless district. In 1952, we had Woodrow Wilson Sayre, Woodrow Wilson's grandson. That was the time we had to have a recount. He had lost by thirty votes in the primary to Hillings, then we had a recount by a congressional committee, and he won by thirty-three votes. I remember sitting in the downtown registrar of voter's office looking at these long ballots and counting them. [Richard] Dick Richards and I and Winston Fisk, who was an attorney who was on the faculty here. We sort of took turns spelling each other in that case. It was a case.

DOUGLASS: But you say he did win by thirty-three votes.

ZETTERBERG: Yes, in the primary. Maybe I will just throw in a kind of interesting thing here. We filed an action in the state courts, and we were thrown out because it was a congressional election and the Congress can determine qualifications and elections of its members. So then we filed a petition in congress for a recount here. And congress, apparently I think because it was Woodrow Wilson's grandson, did grant our petition, and they

sent out a congressman from Louisiana and the staff.

And they held a recount in the office of the registrar of voters. Then after the recount came out in favor of Woodrow Wilson Sayre, the registrar of voters declined to put him on the ballot, saying "We aren't under the jurisdiction of congress, we are just printing the ballot here and there is no reason why we should put his name on." So then we filed an action against him to force him to put it on the ballot. I remember the judge that heard that was Judge [James G.] Whyte, who lived in Claremont. And I remember when I was in Bridges Auditorium for a concert as he went down to his seat he handed me his decision. This was four days before the ballot went to press. So we got him on the ballot. He lost, but there, you see, I think his being on the ballot and his name was very well-known, I think that helped the whole ticket.

In 1954, I think, we had John Sobieski, who was an attorney and later became corporation commissioner of California. He was from San Marino, and he was a very

saleable candidate. His family had come from Pomona, initially.

DOUGLASS: So was the theory that even though these were Republican districts, the stature of the local candidate was such that it would pull all the Democrats maybe and some of the Republicans possibly to the state ticket?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. I think really that may have been true in the fifties. Witness the fact that I did get a substantial number of votes on the Republican side. This tradition has still held true.

DOUGLASS: So even though it is obviously a no-win run, it is worth it to get a good name out there on a congressional or assembly seat?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Just to name a few, we have had Robert [L.] Stafford, who is a very well-known attorney here. We have had Claire [K.] McDonald, who is the wife of a professor at Pomona College. We had most recently a Scripps College staff person [Georgia H. Webb] running for congress. It has been a kind of tradition in this district.

During the days of Dollars for Democrats, this congressional district--I

believe the figures will show--traditionally led in fund raising. Our Claremont Democratic Club would raise more funds than many congressional districts throughout the state.

DOUGLASS: When did Dollars for Democrats start?

ZETTERBERG: I can't remember.

DOUGLASS: Was it in place when you arrived

ZETTERBERG: No. When I arrived on the scene, CDC wasn't in place.

DOUGLASS: Was Dollars for Democrats a CDC vehicle?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I thought it preceded you.

ZETTERBERG: If it did, it was only in ghostly form because we put life into it.

DOUGLASS: Anything else about Pat Brown before his '58 gubernatorial run? Did you see more of him during those years leading up to '58? Did you increasingly get to know him?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I am sure I did because I was involved in either CDC or the state committee, and he always showed up at the CDC conventions and always participated, and also the state committee. He was a very prominent figure, and I feel like I have known him pretty much all of my political life.

DOUGLASS: Were you from the beginning persuaded he was a winner, the kind of person who was very electable?

ZETTERBERG: Well, you know, I am sort of naive and innocent. Mostly, I was interested in getting somebody who would be a good governor. I thought that he would make a good governor.

DOUGLASS: His personality was secondary?

ZETTERBERG: The winner part, you always wanted someone who would win, but, at the same time, I always thought that he would be a good governor. He was sort of ebullient. He helped in our local campaigns. He would give us pictures and endorsements. He even did that in this most recent 1990 primary campaign for our candidate. He wrote a postcard for her.

DOUGLASS: Yes, I saw that. But he helped when he was attorney general, and he helped when he was governor. He was an active Democratic politician?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. He was active. Of course, if he thought we were a little radical, he would send us a picture for campaign use with a sign in the background that said "Commonwealth Club." [Laughter] I remember one of our

political brochures. I forget whether it was for mine or for Evelyn Johnson, candidate in the Fiftieth [Assembly District]. He gave us a great picture, but it was taken with the Commonwealth Club sign in the background.

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: That was a little message?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I think that was a message.

DOUGLASS: In 1958, you did become involved in his campaign and you were a member of an advisory committee he had, which was, as I understand it, composed mainly of teachers and lawyers.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How did you happen to be involved in the advisory committee?

ZETTERBERG: Macklin Fleming, now a retired Court of Appeal justice, was an attorney in Los Angeles. And he was asked to be "convener," which is different from chairman, of a committee. He approached me and asked me if I would chair a committee of three to draft a sample statement for a campaign.

We had attorney [Lester] Les Ziffren, and there was a very able young woman. At this moment I can't think of her name. I can

picture her. So we did a paper on mental health, and, actually, I did the drafting and then sent it out and they reviewed. It was basically in three parts. Number 1, in big letters so you didn't have to put your glasses on to read it, was a position statement that you could use in a campaign. Number 2 was several pages of position paper backing up what was on the front page. Then, thirdly, was a draft of a proposed statute or bill. So it came in a package that way. I think eventually [Assemblyman Nicholas C.] Nick Petris--he was not on this committee --as a legislator was working on this.

DOUGLASS: Why was mental health selected as an issue?

ZETTERBERG: I have no idea. Well, maybe I have an idea why I was selected. I had at first worked in the NIPA, National Institute of Public Affairs, in an internship in what was then the Social Security Board in Washington, D.C., and I suspect they felt that I had a little background in that. Actually, as it turned out, that was generally the field that I was in on this advisory committee. This was then circulated and duplicated to members of the

advisory committee as a sample of what kind of form that they would use.

DOUGLASS: So this was a prototype position paper for the campaign?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How big was the whole advisory committee?

ZETTERBERG: I remember we met several times in the Sheraton Townhouse out on Wilshire Boulevard. We would sit around the table in this room. Looking back, I think there were probably fifteen to twenty. Each one had a separate topic to work on.

DOUGLASS: Say you divided these by three, you would have about five topics that were being covered in position papers?

ZETTERBERG: Each person would have a topic. [Joseph L.] Wyatt [Jr.] in his review of the first eight years of the California Democratic Council said (and I am quoting from a thing that he wrote in this "California Democratic Council: The First Eight Years"):

The Democratic legislature followed the program laid out by the governor and broke the long stalemate on water supply for the whole state, enacted a Fair Employment Practices law, buried the corpse of cross-filing, expanded aid to schools, the aged and disabled, started the work on such metropolitan area

problems as smog, rapid transit, urban renewal, and voted new taxes and economics to solve the state's financial crisis, an inheritance left by years of the Republican rule. For the first time in years, no repressive legislation was passed.

And, basically, his summary of Brown's accomplishment in the first Brown governorship reflects the different things that this advisory committee produced. The last meeting of the advisory group was not really a meeting of the committee. It was trips to Palm Springs on about a two-day basis. Pat Brown-- someone had loaned him a home there--sat there, and we appeared and gave him about a half-an-hour summary for his campaign of the different position papers.

DOUGLASS: Would this have been in the late summer of '58? How close to the election date was it?

ZETTERBERG: That's probably about when it was. I remember it was fairly warm out there. I had resource people. I had a professor of sociology from USC [University of Southern California] and a professor from UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles] who were really helping me on this. When I say this, I am talking about social security, not mental health. That was just a specific sample.

DOUGLASS: Oh, you did others. You had set up a prototype really through that exercise?

ZETTERBERG: A prototype and then I went on in the field of social security.

DOUGLASS: The aged and the disabled?

ZETTERBERG: Right. We weren't just flying blindly. These were both very able and interested professors in this field, as I say, one from UCLA and one from USC. We had met several times and worked over a program for that.

DOUGLASS: Let me make the distinction between these two exercises clear. Were you knowingly then asked to do this first exercise, which had a focal point of mental health? That is, you four, you chairing, were asked to do a position paper which would be the prototype for others and be the format used for them?

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

ZETTERBERG: When Macklin Fleming contacted me, I think he left the subject matter up to me and to the other two members of the committee. And I think we just chose this out of the blue.

DOUGLASS: Did you use resource people on that?

ZETTERBERG: No. Except I am pretty sure we did have some contacts with the office of Nick Petris and he was a resource person. That was not a contact of very great depth.

DOUGLASS: You determined this would be what would be most usable both by the governor and the campaign? The one-pager, the fleshing out of the details, and then the third part of proposed legislation?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And I believe that the papers that came out of the committee followed that same kind of format. A short thing that could be used; a backup thing. All of us went into greater depth in the field. I remember a lot of discussion on taxes. What kind of things you could have taxes on. Whether it is a regressive tax, its effect on social problems. We would, as a group, discuss this subject.

DOUGLASS: So while you might have been working on social security-related questions, you would be in a meeting where all these would be discussed?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And the person that had the particular topic assigned to him or her would take the leadership role in that discussion.

DOUGLASS: Was there a lot of argument and disagreement, good lively discussion, in those meetings?

ZETTERBERG: No. It was mostly like a fact-finding thing. [It was] what is the situation, for example, on taxes on beer cans and things of that sort? What about taxes on cigarettes?

DOUGLASS: So there wasn't a disagreement of philosophy, probably. It was just getting the most accurate facts on the table?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That's right. I mean the general philosophy is shown in this quote from Joe Wyatt. I think we were all together.

DOUGLASS: There wasn't a division within the group particularly about the direction you were going in?

ZETTERBERG: No, no division.

DOUGLASS: How much input did Brown have in this?

ZETTERBERG: He was there. He was listening very carefully. He had called these meetings, and

he was really absorbing this. In fact, you would feel he was absorbing it as if he were a blotter. He had a background as a prosecuting attorney, and this was a broader background that he was interested in having.

DOUGLASS: Did he have some particular person in charge of this from his staff? Or was it simply the convener who was in charge?

ZETTERBERG: It was not Macklin Fleming at that point. Macklin Fleming, he was on that committee. I don't remember what topic he had. I am sure there was someone on his staff. It might have been [Frederick] Fred Dutton.

DOUGLASS: Someone who took the responsibility to see that the meetings were called?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And followed up.

DOUGLASS: Was there any staff per se assigned to you?

ZETTERBERG: No. You did your own.

DOUGLASS: It was volunteer.

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: How much time did you spend on this? Was it a month, six weeks?

ZETTERBERG: It must have covered a period of a couple of months at least.

- DOUGLASS: So right after the primary, you probably swung into action?
- ZETTERBERG: I think that is correct. I could check that with Joe Wyatt. He will remember. I think he was in the field of taxation.
- DOUGLASS: Were you in more than this social security oriented field?
- ZETTERBERG: No. We didn't cross-work the thing. Just one person on each.
- DOUGLASS: You did the total amount of work invested in mental health?
- ZETTERBERG: I don't recall anything else on mental health as such. They were dealing with broader topics. That would have probably merged into the social security.
- DOUGLASS: That must have been a very interesting experience.
- ZETTERBERG: That was interesting, but what was really interesting to me was that Pat Brown wanted to do something for California, and he wanted to get some ideas from a lot of different sources. It wasn't just the lawyers. Most of the people on this committee were lawyers, but some of them were college professors. He wanted to do it in depth, something pretty

solid to go on. I thought that was pretty creative on his part.

DOUGLASS: To your knowledge, had this technique been used by other candidates before Brown?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, I am not familiar with that. I am sure it has on a national basis.

DOUGLASS: It certainly has been used since. But whether it was used at the level of the state governorship in California, I don't know.

ZETTERBERG: Just as a side issue, I know that when I worked for the senator in Washington, this is sort of the kind of thing I did for him. And one of my classmates from the law school also did a similar thing for Senator [Robert] Taft. We were just across the hall from each other. And then we had the backup of the Library of Congress.

DOUGLASS: But in those instances were they pre-election exercises or were they ongoing?

ZETTERBERG: Those were ongoing. You really had a lot of intellectual resources available to you from the Library of Congress. They had an office that just did that. And then, also, the legislative counsel's office of the [U.S.] Senate, too, did the same thing. That would

be ongoing, and they would be furnishing senators. Actually, I was offered a job on that when I finished work. But I came out here instead.

DOUGLASS: This was when you were Scott Lucas' administrative assistant?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then you were also a member of and a speaker for the Brown-for-Governor speaker's bureau?

ZETTERBERG: Probably.

DOUGLASS: Which meant doing what?

ZETTERBERG: On the campaign for Brown or for Senator [Clair] Engle, and, as a matter fact, for [Edmund G.] Jerry Brown [Jr.] also when he was running for governor, they always wanted someone out here outside of the central Los Angeles area that they could call upon to make a speech and a presentation. I would usually just volunteer my services. And I wasn't the only one. There were others out here who would do the same.

And then I do recall. I can't recall specific instances, but I recall getting others to go and appear at meetings for

different candidates. And Brown was one of them.

DOUGLASS: In '58, you were pretty active across the boards. You spoke for Engle for senator and [Stanley] Mosk for attorney general. Doing the same sort of thing.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I was on Mosk's first campaign. I remember meeting over in a house in the Wilshire [Boulevard] district in Los Angeles-- it probably was his house--planning his campaign.

DOUGLASS: He was trying to fill the office that Pat Brown would be vacating. Do you have any particular recollections of the Mosk campaign?

ZETTERBERG: [Laughter] Funny thing. I remember he had a bumper strip that had a configuration MOSK, but the configuration was like an Arab mosque. I remember [] Jerry Pacht, who was an attorney and later a judge, standing up in the meeting and telling Mosk that he would get all of the Arab vote. That's kind of funny.

DOUGLASS: It was funnier then than it is today.

ZETTERBERG: True.

DOUGLASS: Why don't we just cover the campaign of John Anson Ford. You chaired his campaign for secretary of state in the primary.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I've got a file here on that campaign.

DOUGLASS: How did you happen to chair that?

ZETTERBERG: Well, my then late partner, Alan Carter, had been a great friend of John Anson Ford, and through him I became a good friend of his. He would come out as supervisor for Los Angeles County for some twenty-five or twenty-six years. He would always come out to the [Los Angeles County] Fair. He would always invite me to come with him to the fair, and we watched the horse races. He would bet on one race and send me over to get the ticket.

He, I am sure, was the one who got me tangled up with this Los Angeles luncheon club [Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles] because he was on the board of directors there. He was very active in that. So we got to be good friends. At that point, he was like seventy-six years old. So I was very happy to work on the campaign.

I see a lot of work in here, but, as you know, we lost. This was at the CDC endorsing

convention. We lost the endorsement. We were one of the last offices to vote for in the convention, and they voted a very able Harvard [University] law graduate who had a Latino name.

DOUGLASS: Who was that?

ZETTERBERG: [Henry] Hank Lopez. The last I heard of him he was practising law in Mexico City.

DOUGLASS: I assume, without checking, that Frank Jordan won.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I remember Don Bradley, I said, "Too bad we didn't get him. We would have a person running who could have run better." And Bradley says, "Yes, we would have a secretary of state," because John Anson Ford was very popular. So I argue with myself that I let him down. I can't think how I let him down. We didn't have any money, but we had a lot of people working on the floor for him. I guess we just lost for the fact that they wanted to have a person with a Latino name on the ticket.

DOUGLASS: Was there a disadvantage in being last? Did people drift away?

ZETTERBERG: I'll tell something about that in a moment. But I think at this point they were still there, but we were last and there wasn't any other Latino on the ballot.

I remember [Winthrop] Win Johnson (later a judge) and I sitting in a convention. When the time came to vote, we were talking with each other, "Do we each vote once or do we vote the whole seventeen or eighteen votes that we represent?" [Laughter] I don't remember what we did. Everybody else had gone.

DOUGLASS: Were these votes hand or ballot votes?

ZETTERBERG: I think at that point you were standing up and reporting for the district's seventeen votes.

DOUGLASS: So nobody was calling each name. You mentioned the 1952 luncheon club. Why don't you comment on what your responsibilities were and how you happened to do that? You had a letter here that was pretty interesting.

ZETTERBERG: I have a file here two inches thick. That was an ancient club going back to 1921. The list of past presidents here was so long. It was called the Democratic Luncheon Club of Los Angeles.

DOUGLASS: Do you happen to know how it got started?

ZETTERBERG: No. You look at the old names here, and it is mostly lawyers. The past presidents: Judge Leonard Wilson, Judge Daly Stafford, John F. Dockweiler, Judge Minor Moore, and so on. And I can see several others. J. Ray Files, a partner in Preston and Files. Dwight Stevenson, a law partner downtown. Rolin McNitt, who was chairman of the county committee at one time. John Anson Ford.

DOUGLASS: Was it your feeling that when you took on the responsibility, it was mostly lawyers?

ZETTERBERG: It was mostly lawyers. Gordon Jeffers was the secretary. He was a lawyer in Los Angeles. Mrs. Lee Browdie, who later married Glenn [M.] Anderson, who is now one of the senior congressmen. She was the hostess, and she was there. It was every Thursday noon we met.

DOUGLASS: Had you been going to those before '52?

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall. [Laughter] I guess I must have gotten involved because I was innocent. Basically, the food was lousy.

DOUGLASS: You met at the Rosslyn Hotel?

ZETTERBERG: We met at the Rosslyn Hotel upstairs.

DOUGLASS: How big a group would it have been?

ZETTERBERG: I tried to get good programs. My job was to get good programs every week. That is a tough job, and we would have usually thirty people. Sometimes, I think when we had Estes Kefauver we had people hanging from the rafters there. I am looking at the cards here, a sample of cards that we sent out, announcing the speakers. James Bassett, political editor of the [Los Angeles] Mirror. Robert Pettingill, Ford Foundation. George Miller, Jr. We have talked about him before. Ray Kinison, assistant United States attorney. Chet Huntley, political commentator. Clyde Doyle, member of congress from Long Beach. Elsie Jensen, official Democratic courier. Mrs. India Edwards. Dr. Hubert Herring, who was a substitute but good on Latin America. Edward Roybal.

Then I remember, in 1952, we had several prospective candidates for the presidency, including Glenn Taylor, the senator from Idaho. He said, "Do you want my five-minute speech, my one-hour professor speech, or my two-hour senate speech?" [Laughter] A cowboy. So it was kind of interesting.

- DOUGLASS: So this meant every week you had to go to Los Angeles and every week you had to have a speaker.
- ZETTERBERG: Every week. I can't imagine now doing that. My law partners were very forgiving, I guess, at that time.
- DOUGLASS: How far ahead did you have to line people up? I had correspondence weeks ahead of time, and then I would try to get targets of opportunity.
- DOUGLASS: Did people ever turn you down? How did people react to these invitations? Of course, the Democratic officeholders, I am sure, would respond positively, but how did other people respond?
- ZETTERBERG: Well, I see here one at the top of the file is Volunteers for Stevenson--August 21, 1952. This is signed by Hubert Will, who was of the organizing committee for Stevenson:

Dear Mr. Zetterberg:

Thanks very much for your letter of August 20. Instead of my coming to California, I am going East. Ben Heineman, whom you may know, is leaving Los Angeles tomorrow morning. I have given him your letter. He will get in touch with you.

I can't remember whether we had Heineman.

DOUGLASS: But a person like Chet Huntley was willing to come and talk?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And Bassett, who became the senior editor of the Mirror, came. There was enough pig iron, if you will pardon the expression, in the godfathers of this club that they could draw. I was pretty much a foot soldier.

DOUGLASS: Did the press cover this?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. They gave us pretty good press, as I recall. I think we tried to get out press releases.

DOUGLASS: What was the goal of this exercise?

ZETTERBERG: It was just to try to keep the Democratic thread alive in Los Angeles in a nonpoliticized, nonorganizational way. It was sort of like a one-sided University Club. [Laughter] It died. John Sobieski, after he ran and was defeated for congress, he then became president. I think it was maybe in '54. He decided that things were shifting to other forums, and he buried it.

DOUGLASS: You were beginning at that time, too, to run into the explosion of communications and the media beyond radio or face-to-face meetings,

which had been the mainstream way of communicating?

ZETTERBERG: That is true. There was a lot of free television panel discussions in the fifties. I remember being on several television debates with Pat Hillings. You see, in 1950, I was sort of a rare bird in the sense that there were very few people that got through the primaries. Esther Murray, in west Los Angeles, and I were two of the people who got through. Most of the races were decided in the primary. Esther Murray was a much more charming television personality than I was. I know we were often called to fill in.

I remember being on a panel with Goodwin Knight and also being on a panel with Will Rogers, Jr. We were considering him. By "we," I don't remember who the we is, but I remember we were talking about him running for some office because of his name identification. He was on the television. I just remember him repeating his father's story about not being a member of any organized party, he was a Democrat. [Laughter] That is

all I can remember. But there were quite a few television appearances.

DOUGLASS: That kind of format for you as a lawyer must have been a comfortable one.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. It was fun. It would usually be about a half-hour. I don't know how many times I, or anyone in my same position, got on. I was probably on five or six times in the two-year period there.

DOUGLASS: Let me just wind up your involvement in gubernatorial elections. Would it be correct to say that you were the most active for Pat Brown, if you were to name any one governor's campaign?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: You commented that you did some assisting when Jerry Brown ran.

ZETTERBERG: They gave me two or three assignments, mostly to talk to people in the Covina area. It was very local.

DOUGLASS: Just to briefly mention Brown's other campaigns, do you have any particular recollections of the '62 campaign, when he defeated Nixon. In 1958, the Republicans went through all these exercises to shift Senator

[William G.] Knowland to run for governor; he was involved with the "right to work" question. And Goodwin Knight ran for the U.S. Senate.

Nixon decided to run in '62 because he had been defeated for the presidency. Do you remember anything particularly about the Brown-Nixon election?

ZETTERBERG: No. I am sure I was involved in it because of my earlier involvement with Nixon. I probably have a file somewhere on that.

DOUGLASS: There is nothing that stands out in your mind about that election?

ZETTERBERG: No.

DOUGLASS: Do you recall thinking that was a big challenge in that Nixon was going to give Brown a hard time?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I never understood where Nixon got his votes anyway because I never perceived him as a particularly likeable person or a particularly warm candidate. He was mostly on the negative side, and I just felt that Brown had done his job as governor. I really wanted him to win, I remember, and I am sure I was involved with the campaign.

- DOUGLASS: Why don't we go to the '66 campaign. Supposedly, Brown's people were actively interested in not having Warren, no, George Christopher, the mayor of San Francisco, emerge but actually having [Ronald W.] Reagan as the Republican candidate.
- ZETTERBERG: By the way, Warren Christopher was one of the persons on that advisory committee for Brown, and he was dealing particularly with the problem of smog.
- DOUGLASS: George Christopher was the man who really seemed to have a chance. His family had been in the dairy business in San Francisco and he was the mayor. Do you recall any of that activity going on?
- ZETTERBERG: No. And as we sit here on my left is one box of files and on my right is another box going mostly from 1965 on, and I have not been through that box yet.
- DOUGLASS: If you would like, we can pick that up the next time we talk. Let me just ask a few questions about the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee. You went on that in '48, is that correct?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes.

- DOUGLASS: And you have been on it ever since.
- ZETTERBERG: I think that is right. That's hard to swallow, but I think that's right.
- DOUGLASS: Does that make you in seniority the top dog on that committee?
- ZETTERBERG: I think I am the longest surviving member of the county committee. [Laughter] It's funny. You know, in 1950, my campaign manager was Don Rose. In 1950, my campaign chairman was Richard Richards. And I forget which the order was. They were both chairmen of the county committee. I think Richard Richards, came after Rolin McNitt; he defeated the late John A. Vieg, a professor here, for the chairmanship of the county committee. And then Don Rose became chairman of the county committee.
- DOUGLASS: Was that rather automatic, to go on the county committee, because you were a candidate?
- ZETTERBERG: I think if you are a candidate, you are on the county committee. Otherwise, you are elected. Seven members from this assembly district are elected.

DOUGLASS: So then it would be composed of all candidates and all elected persons, by assembly district, within Los Angeles County?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That makes a sizeable group.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. It has been expanded since then with a cross-marriage, notwithstanding Hiram Johnson's ghost, of the state establishment with the county committee and vice-versa.

DOUGLASS: In what sense?

ZETTERBERG: By virtue of being a county committee, the county committee has representation on the state committee. And the state officeholders, who have been a little leery of these county committees that were sort of off by themselves, they have ex officio (and I think it is ex officio) positions on the county committee.

DOUGLASS: Nonvoting?

ZETTERBERG: I think in many respects it is nonvoting. I am not sure of that. I will have to check.

DOUGLASS: By that you mean who from the state? Do you mean an elected official from the area, like the assemblyman?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, the assemblyman or their representative. I think they got through a thing that they don't have to come. They can send a representative. That's why I am a little doubtful about the voting. Then, you see, they gave us alternates, too, all members of the county committee. So when everybody is there, it is sort of like a miniconvention. But their typical attendance runs about a hundred.

DOUGLASS: Where did you meet in the late forties?

ZETTERBERG: We met in the assembly hall in the old state building [in Los Angeles], which was on First Street and Spring [Street] and is now torn down. That building used to house the state supreme court, and all that stuff has been torn down. Then we met over in the new state building in an inadequate auditorium. Now we meet at the California Teachers Association out on Third Street in the Alvarado [Street] area.

DOUGLASS: How often does the county committee meet?

ZETTERBERG: Once a month and always has. It made Time magazine once. One of its members on crutches was swinging his crutch at another member, and

the caption was "Sit Down You Mug."

[Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Would the county committee meetings--let's talk about this earlier period--sometimes be hot and heated?

ZETTERBERG: Always it was hot and heated, especially when there wasn't anything on the agenda. Then things began to get. . . . You are reminding me. Shall I mention the so-called Resolutions Committee?

DOUGLASS: Sure.

ZETTERBERG: There was a lot of disruption in the old days, in 1948 and the fifties, and so we were commissioned--I think it was maybe in the time of Dick Richards' chairmanship--a Resolutions Committee. Resolutions used to be first thing on the agenda, and that would sometimes take up the whole meeting time, arguing what we call Abyssinia journalism. We don't know what to do about Vietnam, but over there in Abyssinia. [Laughter]

I found some evidence of this in these files. Joe Wapner, who has become famous on television, Frank Mankiewicz, who later was the head of National Public Radio, and I were

the core of the Resolutions Committee. We would meet at a Chinese restaurant down just a half a block before the county committee meetings. We would come in about 5:15 P.M. or so, and they would serve us these Chinese dishes, and if any other member of the committee came, they would have another dish.

We would create these resolutions. We tried to make them resolutions that had some substance. Then we would try to get them through the committee before 9:30 [P.M.], and we would take them over to the Los Angeles Times, which was nearby, and go up the backstairs. Then we would get some publicity on the resolutions. If we went past 9:30, it would be too late. That was really kind of a fun thing. It was doing a little bit the same kind of thing that we did in the capitol rotunda. The objective was to give more substance and less air to the resolutions and have them come through committee and due process ahead of time.

DOUGLASS: What would be a typical resolution you would have come up with?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, my gosh.

DOUGLASS: Were they lengthy? Were they subject specific? Were they procedural?

ZETTERBERG: They were subject specific. They were not procedural. We tried to make them less than lengthy. We tried to make them brief and to the point. We tried to make them tuned in with something that was currently in the news already. So that it would show that we, as Democrats, were interested in what was occurring in the heated world around.

DOUGLASS: So they would be issue oriented?

ZETTERBERG: Issue oriented. I guess that's my life.

DOUGLASS: So you were trying to get some punch on issues and show that the party was on top of things?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Did the Republicans have a counterpart to that in those days?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know whether you want to get into this too deeply, but I do have experience with both the Republican and the Democratic county committees. I represented both committees in a legal fight with the county registrar of voters.

DOUGLASS: When was that?

ZETTERBERG: That was about ten years ago. It was a class action on behalf of all members of both committees. So I had to report periodically to both the Republican and the Democratic committees.

DOUGLASS: What was the mutual cause?

ZETTERBERG: The mutual cause was nothing earthshaking, but it had to do with filing fees, improper collection of filing fees. I have done several class actions, but this was one where we actually went through, had the class organized, and had a decision from Judge [Campbell M.] Lucas, the brother of the state supreme court justice, Malcolm Lucas.

DOUGLASS: Was your objection to the amount of the filing fee? Or the timing?

ZETTERBERG: I would have to go back and look at the specifics, but I do remember that we got recovery back to the various members of both committees.

You asked about the two. You would go into the Democratic committee, and it was a raggle-taggle group. Speakers would be speaking and there would be little caucuses going on in the back of the room, there would

be shouts of points of order and demands to have the microphone. Meantime, a raffle would be going to collect money to pay for some expense. It was sort of Dickensian.

You would go into the Republican committee, and the men were all dressed in coats and ties. Everybody sat straight and everything was quiet. When you got through, you didn't know whether you had been heard. There was no real comment or anything. The personalities were different. And yet in the raggle-taggle group you find a lot of wisdom, the same kind of wisdom that you would find in an advisory committee. It is a very interesting group.

DOUGLASS: That seems to be your personal verification of what generally seems to be in people's thinking about the personalities of the two parties. The sort of chaos of the Democratic party is part of it.

ZETTERBERG: It may that the chaos is more apparent than real because when the votes came, people would vote, and they would vote on various issues.

DOUGLASS: Was the filing question having to do with the party having to file or the candidates filing?

ZETTERBERG: Candidates. That is where you get the class action.

DOUGLASS: That is very interesting that you filed on behalf of both parties. You won, it sounds like.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Obviously, you have these years of service on the county committee, and I don't have a good way to get at asking you specifically meaningful questions. Do you have any generalization that you feel you could make about the county committee?

ZETTERBERG: OK. The Los Angeles county committee specifically, in my opinion, was one of the organizations that gave birth to CDC. And, specifically, it was Helen [L.] Myers.¹

Helen Myers was organization chairman of the county committee, and you'll see that she is in organizational positions in CDC as time goes by. Helen Myers was then living in Temple City. She now lives in Claremont. She had a connection with UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles]. She is a graduate

1. Helen Linder Myers, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1990 by Enid H. Douglass, Oral History Program, Claremont Graduate School, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.

of the University of Chicago and is a very bright person. She had connections with UCLA with what was called group dynamics.

She got the county committee to break up this raggle-taggle thing I have described to you into little groups for discussion, group discussion, and come up with a way that you share ideas. Instead of just having Robert's Rules of Order ruin everything, you would share ideas in a giving sort of way. That same technique then she used and gave us as a model for clubs.

Where did clubs come from? She, in the south, and Alan Cranston, in the north, were the godmother and godfather of CDC. I don't know exactly how Alan Cranston did it in the north. But in the south here one of the ways of campaigning for congress was having house meetings. The first few house meetings that I attended as a candidate were sparsely attended. There might be two or three or four or five present. Then it began to become sort of institutionalized and began to get more people coming. Fifteen or twenty. When you, the candidate, would appear and go to two

meetings at night, when you left, the people were still left there and they were encouraged to form a club.

This is the way a lot of clubs in Los Angeles County were formed. And the clubs then were chartered by Helen Myers' organizational committee. As chartered clubs, they were the structural substance of CDC. It was people. It wasn't precinct captains telling people what to do. It was people deciding what to do, and the format was encouraged by Helen Myers and the organizational committee to be like the group-dynamics format, where no one person was supposed to take charge of it.

Although I do remember one meeting about classifying clubs. Somebody said, "There is one classification you haven't mentioned." "What is that?" "Paper clubs." In other words, you could get a club that was dominated by one person, but basically the county committee set up rules and they had a form-- and they have a form--that each club member has to sign, as a dues-paying club member. I am not sure about the dues paying, but I think

so, and you have to have a certain number in the application to the county committee, which is the chartering agency of clubs. The state committee doesn't charter clubs, although presumably they could, the county committees charter clubs.

Back in the days of CDC, I think there were some areas where there were no county committees that CDC did charter a few, with the approval of the state committee. But basically the substance of the membership of CDC was a person membership composed of clubs that had actual members and had to meet regularly in order to be chartered by the county committee.

DOUGLASS: So they couldn't just be on paper in the sense that you had lists of who belonged. You couldn't have people belonging to or controlling several clubs?

ZETTERBERG: This is not a Chicago precinct organization. There were no members that were buried underground. This was live members.

DOUGLASS: As far as you know, was what was happening in Los Angeles County and whatever Cranston was using up north the first effort of this kind?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, I think it was. Hiram Johnson did better than he probably realized in setting up these county central committees that gave a chartering agency for having clubs that were composed of people who were interested in the Democratic party. The candidates would use these clubs. Or maybe the clubs used the candidates. I am not sure which. But there would be a relationship between the candidate and the clubs, and not the lonely relationship of precinct captains. It was a cooperative thing. That was sort of a grass-roots spirit of the California Democratic Council.

DOUGLASS: Did those clubs also focus their meetings sometimes on issues?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Usually there was an issue input in club meetings.

DOUGLASS: It wasn't just organizational?

ZETTERBERG: No.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

DOUGLASS: These clubs were more than just being oriented toward getting a candidate elected?

ZETTERBERG: Right. Under the elections code the county committees have charge of the local elections, whatever that means, and the clubs did work the precincts. But it was not on the precinct organization type of thing, where one person was out there by himself reporting to a precinct campaign.

DOUGLASS: So you have overlapping structures here when it came to working on elections?

ZETTERBERG: Well, yes. Let's drop the word structure and say people. You have a resource of people. I remember walking precincts for George Arnold over in the Silver Lake area. I remember walking the precincts for a candidate for the assembly over in the Monterey Park area. And I think I have probably walked by myself or with other people just about every street in our congressional district as it has changed its size and so-on over the years.

DOUGLASS: What would happen if the election time comes and there are a number of clubs in an assembly district, but there is also this precinct

organization? How did those two work? Did they work independently or did they coordinate, in terms of working for that person's election?

ZETTERBERG: The county committee took it they would not charter conflicting clubs in the same area. They were covering areas that were perhaps adjacent, but they would not have conflicting clubs.

DOUGLASS: You made a comment earlier that the clubs were not under the standard precinct organization framework. How did that come together when there was an election?

ZETTERBERG: I wasn't talking about precinct organization. I was talking about precinct methods. The clubs would do the work.

DOUGLASS: And they would form their own precinct-walking exercise?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Anything else about the L.A. [Los Angeles] County central committee. You have watched it over many years. Do you see any change in its personality or way of functioning?

ZETTERBERG: No. The county committee within the last two years has still gone towards issues. They

periodically will have committees working on different issues. One of the problems that has arisen is a jurisdictional problem. Can the county committee take positions apart from the state committee? Can it take a position on state issues or is it supposed to confine itself to county things?

Actually, much of election time now of the county committee is spent on city things in Los Angeles. Because the bulk of the county committee's members now come from Los Angeles City and there are city issues. But the Los Angeles County Committee has been pretty durable in hanging in there on broad issues. We had several good programs of speakers during the last election year. Mostly, for example, on environmental issues. On transportation issues, which is in but outside of Los Angeles as a city, and so on.

DOUGLASS: Does the dense and diverse nature of this county today make the functioning of the L.A. County committee almost a thing apart from other county committees in the state?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Has that been true for a long time?

ZETTERBERG: Actually, I am not too familiar with other county committees. I have, upon some occasions in the past, attended Orange County committee meetings for candidates and things of that sort. But this county committee is a different kind of animal. It's bigger, and it is sort like a mini-convention any time you go.

DOUGLASS: Does it sometimes make it hard to deal with or make decisions about issues because the needs from various areas can be so different? You just defined L.A. City as being one whole thing of its own.

ZETTERBERG: There are a lot of discussions at meetings when there is fight for like city council of Los Angeles, and there is a group of members mostly centered on Los Angeles as a city. But the overall thing still is there, and I think it still keeps the same character as being interested in general Democratic issues.

DOUGLASS: Technically, running for local offices is nonpartisan. What you are describing sounds to me like it becomes fairly partisan in terms of the county committee.

- ZETTERBERG: The county committee did join in a lawsuit--I was not participating in that--for endorsements in nonpartisan races. I think that was, as I recall, a successful thing.
- DOUGLASS: So the county committee can endorse in a city election?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. Let's say that the parties can endorse.
- DOUGLASS: Which would mean what in the City of Los Angeles?
- ZETTERBERG: That raises a question between state and county committees, you know. Are you going to come up with a conflicting endorsement? This is still an issue in which I would have to be sure exactly how that case came out. I remember hearing that report.
- DOUGLASS: I remember that issue arising.
- ZETTERBERG: But there are jurisdictional issues raised.
- DOUGLASS: So if you have an election in a certain city, can the whole county committee endorse, can the state endorse, or can only something that has contiguous lines endorse?
- ZETTERBERG: Well, there is foreign policy between the county committee and the state committee. But within the county committee there are rules as to what percentage [is needed]. You have to

have more than a 50 percent majority to get an endorsement.

But they just endorsed a lot of people for a lot of nonpartisan offices this last time. And they had them come to talk and present their programs. It is sort of a place which, if it weren't there, there would be no central place where people could come and listen to these candidates.

DOUGLASS: Is it conceivable that the county committee could endorse a Republican?

ZETTERBERG: No. You can't do that.

DOUGLASS: So all the people who would appear before you would be registered Democrats.

ZETTERBERG: I think that is correct.

DOUGLASS: What is your personal feeling about this?

ZETTERBERG: I don't always attend the meetings, but I always like to attend the meetings when the candidates for countywide offices are going to talk because I like to see what they are like. To me, the value is not so much endorsement or nonendorsement. The value is to see what this person believes in and what he or she proposes to do. I haven't really prepared on this particular issue.

DOUGLASS: All right. Unless you have any more general comments about the county committee, why don't we get back to CDC?

ZETTERBERG: OK.

DOUGLASS: Let me start with its origins. I have gathered that it was the Adlai Stevenson campaign for the presidency that was the keystone in the CDC units becoming a formal organization. Was that your impression?

ZETTERBERG: No. I think that there was a good relationship between Stevenson and the CDC always. But we had had good relationships with Kefauver, with Chester Bowles, with lots of people that I think have had an outgoing view of world politics, including Stevenson. Here is a thing which is probably a CDC-sponsored thing about Stevenson being at the Hollywood Bowl.

DOUGLASS: What year is that?

ZETTERBERG: This is October 9, 1954. Actually, I don't see any reference to the CDC in this. There is the Democratic national committee and the Democratic state committee and the Democratic county committee sponsoring him. George Miller, Jr. was really the convener of the

original CDC Asilomar conference, and I don't recall anything about Stevenson as such at that conference. And that's really the childbirth of CDC.

DOUGLASS: What I picked up was there was a feeling of unrest and frustration and yet excitement over the Stevenson campaign that may have caused people to feel they wanted to do something more. Wanted to do something different, which very likely coincided with something that Miller had been thinking about. And also this club movement that Helen Myers had been doing and Alan Cranston also. So you would be of the view that it may have been a coming together of a number of things?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I don't know where Stevenson was physically or politically in 1952-53, at the time of the Asilomar conference.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I didn't mean to imply that he was personally involved. I was speaking more of a general enthusiasm that he had apparently stimulated.

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. I think his enthusiasm gave a little jet propulsion to the members of the California Democratic Council. We got caught

in 1960 between the charisma of [Senator John F.] Kennedy and the charisma of Stevenson. You remember this was at the Sports Arena in 1960. I am sure that a lot of the CDC people were trying to get Stevenson to run at that time.

After one of those meetings, we were eating at the Sheraton Town House on Wilshire Boulevard, and he was at the next table. When we saw him there, we gave him sort of a round of applause. Then he came over to the table and said, "I am not sure you are doing me a favor." He was sparkling and in good humor. If you will recall, he decided not to run at that time.

DOUGLASS: What was your involvement in these vestigial movements towards CDC? The calling of the January [1953] meeting in Asilomar. Do you have any recollections of the lead-up to that?

ZETTERBERG: No. I just remember being there. [Laughter] I have in front of me what you might call the convention call by George Miller, Jr., and I see the program here. You have Pat Brown and High Raskin, the deputy chairman of the Democratic national committee. Clara

Shirpser, Democratic national committeewoman, and John Anson Ford, Democratic national committeeman. They were all speakers at the first general session of that Asilomar conference. It was really a conference and not a convention. That is one page, and then the rest of this is the conference. Several pages all given to program.

DOUGLASS: What was the ostensible reason for calling the conference? Why did you go?

ZETTERBERG: Well, there was just a sort of an uprising of feeling that the Democratic party in California needed a renewal. It was just sort of like spontaneous combustion. I don't know how many people were there, but the grounds were full at Asilomar. The place was very full.

DOUGLASS: I have a figure of about 500 people.

ZETTERBERG: I think that is probably about right.

DOUGLASS: I suppose all of the state central committee was there.

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. I have in mind then who was a member of the state committee. I read you the big wheels that were the speakers. They were Clinton McKinnon, George Miller, Jr., who, I

guess, was at that point the state central committee chairman. Then he was sort of presiding at the whole thing.

DOUGLASS: Do you think he was reacting to this club movement?

ZETTERBERG: I think he was reacting, but not in a reaction-type way.

DOUGLASS: No, I meant responding.

ZETTERBERG: Responding, yes. He was a sui generis. He was a very interesting person. I am sure he was very much in favor of the goals and methods of CDC, but he was still the head honcho in the state committee at that time.

DOUGLASS: But something caused him to call this meeting.

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall being in on the calling of the meeting. I was just a foot soldier. I see Alan Cranston at that time was chairman of the panel on neighborhood and precinct organization. He has both in there, both the neighborhood and the precinct organization.

DOUGLASS: Now that is the January meeting?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. So he was looking towards the organizational aspects of it at that time.

DOUGLASS: I have a note that you, Cranston, and Helen Myers met to discuss how to get the clubs to

organize and have representation. Do you recall that?

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall specifically. I don't think I was that important at that time.

DOUGLASS: I don't mean that was the triggering event, but that this was a topic being discussed.

ZETTERBERG: I do remember Alan Cranston coming down and meeting with Helen Myers, and I perforce certainly must have been there because I remember it.

DOUGLASS: Do you think it was between the two Asilomar meetings? Or before the first one?

ZETTERBERG: I can't remember. I would guess it was before the first meeting.

DOUGLASS: Before January of 1953. That is what I thought. I may have checked that with her.

ZETTERBERG: I have the feeling, now that you are reminding me, that he came down, as sort of like he had something going in the north on club movements and he came down to combine that with what Helen Myers had going down here.

DOUGLASS: So it may have been the beginning of the idea of having a state network of clubs?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: Do you have any particular recollections of that January 1953 Asilomar meeting?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes, I have the general impression that it was just bubbling over with excitement and interest and application of a lot of people to the Democratic issues. By issues, I mean not issue-issues but also program, finance, and so on.

It was not just all in one big auditorium. It was a lot of separate meetings where there was a lot of participation. Everybody there, all the people there, were participating in some committee or panel. And then this was again using the group dynamics type thing. There were reporters, in the group dynamics sense, who would report to the closing central meeting. Instead of being in a big auditorium where everybody sits and is talked to from the proscenium, we were farmed around in all those little wooden buildings. Everybody had a chance to discuss.

I remember I was chairman of a panel on policy and program, and I went around. We had eleven different committees, and I remember sitting in and listening to the discussions.

I remember specifically Mervyn Dymally at one program. I was very much impressed with his interest in us.

DOUGLASS: So was it at this January meeting that you chaired that program and issues effort, not the November meeting.

ZETTERBERG: This was February 1, 1953. I see here in the announcement that James Harvey Brown of Los Angeles was the chairman of the panel on policy and program, and I was vice chairman. But he didn't come, and I see in the final report, which must be about thirty pages here which I have in my hand, that I was listed as chairman.

DOUGLASS: So this was the first statewide effort to discuss issues?

ZETTERBERG: Issues and organization and finance. It was all in a bundle.

DOUGLASS: I have you down as becoming chairman of the CDC issues committee on medical care. Did that happen at this time or did that happen after the formation of CDC in November?

ZETTERBERG: That was years later. That was after Pat Brown was elected. Then he asked me to chair a committee to review the health needs of

California. Then I got enough know-how out of that experience, which lasted for two years, then they made me chairman of the health committee in 1960, I think.

DOUGLASS: Of the CDC committee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I can tell you. I have my work paper here--it was our committee--March 1961, Santa Monica.

DOUGLASS: What is the title of that document?

ZETTERBERG: It is called "Medical Care and Public Interest." Listed here is: California Democratic Council, Joseph L. Wyatt, Jr., President; Marvin Schachter, chairman of the issues program, Third Annual Issues Conference. I have a list of the people who were on that at that time. But that came much later.

I might just add. I was quite interested last night to find this so-called final report of the workshop conference sponsored by the-- here you get marriage of the CDC and the state committee--Democratic state central committee of California up at Asilomar.

DOUGLASS: What is the date on that?

ZETTERBERG: January 30, 31 and February 1, 1953. This is the final report. Most of the paper here--it is kind of long--is made up of the program of that panel that I was supposed to be chairman of. But the real guts of it is the organizational thing. One can look through here and find the doctor's prescription for the Democratic party is to have something like CDC. It was fine to have these issues and lots of people attended that and we had a long report of the different committees. But the real guts of it was the organizational recommendations.

DOUGLASS: Where did those recommendations come from? Was it the sense of the whole meeting or was it from a committee?

ZETTERBERG: Remember we are not still operating under Robert's Rules of Order.

DOUGLASS: I understand, but what is the origin of that?

ZETTERBERG: The state committee sponsored this and you have about four of five panels. Let me just read some of the titles. I will skip the committees and just read the panel titles. The panel we already discussed. Panel on promotion. That is Ruth Lybeck, chairman, and

Bert Coffey of Contra Costa County, vice chairman. A panel on organization. The chairman was [] Ed Cook of Los Angeles, and the vice chairman was Elizabeth Witkin of Berkeley. A panel on neighborhood and precinct organization. That is Alan Cranston as chairman; Ethel Longstreet vice chairman. Then I think there is one other panel here. A club organization panel. I don't recognize these people. Albert Brundage from San Francisco, and Anne Snyder.

Helen Myers was not there. I asked her why and she said, "I couldn't afford it."

DOUGLASS: I guess what I am trying to get at is this. You said a few minutes ago there was a recommendation or a sense that a more permanent organization should be forthcoming. I am trying to find out who said that.

[Interruption]

ZETTERBERG: There appears to be a committee on the selection of candidates and issues with Elizabeth Smith as chairman, and the reporter was--you see we are getting into the group dynamics thing again--[William] Bill McFait. And they talk about the San Mateo plan, and I

have a page in front of me of the San Mateo plan. That calls for a preprimary convention, which is held in San Mateo County, for endorsement. This was to fight cross-filing, and the issue was "can we have preprimary endorsements?"

This, I think, is basically the idea for the California Democratic Council, which could then give preprimary endorsements and get the Democratic party back in to the general elections, notwithstanding cross-filing. And that, of course, is what occurred in 1954, a year later, the preprimary endorsing convention. And one of these pamphlets I have here shows the pictures of the candidates who were endorsed at that convention.

DOUGLASS: At the end of this meeting in late January and early February, what was your sense of what was to happen next?

ZETTERBERG: Well, it was my understanding that we were going to follow, in general, the San Mateo plan and have a preprimary endorsing convention which would be based on the membership rather than money. Membership in

clubs, with clubs having representation, so it would be a truly democratic membership.

DOUGLASS: There was the strong implication of some kind of a permanent organization, would you say that?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I am not sure that out of Asilomar a permanent organization was one of the specific recommendations. What you had was a preprimary endorsing convention. Then you get involved in the problem of who would attend the convention and how would it acquire status which the public would recognize as being a grass-roots convention. Then you suddenly have the structure for an organization. In other words, it is my impression that the structure of CDC grew out of the simpler idea of a preprimary convention.

DOUGLASS: I gather that there was an understanding in that meeting to the effect that there would be a meeting held in the north and a meeting held in the south as a follow-up. There was a meeting held at Stockton, and I think Don Bradley assisted in that meeting. The southern chairman, who was Clinton McKinnon, never called the southern meeting and finally

Miller insisted that it be called. As I understand it, that is part of what happened in the intervening period between the January-February meeting and the November meeting.

ZETTERBERG: I didn't know about that. That is very interesting.

DOUGLASS: Miller appears to be critical.

ZETTERBERG: Let me read the last sentence of this report of Asilomar. It says, "The Executive Committee of the State Central Committee met at noon Sunday. It voted unanimously to accept and implement the recommendations of the workshop conference." So that would give George Miller the backing to proceed ahead.

DOUGLASS: He had the capacity to call at least a preprimary endorsing convention?

ZETTERBERG: Right. But then there were a lot of other recommendations. You see, it gets into finance and publicity. So it is like creating the United Nations without maybe knowing that it was being created. Although I am sure that a lot of people. . . . Probably Cranston was taking it in and probably Helen Myers, too.

DOUGLASS: In November there were people who called for the second Asilomar meeting. Among those were

George Miller, Clinton McKinnon, Paul Ziffren, Clara Shirpser, Helen Myers, and Alan Cranston. These were the people who called for it. Do you have any feeling about how that meeting happened to be called? You were at the November meeting?

ZETTERBERG: I don't think I was there.

DOUGLASS: Helen Myers wasn't at the January meeting, but she was at the November meeting.

ZETTERBERG: No. I was not there.

DOUGLASS: In August of '53, Dime A Day for Democracy was founded in southern California. Elizabeth [C.] Snyder was a leader in that. What can you tell about that?

ZETTERBERG: [Laughter] Well, I am sure there was apparent cooperation between all elements of the Democratic party. You will see Dime A Day for Democracy cosponsoring things. But I remember the California Democratic Council people were very concerned because it was a money-oriented thing rather than a person-oriented thing.

While a dime doesn't sound like much, I do remember one large donation made from Dime A Day to one of the Democratic meetings. What their quid pro quo was, I don't know, but we

had pretty good understanding that the money that was contributed--it was something in four figures--came not from a lot of people contributing dimes but from one contributing source.

I don't have the proof of this, but it was sort of common understanding that it was William [G.] Bonelli. William Bonelli was a member of the State Board of Equalization. At that time, the Board of Equalization had jurisdiction over issuing liquor licenses. There was always a concern that the granting of liquor licenses would produce money which was then laundered into Dime A Day for Democracy.

I am pretty sure that Bonelli wanted to become governor of California. And Elizabeth Snyder was a very distinguished woman Democrat. She had been head nationally of Young Democrats at one time and was a very bright, intelligent person, and her husband, [Nathan] Nate Snyder, was an assistant to Bonelli. So we who were interested in CDC were concerned that instead of having the verifiable people representation in the

Democratic party that Dime A Day would come in like a bulldozer with money and maybe put a person up for governor who didn't have any kind of grass-roots background. I am sure, if my memory serves me, that Nate Snyder was convicted of some charge relating to these liquor licenses.

DOUGLASS: Yes. And, actually, it was during this period that William Bonelli was charged too.

ZETTERBERG: He, as I recall, moved to Mexico. That was what I would call a close shave. However, I have never thought that Elizabeth Snyder herself, even though she was married to Nate Snyder, deviated from her dedication to the

DOUGLASS: For those who were interested in seeing CDC succeed, this was not very good news to have this formed in August of '53? Or did it matter?

ZETTERBERG: What was your question again?

DOUGLASS: My question is this. If you feel there is this impetus starting in early '53 which is probably progressing to a state convention, and there was another Asilomar conference held in late '53, having another organization

formed for fund raising might have caused some concern.

ZETTERBERG: I don't think we felt any jealousy of another organization as such, because we really didn't feel it was an organization. Now we have to defer to Joe Wyatt on that because Joe Wyatt later became president of CDC. He was involved with Dime A Day. And he is a very reputable person.

DOUGLASS: Yes. It would be interesting to know what was really going on with Dime A Day.

ZETTERBERG: You know, we had a meeting in Clinton McKinnon's office. Helen Myers was there, I am sure, I was there. [Congressman] Chet Holifield's local representative was there.

DOUGLASS: Harold Lane.

ZETTERBERG: Clinton McKinnon was sort of on the fence there. But the CDC people were carrying the day in that discussion, I remember. There weren't too many people there, maybe five or six. I remember Holifield's representative saying, "If you people were of any importance, you wouldn't be to this meeting." [Laughter] You wouldn't be taking the time to come to this meeting.

DOUGLASS: In terms of bringing in money, you mentioned earlier that Dollars for Democrats became a fund-raising movement. Now that was for CDC?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I don't know whether that came before or after the Dime A Day, but it was sort of competitive.¹ There was a mechanism. CDC furnished the people power, the troops.

DOUGLASS: So Dollars for Democrats may have been in place.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: As far as you know, there wasn't a particular rift between Dime A Day and CDC?

ZETTERBERG: There was never a marriage. So how could there be a rift.

DOUGLASS: Alan Cranston became the first president of CDC. You weren't there at the time of the election. Helen Myers was one of the vice presidents. What do you recall of the initial activities of CDC during the Cranston presidency?

ZETTERBERG: I am trying to recall.

DOUGLASS: He was president from '53 to '57.

1. Dime A Day for Democracy was established in 1953. Dollars for Democrats began in 1956.

- ZETTERBERG: In December of '57 he resigned and Joe Wyatt, who was secretary of CDC, became president. Cranston resigned to run for controller.
- DOUGLASS: Some people might have viewed Wyatt's coming in as a vote of confidence for Dime A Day for Democracy. Did you view it that way?
- ZETTERBERG: Oh, no. I think his name was attached to the Dime A Day, but his energies, I believe, his real concern, was with CDC. You asked me about what I remember. That is kind of a broad question.
- DOUGLASS: Well, let's just say your recollections of Cranston and CDC. Is that easier to recall?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes, but remember, I am sort of a foot soldier in this. I notice here--I found some of these convention calls--I am always in some room doing some work. I see here in the '55 convention, March 18-19-20, I was vice chairman of the rules committee. I found a lot of notes on the convention rules that I worked on. I think in 1960 I was also at that point chairman of the rules committee.

Then at one point I was stuck in a room all night with the resolutions committee. I remember papers stacked all over and people

waiting to be heard. Somebody sent us a case of champagne to keep us alive. It was about 4 A.M. That was in the Senator Hotel in Sacramento.

DOUGLASS: Did you attend most of the conventions?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I attended them. In looking back over the records it seemed that I was at first a member from this assembly district to the California Democratic Council. Then later on I became the district (what-they-called) director. It sounds like a contradiction in terms with the CDC. Then I was on the board of CDC, but that mostly comes under [Thomas] Tom Carvey, when he was president. I was very active on the board at that time.

DOUGLASS: So when you say a director, that means you are a director representing your congressional district?

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: What status did a director have, as contrasted to a board member? Or is a director the name for a board member?

ZETTERBERG: The congressional district directors were members of the executive board of CDC. I was trying to recall how many people typically

attended meetings of the board. It usually was like about twenty. That would tie in.

DOUGLASS: I have you as a director from '59 to '62 for the Twenty-fifth Congressional District and then the Twenty-fourth Congressional District.

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Tape 2, Side B]

DOUGLASS: Why don't we move to the presidency of Wyatt, who took over after Alan Cranston resigned.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And Wyatt then became president in January or February of '58.

DOUGLASS: Right. He was elected in December '57.

ZETTERBERG: I just read over last night in this document I referred to earlier, Wyatt's report "California Democratic Council: The First Eight Years." It is an excellent report. It's better than Cranston's. You could see that in some of his reports Cranston was turning towards "let's see what we can do organizationally with the state committee" and "how we don't want to offend people." That's my interpretation of his report here. It's a very good report. We have maybe three reports here and his [Cranston's] speeches at the CDC.

DOUGLASS: Do you think this was because Cranston was looking toward running for election?

ZETTERBERG: Right. I felt, and I'm sure a number of the others felt, that he was looking toward the election. We were concerned that CDC--when I see we, I mean I and others I talked to within CDC--this excellent organization might become

a single-person organization and therefore miss its mark. So, knowing that he wanted to run for office, I was not displeased that he resigned. We thought that he should resign if he is going to run for office. I say this realizing that I was on the first committee for him for United States Senate, back whenever that was. I felt that he has done a good job in his years as a senator, but I felt a relief that Joe Wyatt was coming on as president.

Now Joe Wyatt was a good parliamentarian. He was, of course, more than that, but he had a good sense of what I might call corporate organization. So he was what I would call a very excellent presider. I felt he did a good job as president.

DOUGLASS: How active were you during that period?

ZETTERBERG: I was active all the time. But remember there was a lot of activity on a local level, local endorsing conferences. We had local assembly district and congressional endorsing conventions. There was a lot of that going on, trying to get candidates from this district here.

Carvey came on in '61 to '65, and he seemed to throw himself more into the job of president in a leadership way. There were lots of meetings in a restaurant down on Ninth Street in Los Angeles near the CDC southern headquarters. I am going to maybe comment on that in just a minute. We'd meet at night, and he put a lot of time in on it. Of course, Joe Wyatt is an attorney, and he is working to feed his family. Carvey was employed by a corporation in an executive position. I think he had a little more freedom in what he could do.

DOUGLASS: Now when Carvey was president was when you were on the board?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And that may be part of it. I don't think I was on the board when Wyatt was president. So maybe someone else might comment on that.

DOUGLASS: How did one become a board member?

ZETTERBERG: We were talking about district directors. Then the president would assign different jobs to you.

DOUGLASS: Were people elected to the board at the state convention, other than certain positions?

ZETTERBERG: I can't remember.

DOUGLASS: At this time you were your congressional district director. So that was why you were on the board.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I said I would mention the place where the headquarters was. Alan Sierorty, who later became a state senator, had some property near Ninth Street on Figueroa [Street] or Broadway [Street]. It was a great big upstairs barnlike place, and you had to take a freight elevator to get to it. It was fantastic. Everybody was in one big room, and it was a bundle of activity.

Then [Louis] Lou Warschaw promoted a more elegant place in the subway terminal building, where we had a long corridor and lots of rooms. And that completely wiped out the ambiance of the big room. Everybody wanted to have a room for a secretary. And would the door be opened and closed? The physical things makes a difference because everybody was in a cooperative attitude in this old barn that Alan Sierorty furnished us for free. That was during Carvey's presidency, I remember. I am not denigrating Lou Warschaw's

contribution. It was really a much nicer place.

DOUGLASS: It speaks to the psychology of your physical environment.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Going back to the group dynamics thing.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember any big decisions that were made during that five-year period that Carvey was president? Or any changes in course?

ZETTERBERG: I get mixed up between Carvey and Wyatt and others. But there was a lot of hassle on the fake election documents and who had and who had not the endorsement. There was a lot of attempt made to fool the public. You still see that thought in force this last election. I remember my then law partner, [Lawrence] Larry George, and I to some extent, but primarily Larry George did a lot of work in injunctions against fraud in the elections. That was sponsored by. . . . I think it was in Carvey's time. It might have been partly in [Gerald] Jerry Hill's time, too. But we spent a lot of time in the courts fighting it. You had to show really the true source of the publicity that was coming out.

There was also a hassle on--I can't remember now where the source came from--there was also a hassle on whether CDC could properly endorse, based upon the idea of if it were an organization that was an official organization, it couldn't endorse in the primary. We discussed that earlier in respect to the county committee. There was a lot of hassle. We were beginning to grind with not only the opposite, the Republicans, but also within the Democratic party.

DOUGLASS: Let me then take off on that and talk about [Jesse M.] Unruh. Unruh was a member of the Los Angeles County Committee. Do you remember meeting him at that time?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, I remember seeing him all around. [Laughter] He was ubiquitous. He even talked at the Claremont Inn at a lunch once. He was thinking of running for governor, and he said, "Modesty in the face of ability is hypocrisy." Yes. [Laughter] And, actually, I supported him, and I was on his committee, when he ran for governor.

DOUGLASS: In '62, apparently his colleague, Thomas Bane and a slate defeated a CDC slate on the Los

Angeles County committee. This devolved around the controlling of club chartering. Can you fill in the rest if that catalyzes anything in your memory?

ZETTERBERG: I can't remember specifics. But I do remember considering him as an enemy within of CDC.

DOUGLASS: Unruh?

ZETTERBERG: Unruh. Very intelligent. I remember [State Senator] Hugo Fisher, who later became director of the natural resources agency in the state, hassling Unruh, or disagreeing with Unruh. And there were courteous but very active differences between Fisher and Unruh. Fisher was sort of taking the position of CDC. You are getting into my memory. I haven't researched this at all.

DOUGLASS: No, but I am interested in what it pulls out of your memory. I guess some people viewed Unruh as being a person who didn't like the grass-roots idea and favored professional politics.

ZETTERBERG: That is my impression. Yes. Very much.

DOUGLASS: And I guess going along with that would be he would like more moderate middle-of-the-road

stances and perhaps CDC might be viewed more liberal or swinging out?

ZETTERBERG: I think he was doubtful about the utility of programs that come up from the bottom without realizing the political implications of the programs on the state and national level. I have always thought of him as the consummate politician. As you know, he turned his talent eventually, when he was [State] Treasurer [of California], to doing a very good job as treasurer.

But he never really--Big Daddy he was called (from "Cat on a Hot Tin Roof")--liked CDC. But he realized it was a force. He didn't just say, "You wouldn't be here if you were important." [Harold Lane statement]

DOUGLASS: To continue the story of Unruh and CDC, apparently at the '63 convention of CDC he did try to stack the convention in this mode we have just spoken of. Professional politicians. And then his ultimate move apparently was in '63 when his bill, A.B. 2922, Truth in Endorsement, passed. That is the bill that would require CDC to put a

disclaimer on its literature that endorsement of candidates was unofficial.

ZETTERBERG: I had forgotten that. I remember that very well.

DOUGLASS: That would be part of what you were just mentioning. And Pat Brown signed the bill.

ZETTERBERG: Pat Brown is a practical politician.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember it rankling that CDC had been fingered in that manner?

ZETTERBERG: I do remember that. That was a real hassle. That was during the time of Tom Carvey, and I am sure that I was involved in that because I Again, I haven't gotten to those files over there.

DOUGLASS: You may think of some things to add to this. I am just trying to flesh out this relationship of Unruh to CDC. He then formed the Democratic Volunteers of California, which apparently was his statement. [Laughter] Does that also ring a bell?

ZETTERBERG: I had forgotten that. [Laughter] These things about truth in the publicity have a way of coming back. Like the winds of Cape Wrath, they have a way of causing you to run aground on them.

DOUGLASS: Well, you may think of things later. Then I guess there was sort of a difference of opinion with CDC--at least they went different ways--in the '64 U.S. Senate election. Pat Brown endorsed Cranston and Unruh endorsed Engle, who was ill, and then moved to support Pierre Salinger, who won the primary. So Unruh definitely went his own way in that. Any comments?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That was a kind of a heartrending time because we knew that Clair Engle had a brain disease and yet we wanted to be loyal to him. He was a very folksy type of senator, and he was very well-liked. Unruh and others were using him because they wanted to have the right to appoint a senator when and if he died. That is interesting. You mentioned that Pat Brown endorsed Cranston. That is very interesting. I guess that is probably the machine politics.

Just as a footnote, Clair Engle gave, I think, one of the best political speeches I ever heard. I went to a fund raiser for him at the Beverly Wilshire Hotel. They said, "We will now introduce Clair Engle for five

minutes. And he got up--he had a cigar in his hand--and he said, "There isn't a United States Senator than can clear his voice in five minutes," and then he stepped back.

[Laughter]

Of course, he tells a story about Black Bart, that man up in the back country who would come down and rob stages. A very short story. He always had these stories, you know.

He said, "I was staying in a hotel in Independence and they had a Gideon Bible. All they had was a bedstead, light bulb in the ceiling, and a Gideon Bible. I took to reading it because there was nothing else to read. And the book opened to a page and I read the first. It says, 'If you are lonely and disconsolate, turn to page so-and-so.'" And he said, "So I turned to that page, and it turned very easily. And I read and it says, 'If you have read this part of the Bible and you still are disconsolate, turn to page so-and-so.'" He said, "I turned there and it said, 'If you are still disconsolate, turn to page so-and-so.'" He said, "I turned there

and it said, 'If you are now disconsolate, here is a phone number.'" [Laughter]

That was the kind of a story that Clair Engle would tell. Anyhow, I think there was a political move for him. I felt sorry for Clair Engle.

DOUGLASS: I wanted to cover this whole business about candidate endorsements and Unruh and that situation because it happened during the Carvey presidency. We could move on to Simon Casaday unless you have more to say about Carvey.

ZETTERBERG: Let me say that if we are going to meet again, I want to go through that other file, which is mostly '65 and there on. Casaday, I really have very little recollection of him.

DOUGLASS: OK. He was only there a few months.

ZETTERBERG: We felt--I use the word we here--it was sort of assumed that he was brought in by an alliance of people at the top. Maybe Pat Brown, maybe Alan Cranston, maybe Unruh. I can't remember who was running against him, but I was surprised that he was elected because he had no real experience and exposure in CDC. Although he seemed to be a very

personable person, I don't really think of him exactly as a president.

DOUGLASS: He was editor of the El Cajon Valley News. Was he looked on as somebody who might bring in a new viewpoint?

ZETTERBERG: He was considered a safe president.

DOUGLASS: He became president in March of '65, and, in September, Pat Brown, with Cranston's support, wrote requesting his resignation. I guess Brown may have been getting concerned because he wanted to run for a third term. Casaday was criticizing [President] Lyndon [B.] Johnson's conducting of the Vietnam War. So I guess things were heating up and there was a threat of impeaching him.

Helen Myers made the comment that she thought the Vietnam issue splitting the Democratic party weakened CDC.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That's not a CDC thing. That's a national issue.

DOUGLASS: Of course not. What she is saying is that the repercussions of the issue, which is why Casaday was getting in trouble, didn't help the cohesiveness of CDC.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I think that's true and maybe even almost a truism in terms of an application to the Democratic party and maybe even to the Republican party.

DOUGLASS: You mentioned Jerry Hill. Again, maybe you want to look at your files.

ZETTERBERG: I think from this time on--we are talking about 1965--maybe we had better wait.

DOUGLASS: In terms of your overview and general comments--you said you had some reflections about the whole thing--do you want to hold those?

ZETTERBERG: Let me just throw it in now so we won't forget it for later. I have here--you have a copy--of a 1968 publication called "Democratic Report," when Charles Warren was chairman of the state committee. That was a conference held up in Lake Arrowhead.

The only point I want to make--and we should remember to be reminded of it later--is that that was the time when Reagan was governor. This was held for the state assemblyman and state senators by CDC. It was a sort of an educational conference, at least we could call it that now, and we wanted their

input. But we also wanted them to have whatever input that CDC wanted to give. So it was sort of a marriage of the state legislators with CDC. It was a very good occasion, from that standpoint.

We can cover that later. That was sort of like coming back. We now at that time have a majority in both the assembly and the state senate. So CDC is saying, "Hey, we're still here, and we've got something to give you." And they were saying, "Thanks and we'll come." So it was sort of a fun-type thing.

DOUGLASS: If you were to mention what you thought the high point for CDC was, would you consider the abolishing of cross-filing the high point?

ZETTERBERG: Absolutely. Yes. As I said earlier, the saddest part in any cause is when the cause is won. When cross-filing was abolished and then we began to get honest elections in the general election between the parties, that took away one of the real major goals that we were after at the beginning.

DOUGLASS: So what would be the remaining goal that made it continue?

ZETTERBERG: Well, the heritage, I suppose, is still there. When you had cross-filing, Republican incumbents and Democratic incumbents both got reelected. So we had a kind of a drying up of political enthusiasm. Now it is not the way it is. You have general elections that are opposed. So you have a place for the clubs of the CDC. What were the clubs of the CDC and now are clubs of the Democratic organization and, as they refer to it now in many of the mailings, the California Democratic Party. You have a kind of a coming together and a chance to get across the policy issues and to elect people.

Incumbents, during cross-filing, there was no real interest on their part to share the power. And, as you know, it was kind of odd. There was one occasion in the Central Valley where a Democrat won the Republican nomination and the Republican won the Democratic nomination. They were both disqualified because the Democrats were trying to play like they were Republicans and the Republicans were trying to play like they were

middle-of-the-road Democrats. So you really had a lack of political interest.

DOUGLASS: Would you say that one of those original thrusts, namely a new way of airing issues and having them discussed, was a driving force after cross-filing?

ZETTERBERG: Absolutely. Actually, the airing of issues was one of the things that powered the drive to eliminate cross-filing. Because we, as Democrats, as citizens, wanted to be heard. I don't want to be pompous here, but at one point it was said that we had 70,000 members. I see in the literature that I have been going through last night it says 50,000 actual bodies that were interested in and involved in the CDC through the club movement. That's a pretty hefty organization. That was there. That was an enthusiasm that went on the issues.

I was chairman later on--I can't remember the year now--of everything but the foreign policy issues committee at a Fresno convention. And that was well attended, and we had a lot of different issues statewide that were discussed. People were attending

and legislators were attending. It was really an educational process. That was what was happening at all of these state conventions, you see. Which is sort of renewing. And I recall that some of our issues statements were tacked on nationally, and we sent representatives back to help draft the national platform. I never did that.

DOUGLASS: CDC did have input into the national platform then.

ZETTERBERG: That's right. It was getting things from the grass roots rather than just having it done from the top down. I think we were renewing the spirit of the Democratic party, in that sense.

DOUGLASS: And you did have a lot of overlap then, didn't you, between the State Central Committee and CDC? That is, the same people would be involved in both.

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: All right. Thank you very much.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Session 2, March 7, 1993]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

DOUGLASS: In the last interview we did, which was some time ago, we talked about the fact that you had developed a prototype for Pat Brown's position papers in the gubernatorial race of 1958. I would like to start from that in terms of your interest in health and the fact that we will be discussing health care today. Could you just reiterate a bit about the position papers and the fact that you did more than the paper on mental health?

ZETTERBERG: We found among our papers here in the files a rather lengthy--it's long enough to be boring actually, eleven pages long--survey of medical care problems. It is dated February 5, 1958, which would have been at the . . . Remember Pat Brown announced that when the snow was in the Sierras he would decide whether he would

run. Apparently, it had snowed in the Sierras by that time.

DOUGLASS: He was attorney general then, right?

ZETTERBERG: He was attorney general, and this was the long paper, which is full of all my whole bunch of notes (it is difficult to read my own writing here) on medical care problems. I can't recall how this got to Pat Brown, but apparently this is a copy of what was sent to Pat Brown.

So at that time he had established a committee of about eighteen or twenty people, mostly lawyers. Lawyers get into everything, don't they? On a lot of different topics to kind of give him campaign material. When that committee was established, Macklin Fleming, who later became a judge of the Court of Appeal, was the convener. And he asked me and two others, with myself as chairman, to prepare a position paper on some subject of our choice.

And, as I recall, I don't have a copy of that, but we prepared it on the field of mental health. As I recall, it was in three different sections: sort of big print; and

then an elaboration of a position that the candidate for governor could take; and then remedial legislation. I think we cribbed from the Short-Doyle mental health bill that was being considered at that time.¹ And that was passed around to all the other members of the advisory group as a sort of a sample. It wasn't too good a sample. It was just sort of in a form that could be used.

DOUGLASS: So this was a prototype for what others would do in other fields?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: About how long was it? Do you remember? Three to four pages, was it short?

ZETTERBERG: Well, the first part was, of course, like one page, which is the position on mental health. And then there was the backup elaborations. Like if the governor had made a statement, then he would be asked a question, and he would have backup information. And then the third was proposed legislation, or proposed position the legislature might have taken.

1. The Short-Doyle Community Mental Health Services Act, S.B. 224, 1957 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1989. Provided for local community mental health care through a shared arrangement between the state and a county.

And that was the form of the pattern that was used by all these other subjects.

DOUGLASS: So this would give him a tool to use in his campaign on the subjects he was interested in, or that were apt to come up?

ZETTERBERG: If he wanted to use it. Right.

DOUGLASS: You have stated there were two other people.

ZETTERBERG: One was Les Ziffren, that's Paul Ziffren's brother. And the other was a young woman attorney. You know, I can't, for the life of me, remember the name. But they were fun to work with, although mostly it was by mail between the three of us.

DOUGLASS: Then, in addition to that prototype you worked on, you worked in the general area--there were other position papers obviously--of Social Security and health-related subjects?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. This paper we mentioned first, the eleven-page paper, was not limited to mental health. It was on the whole medical care problem. I should tell you that back after I got out of Pomona College, I was an intern in Washington, D.C. for a year, and I was assigned the first part of my internship to what was called the Social Security Board at

that time. In the office of one of the directors of the Social Security system. And so I got a kind of start there in the field of social security.

Now, going specifically to your question. This general pattern (the specific topics that Pat Brown assigned through Macklin Fleming, I don't recall exactly what they were but I remember taxes and I remember environmental problems and things of that sort) the general structure of studying different topics was carried through to the campaign so that we met before the election. I am not sure about before the election.

But we did meet at Palm Springs with Pat Brown. He was at somebody's home in Palm Springs, and all of the people assigned the different subjects, following the general structure of this informal committee (mostly lawyers), they brought resource people out at appointed times, met with Pat Brown, and went over the subject matter that they were covering. I remember I had the help of a professor, I believe of sociology, from the University of California, Los Angeles and a

professor of sociology from USC [University of Southern California]. I remember going out to Palm Springs and meeting with him for about an hour on the general subject of Social Security and health. That was during the gubernatorial campaign.

DOUGLASS: This was probably still the winter of '58 then? Is that right? It would be after this paper we talked about at the beginning of the interview had been given to him?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, it would be after that. But what I am not sure of was whether it was after he was elected or during the campaign. He would have been in Palm Springs either in the early spring or winter or the late fall. It might have been after his election, to form the program. The process carried through the whole year of 1958.

DOUGLASS: I believe you said that Warren Christopher was on this committee that Macklin Fleming was convening.

ZETTERBERG: Yes, he was on the committee.

DOUGLASS: Did he do environmental questions?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. He worked in the field of air quality and came up with the plan which basically

preceded the air quality control system that we have, of correcting the emissions of automobiles, based on the fact that they discovered that the automobiles were the chief villain in the smog of California.

DOUGLASS: I believe it was until the mid- to late-fifties that conclusion was drawn. It was not known for sure in 1950, I don't think.

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall. I am sure it was an ongoing study.

DOUGLASS: Caltech [California Institute of Technology] did the key study.

ZETTERBERG: I remember Joe Wyatt was also on that committee, in the field of taxes. I talked with him yesterday on another matter--on a case we have with him--and I asked him questions. He said he remembered the committee, but he couldn't remember exactly what he had done. I remember his sitting--we were in the Town Houses Hotel on Wilshire Boulevard near MacArthur Park, that's where we usually met--in a kind of a roundtable discussion. Usually, we were anywhere from twelve to eighteen people there at the

meetings. And I remember him being there and telling his progress on the field of taxes.

DOUGLASS: Steve, to begin with, why were you asked to be on this election campaign committee?

ZETTERBERG: I have no idea.

DOUGLASS: Did Brown personally ask you?

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall, if you are talking about the general research committee and not the topics committee.

DOUGLASS: The position paper committee.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Wait, you are not talking about the health care thing now?

DOUGLASS: I am talking about what we are talking about now, and that is the campaign period in '58.

ZETTERBERG: Oh, right.

DOUGLASS: Why were you involved in this campaign position paper, as you recall?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know why. I do recall that back in 1948 and '50, when I was running for congress, there weren't too many Democrats that got through the primaries and were on various public programs. And I was often on the program with Pat Brown. We ran a combined race in our district in '48 or '50. I think it was '50, and he was running again for

attorney general and I was running for congress. So I got to know him there.

DOUGLASS: And also you helped on his campaign for attorney general?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The next question is why were you singled out to head this mental health position paper prototype?

ZETTERBERG: You know, I really don't know that.

DOUGLASS: Could it be, possibly, that this paper you had done led him to believe that you were ready to do that?

ZETTERBERG: I might have been this paper--the one that we were talking about that is dated February 5, 1958--that very well might have been.

DOUGLASS: With that setting in mind, and, also, I can't help but recall your story much earlier in which you were sliding things under the door in the capitol in order to help the Democratic platform committee with issues. So you had a long-standing interest in issues. [Laughter] That was a great story.

Let's talk about what we will call the governor's small study committee on medical aid, the one that operated in 1959. Could you

discuss how you were asked to serve and what the nature of that committee was in its charge?

ZETTERBERG: Well, shortly after Pat Brown went to Sacramento as governor, I had a call from [William R.] Bill Coblentz, who was one of Pat Brown's secretaries. He called me up on the telephone and mimicked the Germanic accent of the then head of the American Medical Association and told me that he was the man (I can't remember his name now) who "would like to haf my help." And I said, "What's up?"

He asked me if I would head a committee of departmental people to study health care, and then we would have the complete cooperation, although no money, of the Departments of Mental Hygiene, Social Welfare, and Public Health and get some good people. So I said, "That would be fun." That was early in 1959, as I recall. Shortly after he was elected.

DOUGLASS: So you were the lead person of that group?

ZETTERBERG: Lead is probably correct. I was the least knowledgeable of the people of that group and was the only lay person. As it turned out I

was sort of a secretary; I kept the minutes (notes). We met probably every two or three weeks, usually at one of the airports, either in southern California or in northern California, and met overnight and then the next day. Like parts of two days. That went over a period, didn't we figure out it was something like seven months?

DOUGLASS: At least seven months. Probably.

ZETTERBERG: That was a really fun experience.

DOUGLASS: Maybe you could go over the professional staff who were the other six members of this committee?

ZETTERBERG: You say, professional staff?

DOUGLASS: They were, let's say, consultants out of the state government.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. We had Lester Breslow, M.D., who was then chief of the Division of Preventive Medical Services, State Department of Public Health, Berkeley, and later he became Director, State Department of Public Health. He is now a professor of public health at UCLA. Also from the State Department of Public Health, we had Gordon R. Cumming, who

served as chief of the Bureau of Hospitals, State Department of Public Health.

And we had Mrs. Elizabeth [M.] MacLatchie, who was chief of the Division of Social Security, State Department of Social Welfare, and her colleague, Wilbur R. Parker, who was Chief, Research and Statistics, State Department of Social Welfare. Then we had Edward Rudin and Nathan Sloate. Rudin was Chief, State-Local Mental Health Services, State Department of Mental Hygiene, and Nathan Sloate was Chief, Social Services, State Department of Mental Hygiene.

So these were the six people. You will see that they were not the politically appointed top people. They were the people immediately under the top people. And they were all professionals and really a great group.

DOUGLASS: Had they ever come together as a group and met in this kind of informal setting?

ZETTERBERG: No. They never had, and the first few meetings we had--you see, they talked with each other, they had to talk through channels, up through their director and back down--and I

detected a little hesitancy in conversation. Were they free to reveal, free to tell their own personal views? I remember that being discussed. And I said, "Yes, we are free. We can talk just like people." That's what made the fun part of it.

DOUGLASS: Because they broke down and became fairly informal?

ZETTERBERG: Right. Very informal.

DOUGLASS: That must have been fascinating to watch?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, it was one of the best seven or eight months I have had. It was really fun.

DOUGLASS: Who had selected those particular people? Had Brown indicated that these were the kind of people he wanted on it? Or Coblentz?

ZETTERBERG: I think it was Bill Coblentz probably. You never know. Pat Brown had several secretaries at that time. Bill Coblentz was the one who was putting this together. I haven't seen him now for several years, but he is a graduate of my same law school, Yale Law School. He is a very creative person, a creative attorney, I think.

DOUGLASS: Did he have a particular interest in the health care question himself?

- ZETTERBERG: I don't think so. Actually, later they put him on the Board of Regents of the University of California. That was more in the field of education.
- DOUGLASS: The question of budget. You mentioned there was no budget. What was the premise behind this? That there would be minimal costs involved?
- ZETTERBERG: I asked Bill. I said, "What's our funding? How much money do we have?" And he said, "You don't have any. This is a contribution. And, of course, the departmental people will have their departmental salaries and expenses paid."
- DOUGLASS: So you didn't even get travel for yourself?
- ZETTERBERG: No, no travel or hotel bill or anything.
- DOUGLASS: This was really doing pro bono work.
[Laughter] At one time, I think you told me you met every other weekend. You met on a very regular drumbeat?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. I am not so sure it was regular. It was often. We would discuss at the close of one meeting where and when we would meet at the next meeting.

DOUGLASS: Were all seven of you basically at each meeting?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: No subgroups?

ZETTERBERG: No. This was not a perfunctory group. This was a group that really went into it and were interested, and they all came. I don't think any of them missed any of the meetings.

DOUGLASS: Do you recall? Were you given a deadline, do you think, by which the work had to be done?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, we were, but I can't remember what it was.

DOUGLASS: Less than a year, it sounds like?

ZETTERBERG: Working back, the Governor's Committee [on Medical Aid and Health], which we haven't come to yet, its conclusions were published in February of 1961. So if you work back from then, and there were many months in the latter part of 1960 when the documents were put together in that report, it must have been I would say probably in the autumn of 1959 when we presented our report.

DOUGLASS: Then another obvious question is why had Brown elected to give this priority? Was health

care high on his list of things he wanted to address?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I don't know that this had any priority.

DOUGLASS: The fact of appointing this kind of a committee, was this happening in other subject matter areas?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I am sure it was, at the same time. In my opinion, he really did a good job of trying to put together programs in lots of different fields. Witness the fact that in my situation he used intellectuals brought from UCLA and from USC, you see. We, people like myself, were just sort of the conveners. Like I called Macklin Fleming a convener, we were sort of conveners in that same sense, to carry through. He was really putting together a program.

DOUGLASS: Do you think you were selected to do this because of the position paper you had done for the election?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. But I think that probably most of the people that were on that original advisory committee, if you call it that, on different subjects were continued to be used during his administration. One of them, as I

recall, became his clemency secretary. Most of them became judges in the Courts of Appeal in California eventually. So I am sure they carried their various subjects. I am sure these were the bases for Brown's programs.

DOUGLASS: And so he was moving ahead simultaneously in a lot of fields, like water, et cetera. He obviously got it into gear very quickly?

ZETTERBERG: That's true. People like Bill Coblentz, and maybe Bill Coblentz himself was the person that was moving ahead on arranging those things. But I need to tell you a little incident that occurred. The seven-person committee did have an appointment to present our conclusions to Governor Brown. It was morning in Sacramento, and I was wandering around the marble corridors there before the time, probably looking for the john or something. And I ran into Pat Brown, and he said, "Why, Steve Zetterberg, what are you doing up here?" [Laughter] So he didn't know. Then about ten minutes later there we were, sitting at the other side of his big desk. I think all seven were there.

DOUGLASS: And this was your final report you were presenting to him?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I think we should back up a moment and pick up your story of what happened right after Brown's election in terms of what your interests were, perhaps a judgeship?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, I had forgotten that. Well, he had appointments at the . . . They had a suite in the Beverly Hills Hotel, and he and his secretary, Fred Dutton were there. I was supposed to come in there at a certain time, and I arrived. They said they would like to offer me a position in the administration. They said, "Tell us what you would be interested in. We won't promise we will give it to you, but we will give you consideration as we are setting up our administration." At that time I told him I didn't want any position that was a paying position. And he said, "You aren't interested in a judgeship?" I said, "No, not really. I am not interested in a judgeship, nor anything that would be a paying position." So then I think at that time they discussed boards and commissions,

and they had mentioned the State Board of Public Health. That is basically how that happened. Somewhere in our files that you and I have been going through I have his letter appointing me. That's a little later.

DOUGLASS: Yes. We'll get to that later. That's in January of 1959 that he wrote you the letter. Why was it you weren't interested in a judgeship?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, I don't know. In some ways my interests have been in the field of public policy, and one problem with being a judge at any level is you can't control what you work on. I remember running into Macklin Fleming in the Kennedy Airport--we were taking the same plane--and he was complaining that here he was a judge on the Court of Appeal, but he said he never can control what he works on. He has to take this stuff that is served up to him.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You can't control the subject matter.

ZETTERBERG: That was one of the things that. . . .

DOUGLASS: Were you tempted, though, to take on a job in the administration? You said you didn't want a paying job. You obviously wanted to continue practicing law, it sounds like.

ZETTERBERG: That's true. I can't really reconstruct that. I was working, if you call it that, in the field of voluntary politics at that time. I was active in CDC and policy statements there. I guess my interests were. . . . I had worked for a United State senator both before and after my law school, and that was the area that really interested me.

DOUGLASS: Public policy?

ZETTERBERG: Right. I had been offered a job as clerk for a United States Circuit Court of Appeals judge in the Washington District of Columbia. And also offered the job as the secretary to the [United States] Senate Majority Policy Committee. But I turned both of those down. I don't remember the dates for those. But I must have been awfully dumb in not wanting to take these things.

DOUGLASS: You instead came out to California and studied for the bar?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Is it possible in this meeting that Fred Dutton and the governor had with you right after the election that you indicated that public health would be something you were

interested in being involved in? Because he did appoint you to the board, and you were the convener for this small committee. That happened pretty promptly.

ZETTERBERG: Yes, that's true. That is probably what happened.

DOUGLASS: Why were you interested in health? Was this sort of accidental that it grew out of your early Social Security experiences in D.C.? Or did it become a real central policy issue for you?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I have always been interested in the problems of health care, and I still am, as a matter of fact. How to get health care to those who need it rather than those who are just able to pay it. And the work with the six-person committee really reinforced that.

DOUGLASS: That certainly geared you up knowledgewise, didn't it?

ZETTERBERG: It's true.

DOUGLASS: Out of those six people were there particularly outstanding persons?

ZETTERBERG: Well, as a person, of course, Lester Breslow was, and still is, a person of great ability and conceptual approach to public health and

health care, together with an ability to elicit from people their ideas. He had no ego, no pride of authorship, he was trying to get at the substance. I know he had written papers using the statistical approach to effects of tobacco smoking, which is one of the first times that I recall that kind of approach being used in proving that tobacco did cause cancer. He also wrote papers on the use of seatbelts. He was expanding the concepts of public health. It wasn't just doctors and medicine and pills and nurses. It was broader subjects. Like smog, like smoking, like using seatbelts. These were elements of health. And those were things that I recall that he was thinking of. That was his scope of approach.

But in this group of six he didn't overawe anybody. There was mutual give-and-take. Gordon Cumming as a person was a very interesting person. I kept in contact with him later on because of my association with Casa Colina [Hospital for Rehabilitative Medicine]. We were trying to get funds to build Casa Colina rehabilitation center. This

was a very good group. I don't remember any arguments. It was all a positive approach.

DOUGLASS: So no one or two dominated this group? They were all giving equal input?

ZETTERBERG: That's true. The only one that subdominated was I. I was the least.

DOUGLASS: Your duty, I believe you said, was to record, to keep track of what happened at each meeting and get that together and feed it into the next.

ZETTERBERG: That's right. I kept the notes. And, of course, I entered into the discussion also, but I kept notes and then reread the notes, or portions of them, so we would know where to start in the next meeting.

DOUGLASS: Cast in another light, would you be the person representing the public--the consumer or whatever--since you weren't a professional health person?

ZETTERBERG: I didn't think this was representing any particular constituency. We were just bringing our own backgrounds, that was the reason it was so good.

DOUGLASS: But obviously having a layperson lead, I suppose Brown did this with other committees?

ZETTERBERG: In order to get a group of people like this together you have to have someone with a great fund of ignorance to ask questions.

[Laughing]

DOUGLASS: Then also pull it together? Someone has to be the one person with the responsibility of keeping it on track and coming up with something.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But when we gave the presentation to Pat Brown, the person that I worked with mostly-- the person that really pulled the structure together--was Lester Breslow. I remember I prepared a kind of a big flow chart that you could fold like an accordion to show Pat Brown, with diagrams and everything, and I know Pat Brown looked at it for about thirty seconds. [Laughter] That really, with him, didn't last too long because he just looked over to one of his assistants and said, "What do we have available here?" And he said, "We have \$50,000 we can allocate for a broad study, not just conceptualizing but a staff and everything." That's the start of this nineteen-person committee.

DOUGLASS: When you went into this exercise were you assured that there would be that kind of follow-through, that something else would grow out of this?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. From the very beginning, we realized that for anything to be accomplished in the field of health care, that it had to be people other than the kind of consist we had with these six people. We had to have people from the providers. And if you will look at the consist of this nineteen-person committee, it was very broad, but the majority were people in the health care professions. You couldn't leave out the nurses or the dentists or the doctors.

DOUGLASS: All the constituents.

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: There surely was a written report, wasn't there? This is the missing archive item we can't find. That is, you gave Brown a document?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And, you know, it may be one of these things that we have looked at here. But, basically, I remember what it was. It was an outline for a further study. It was like a

skeleton. We had sections that we had discussed, but we stripped away the substance and gave him the proposal for a study. And the study framework was the study framework used by the nineteen-person committee.

DOUGLASS: Did Coblenz participate in your final meeting with the governor or any of that? He simply had the responsibility of putting you track?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. I don't remember. I think I may have checked with Coblenz from time to time. But I don't remember that he was even present at that time we met the governor.

DOUGLASS: One interesting responsibility you had, as the convener of that committee, I gathered, was to approach someone to be the chair of the successor committee.

ZETTERBERG: We had to come up, in effect have a nomination for Pat Brown of who might be the chairman of a successor committee. It was thought not wise to have one of the six as chairman of the committee, and we needed someone who was a medical doctor. And, as I recall, it was Breslow who thought about Roger [O.] Egeberg, who was head of what they called the Department of Charities of the [Los Angeles]

County USC Medical Center. That's the L.A. County General Hospital. Which is to say he was really the head of that hospital.

DOUGLASS: Had he been in the job quite a while when this came up?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know how long he had been in it. He had had some other work that he had done because Lester Breslow was aware of him, not just in that position. It was basically Lester Breslow's nomination, but everybody else on the six-person committee agreed with that. You couldn't just have the governor call him up and ask him because he might turn him down, and our committee's job--and they assigned that to me as the layperson to do it --was to go talk with Roger Egeberg.

DOUGLASS: Can you remember that?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes, I remember it. He was in the old part of the L.A. Medical Center there, the old brick part.

DOUGLASS: Which is where the County Hospital is, right down in the middle of old L.A.?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. [Laughing] I was beguiled by him because he had these jars in front of him. One of them said "Marijuana" and I forgot the

other two, and the "Marijuana" jar had raisins in it, I think, and another one had peanuts in it, and he offered me raisins and peanuts. We went up to the regular hospital cafeteria and had lunch, and then we went for a long walk outside of the hospital. We generally reviewed what the committee had been doing and what was lined up and how he would get support, and there was a fund that would be available to him.

DOUGLASS: Was he surprised to be approached, do you think?

ZETTERBERG: I think he was beguiled. He didn't respond right away. He thought about it and he sort of ruminated. I felt like I was walking with him and we were talking, but that he was thinking within himself as he walked along. Then he did say he would be willing to do it. I presume that the governor or Bill Coblentz, or somebody, called him up, and he accepted.

DOUGLASS: I think you said he had a good sense of humor.

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. [Laughing]

DOUGLASS: Or has [a good sense of humor]. I guess he is still alive?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. I got a letter from him within the last two weeks. He is in the National Academy of Science in Washington [D.C.], working on the problems of the aged. I asked him how he was? He says, "My wife and I are both fine. We are full of beans." He had had San Joaquin Valley fever, so he had a private research project that he has continued through the years of working on the San Joaquin Valley fever. I guess once you have it, if you survive, then you are able to work with it without catching it again.

DOUGLASS: You are immunized. So, anyway, you found him to be a colorful personality?

ZETTERBERG: He was sort of a tall, craggy Norwegian and very feisty. I have told you about him.

DOUGLASS: Give one anecdote about him.

ZETTERBERG: We used to meet, I'm talking about the nineteen-person committee now. I remember meeting in Watts at a black elementary school. We would meet in those kinds of places often, as a committee. We were discussing things, and various classes would come in and sit in the auditorium and listen to the discussion. And he was using certain four-letter words in

the discussion. I wrote him a little note, and they passed it on down the line. I said, "Roger, why are you using these four-letter words? You notice there are classes of young students." He wrote back, and he said, "Because it titillates the women and amuses visitors." Something like that. But you see that kind of approach breaks down barriers

DOUGLASS: I gather your meeting place was varied, but you often did meet in Berkeley, at the offices of the State Department of Public Health?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. The public health building has a nice view of the [San Francisco] Bay, and you can see why the State Department of Public Health never wanted to move to Sacramento. On the top floor they had a cafeteria. We would meet usually there in the cafeteria, in one corner or one marked-off room in the cafeteria. We would meet also in schools around.

I said meeting, but you understand that the committee itself was just a small part of what was going on. There was a staff. And there was testimony taken. You and I have looked to see what happened to that. I have copies of the testimony--it must have been a

couple of feet high--of various witnesses on health care.

DOUGLASS: So you were, in a sense, holding hearings?

ZETTERBERG: We were holding hearings, that's right, and we had the social scientists doing the staff work. Just like a congressional hearing, really. Maybe better than the congressional hearings we have. [Laughing]

DOUGLASS: More focused maybe. We could get into that in a moment. First, was it a foregone conclusion that you would be on this committee?

ZETTERBERG: I don't recall that.

DOUGLASS: But there was a carryover, wasn't there? In one way or another, did not all the people who were on the small committee end up being involved with this committee? There is the list.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. You see, all of the six people were designated as departmental consultants to the committee.

DOUGLASS: The professional people who had been on the small committee became consultants to the larger committee?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. The committee's report itself indicates Lester Breslow was listed first [in

the departmental consultants list in the report], and he is called Coordinator of the Study. So it was basically a study.

DOUGLASS: So he became the key staff person then?

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: And you became a member of the committee, and the other five professional became consultants.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So there was total carryover in one sense?

ZETTERBERG: Absolutely.

DOUGLASS: And that was intentional?

ZETTERBERG: You see, there is the study staff. Lester Breslow was coordinator of the study. It includes people that I recall, like [N.] Mark Diamond and Morgan Odell and others. There is a list here of about ten or eleven people who were staff. They were really far ahead with the staff work for a report.

DOUGLASS: Why don't we go over the members because we talked about some in passing. I think it is interesting to see what constituent elements are represented. Who decided on these appointments?

- ZETTERBERG: Well, I think Egeberg and Breslow did. They were the ones that decided. They knew all of these people. Shall I go down the list?
- DOUGLASS: Yes. Perhaps you could pair some.
- ZETTERBERG: They are listed alphabetically on the report. You see, you have got Charles Abbott, who was Executive Director, Blue Cross of Southern California. At that time, Blue Cross was really the. . . . They put the financial lid on medical costs because they would negotiate with hospitals and they would follow up with doctors. If doctors charged too much, they would go talk with the doctors. I remember the testimony on that.
- DOUGLASS: They bargained, actually?
- ZETTERBERG: They would bargain, and if a doctor charged too much, they would say, "Why did you charge so much?"
- DOUGLASS: What is the difference between Blue Cross and Blue Shield?
- ZETTERBERG: All I know is that Blue Shield is physicians. But Blue Cross, I conceive of that as being more important. At this time it was more important because they were the ones that were really working to try to put a lid on costs.

DOUGLASS: I guess they were about the only private organization doing that, except for the Kaiser health plan and the Ross-Loos Clinic in Los Angeles?

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

ZETTERBERG: Let me just go down the list here. You have the State Department of Mental Hygiene represented by the director, Daniel Blain, M.D. He was not on the six-person committee, but he was the head of the State Department of Mental Hygiene. And you had [Assemblyman Ronald] Ron Cameron, who was an accountant who was a state assemblyman, so you had the state assembly represented.

DOUGLASS: He was from the Whittier area.

ZETTERBERG: Right. He was very good in the committee and followed through with a lot of stuff later on.

DOUGLASS: Was he selected because he was involved with some assembly committee dealing with health issues? Did he have an interest in health?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. But I had known him before because he was assemblyman from part of the congressional district where I lived. Then you have a dentist, Daniel [A.] Collins of San Francisco. [State Senator] Hugo Fisher, San Diego. He was a state senator, but before that he had been attorney for a thing called The Complete Service Bureau, which was a private prepaid medical program which was

challenged by the California Medical Association because it was prepaid.

DOUGLASS: Now you had known Hugo Fisher for some time?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: How did you happen to know him?

ZETTERBERG: He married Lucia Sloane, and Lucia Sloane's sister was a good friend of my wife, Connie [Lyon Zetterberg]. They used to play tennis together. Harry Sloane was an attorney in San Diego. When I was studying for the bar, I used to go down and use his library to get away from the smog of Los Angeles County. So I got to know him there. And he had a very conceptual approach to lots of problems and was very good. He later became the director of the Department of Health, Hygiene and Social Welfare and moved to Sacramento.

DOUGLASS: He had an interest in health. He had, maybe, because of a case that his father-in-law's law firm handled?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That was a flag case. It opened the door for prepaid medical care, along the lines of Kaiser [Foundation Health Plan, Inc.]. Then you had Paul [D.] Foster, who was a dermatologist who was the head of the

California Medical Association. He was from Whittier, as I recall. Then you had a public person, Mrs. Ernest Lilienthal from San Francisco.

DOUGLASS: What was her background?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. Except she was, like me, in a way, she was just a member of the lay public. They had rules on that. Malcolm [H.] Merrill, who was Director, State Department of Public Health at that time. You couldn't do anything without including him, and he was a very--I was going to say conventional, maybe that is not the right word--he had a very good mind, but he was running a state department.

And you had a nurse, Miss [Helen] Nahm. Nurses, you know, they keep tabs on the doctors, second-guess the doctors, and they were very important to have. I should have mentioned that the dental thing is important because dentists have a sociology of being more for preventive care than the medical doctors do. Brush your teeth, use fluorides. Rather than the Woolworth Store type of thing of come in and buy our services like many of the doctors were at that time, they were

trying to prevent problems from happening, which is better.

And [Nicholas V.] Nick Oddo had his D.O. [doctor of osteopathy]. A lot of the D.O.s got grandfathered over into the medical profession.

DOUGLASS: Had that legislation passed by then?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And he had been of the group that didn't go over. He was a really fun person. He said he has no prejudice against M.D.s and said, "In fact, I sleep with one." [Laughing] His wife was an M.D.

Then you have Joseph [B.] Platt, who was president of Harvey Mudd College.

DOUGLASS: Why was he on the board? Do you have any idea?

ZETTERBERG: Well, they just wanted somebody from the general field of education.

DOUGLASS: And, of course, he was the president of a school of science and engineering.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And, as I recall, he is a neighbor down here, as you know, he had done some volunteer work on education in Taiwan for graduate students. He later on became head of the

general Claremont Colleges, the [Claremont] Graduate School [and University Center].

DOUGLASS: Yes. But he has been going to Taiwan for years. I didn't realize that was what he was doing.

ZETTERBERG: Then you had an economist, Harry Polland from San Francisco. My recollection is that he was a rare bird in that he was a member of a law firm but he was an economist. Which shows the law firm was a very creative law firm. I remember. I think he was the one.

T. Eric Reynolds, a very gentlemanly former head of the California Medical Association. After his experience on this committee, I understand that he quit the medical practice and entered into public health work, which is really interesting.

And you had John [E.] Smits, who was Regional Hospital Administrator, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals of Los Angeles. J. Paul St. Sure was a very interesting person. He was a lawyer, president of the Pacific Maritime Association, which was always dealing with the longshoremen's union.

I remember one of the persons that we interviewed as a resource person was Goldie Krantz, who was like an economist for the longshoremen's union. They had health care issues. She said, "Our longshoremen are in their childbearing stage of life."

Then you had Jack [E. A.] Stumpf, who represented San Bernardino County Council of Community Services, represents the views of the county. Then John Wedemeyer, Director, State Department of Social Welfare. And then myself. So that's basically the committee, you see.

DOUGLASS: What kinds of roles did these various people play? Were some people a lot more active than others?

ZETTERBERG: Abbott of Blue Cross was, in effect, a cross between a member of the committee and a resource person because of the experience of Blue Cross in trying to deal with hospital costs. They essentially got wiped out when Medicare came in and footed the bill. Of course, now Medicare is having to do what Blue Cross did then, which is try to hold the costs down.

DOUGLASS: Same problem.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And he was also very important, as was the Kaiser representative, because those organizations, and later Medicare, have the lowest loss ratio. Loss ratio means the administrative expense formed a very small part of their cost. Whereas conventional insurance carriers for health care, their loss ratio might be 90 percent. In other words, 90 percent of the insurance might go to profit. The average (for all health insurance) was somewhere around, as I recall at this time, 40 percent.

DOUGLASS: Apparently, it could be as bad as 5 percent that went to benefits and 95 percent went to profit and running the company.

ZETTERBERG: Right. You see, that was one of the problems we dealt with.

DOUGLASS: So the input of these two group-oriented organizations, Blue Cross and Kaiser, made them semi-resource people?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: What about the two people from the California Medical Association, which, one might assume,

would be nervous about this approach you were taking?

ZETTERBERG: It seemed to be that if either of the two was nervous, the most nervous one was Paul Foster. But I don't call him nervous. I really would have expected him not to sign the report, but I had some contacts later with him. And I recall that he was really made a Christian, pardon the expression. He really listened and went along with the general conclusions. So they were members of the committee rather than prods. They didn't try to take a biased position. As I pictured them, they didn't have to go back to their organization and say to them, "What shall I say?" They were talking as individuals.

DOUGLASS: That is interesting. Because I think one's view today, or in the recent period, is more that they do automatically seem to take a position of great concern about anything that involves the doctor-patient relation. Would you agree with that? It seems like they were more open to the ideas you were discussing.

ZETTERBERG: That's true, but then one wonders. Within the last week we have seen the attempt of the AMA

[American Medical Association] to be on the Hillary [Rodham] Clinton health care task force has been turned down. They don't want a board representative to join them.

DOUGLASS: That's true. That is an interesting comment.

ZETTERBERG: I do want to add one other thing. I think Roger Egeberg really handled them because he was of the profession. By handled them I mean he was very important, in terms of their contribution.

DOUGLASS: How about Miss Nahm of the School of Nursing [University of California, San Francisco]? Was she an active participant and a resource person of any kind?

ZETTERBERG: Thank you for mentioning that. Yes, she was. She gave the nurse's point of view, and it was listened to very carefully. Let's see if there is anyone else in there who was that same way.

DOUGLASS: Was there any discussion about using nurses-- there is a new category now, nurse practitioner--given training that is in between being a doctor and being a registered nurse? Did any of that come up? Was there the problem of the shortage of doctors then?

- ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. That was one of the main questions.
- DOUGLASS: There was a shortage, or an expected shortage?
- ZETTERBERG: But, conceptually, we thought of the shortage as being a thing to be remedied by having more doctors and more medical schools, and so on. Of course, in California at that time, I would guess that maybe a large percentage of the doctors practicing here had been educated at the expense of some other public organization, like another state's faculties and so on.
- DOUGLASS: All right. I interrupted you. You were going to mention somebody else, I think.
- ZETTERBERG: Well, no, I think probably Malcolm Merrill was a resource person as well as a member of the committee because he had knowledge about the State Department of Public Health. And the dentist, Collins, always had a little different approach than the other medical providers, which was a lot more towards preventive medicine.

You were talking about why we met in Watts once. Watts was an area of minorities, mostly black minorities, I think that's why we met there. Later, when Roger Egeberg became dean of the USC School of Medicine, he had a

signal program going on in Watts from the USC medical school, trying to bring health care to a minority area.

DOUGLASS: We were talking about how this committee functioned. Did you meet as a committee of the whole frequently?

ZETTERBERG: I see from the notes here. I had forgotten that Roger Egeberg appointed subcommittees on personnel, financing, medical facilities, and organization of medical services. In general, the precursor committee, six people met like across the table from each other. Our committee generally met facing outward, like in a line, like you see in a congressional committee, listening. Although I am sure these various subcommittees worked the other way, too. But it was a different kind of committee.

DOUGLASS: You were a member of the financing task force. These appointments were made by Egeberg. Why were you put on financing, do you suppose? Any particular reason?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. How do you bring health care to. . . .

DOUGLASS: The task forces are listed in the back of the document. I noticed that you had a lot of other people on the task force. So there would be a core that would be a subcommittee of the full committee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Let me say that of the people who were members of the task force, but not members of the committee, many of them were invited by the California Democratic Council, in its 1961 Issues Conference in Santa Monica to participate in that further health care discussion. So this is a really good list of resource people on the back cover of the 1960 report.

DOUGLASS: The members of the task forces who were not full committee members?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. There you see, for example, James [E.] Ludlam, who was a well-known attorney for the California Hospital Association. And you have Russel [V.] Lee, M.D., who had created the Palo Alto Clinic. His son, Philip Lee, was recently on television on the President [William J.] Clinton program about two or three weeks ago as a medical doctor. So those were creative people. I remember talking with

many of these people. I remember a state health car picked up Russel Lee and me once, going up to one of the meetings, and having an interesting discussion with him.

DOUGLASS: To what degree were those five other people left from the small predecessor committee used? Would they be assigned to a task force? Or were they used in the overall?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know, but I think they were used internally, so to speak. They had been through the precursor committee, and I think they were used probably by Breslow in working up the final draft and checking all the facts.

We turned outward, you see. If you look at the members of the task forces, we turned outwards to people who were not in the state government staff.

DOUGLASS: There is a list of your task force on financing. It is interesting because there were only four of you, I think, from the committee. This was cochaired by Harry Polland.

ZETTERBERG: And Paul St. Sure. Yes.

DOUGLASS: And then you had Paul Foster, who was from CMA [California Medical Association].

- ZETTERBERG: Yes. And St. Sure was an attorney for the Pacific Maritime Association, who presumably negotiated on financial problems in contracts with the longshoremen's union. Harry Pollard was an economist. So you did have the California Medical Association represented in the financing task force.
- DOUGLASS: Right. But then it is interesting to look at the other people who were pulled in.
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. You have Earl Chiet, research economist, University of California [Berkeley] Ted Ellsworth, UCLA. What was his background? I remember him.
- DOUGLASS: Institute of Industrial Relations, UCLA.
- ZETTERBERG: [William] Griffith was with a drug company [Leibold Drug Company]. [A. B.] Halverson, life insurance.
- DOUGLASS: Occidental Life Insurance Company.
- ZETTERBERG: And [Howard A.] Hassard was the attorney for the California Medical Association. And [Arthur] Weissman was with the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Director, Statistical Services. So they were pretty good resource people.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember much about working on that task force?

ZETTERBERG: No, I don't remember anything in particular. You see, you have Breslow and Parker. This was a key program of how you finance health care. If you'll notice the conclusions of financing, their rules were sort of general. In other words, they were correct but general. Whereas if you compare that with the recommendations of the California Democratic Council, we were specific. But this 1960 report--let me see if I can find an example for you--here is a recommendation. It says "Prepaying benefits be in the form of services or substantially cover the cost of services." And means be found for prepayment of costs. And then "Comprehensive health care of high quality be available to everyone in the State...."

Then we carried on in the CDC and said we ought to use Social Security to finance Medicare. We were specific on that.

DOUGLASS: I think it was pointed out in this study of the nineteen-member state committee, you really didn't address the federal side of it.

Purposely went the route of just dealing with the state of California.

ZETTERBERG: That's true. But you see this one general conclusion: "Prepayment for health service be extended to cover substantially the entire population of California." That looks to some kind of a structure that would do that. And, you see, we had the Social Security system already in place.

DOUGLASS: As you pointed out, you didn't get into any specifics of that.

ZETTERBERG: If we had been specific, as we were with the California Democratic Council a year later, I am sure that not everybody on this committee would have signed it. I would have guessed they would not. Maybe they would sign it now. I am sure they would.

DOUGLASS: The four task forces--on organization, financing, facilities, and personnel--were considered the major elements in the approach to health. I would gather that financing and organization would be absolutely key in how those tied together?

ZETTERBERG: Let me point out that Egeberg appointed these four subcommittees. Whereas, basically I

think, Breslow and the precursor committee set up the breakdown in the report itself. You see, the report itself has a whole series of different breakdowns. So you had two different structures there.

DOUGLASS: Right. Then, interestingly enough, it sounds like you worked pretty hard in this group because, in June, Egeberg appointed the four subcommittees, which were to address: prevention of illness, diagnosis and treatment, rehabilitation (which you were involved with), and population groups with special health problems. Now, do you recall why you were put on the rehabilitation subcommittee? You chaired that, didn't you?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I think I did most of the drafting or at least a large part of the original draft of the section on rehabilitation. That is because of my experience with Casa Colina, which was a rehabilitation hospital here in San Gabriel Valley, and is really the only such hospital now that does that kind of rehabilitation work.

DOUGLASS: Could you explain how you happened to get involved with Casa Colina?

ZETTERBERG: Back in 1950, there was a lot of infantile paralysis, poliomyelitis, in this area. And my nephew and my son, Alan [Zetterberg], were both stricken with polio. My nephew, who is now with the Rand Corporation, has had permanent problems with his arms because of that. He was in what you call an iron lung. My son was less injured, although he was out at Casa Colina as a rehabilitation hospital in Chino at the time.

Then I was asked to come on the board there along about 1950, and I was on it for somewhat over ten years. We discovered that the hospital out there in Chino was on an earthquake fault, and it was just bricks and stone and not reinforced. So we had to move or it would have been closed. So we were able to get grants of money for rehabilitation from the state hospital council.

DOUGLASS: Was that [Lester] Hill-[Clifford] Burton [Hospital Construction] federal money? Do you know?

ZETTERBERG: That was Hill-Burton money. There was an issue there, which I might mention in a minute. Anyhow, in going through that and

planning with the architects for the present Casa Colina, we had to think of all the different kinds of services that are necessary for rehabilitation. So that is how I happened to get on that particular thing.

DOUGLASS: What was the added comment you were going to make about the Hill-Burton financing?

ZETTERBERG: One of the problems we dealt with in the committee, I recall, is the private hospital versus the public community hospital. And there were lots of applications for funds for private hospitals by real estate developers who wanted to have the hospital located in an area, and then they would be able to sell the surroundings to supportive vendors. And it would be a good financial venture. Secondly, they were concerned that most private hospitals, maybe not most but many private hospitals, wanted to do the luxury-type service and not the community-type service.

DOUGLASS: Take the cream off the top?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. We were going in the direction of trying to have communitywide services. Russel Lee was the person who really espoused that in our studies in this committee. He

said, "We all should belong to a community hospital just like we belong to a school district." That was his central, and probably very good, thinking at that time. And so the Hill-Burton people, when they were hearing and granting funds, had to consider those two types of issues. Was there some real estate development behind the hospital that was asking for money? And was it primarily a private hospital that would not serve community needs? So that was basically two of the issues.

DOUGLASS: Very interesting. So this background helps explain why you were the lead person on this rehabilitation committee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember particularly who else was on that committee?

ZETTERBERG: I don't remember.

DOUGLASS: How about a professional group? In looking at members of the task forces, were there. . . ?

ZETTERBERG: I will see if this can refresh my recollection here. Well, I seem to recall discussions about Liberty Mutual Insurance Company. I don't see it on here. In the field of

workers' compensation, they had been a flag that had been saying to have rehabilitation is cheaper than paying money. So you had insurance companies that were paying for damages and for workers' comp wanting to rehabilitate people. I am trying to see if there is any other.

DOUGLASS: There is Occidental Life, Halverson.

ZETTERBERG: I just remember specifically Liberty Mutual and, of course, other insurance companies here. There is a difference in view between a hospital and the goal of rehabilitation. Hospitals tuck you in and keep you prepared for the doctor. Rehabilitation, as Egeberg said, "Get people at home and get them so they can blow their own noses." They can walk next door and talk with their neighbor, and so on. I remember very clearly that was one of the things that interested Egeberg. He is still interested in that and rehabilitation and activity for the aged. Anyway, that is more than you want to get into.

DOUGLASS: So you pretty well drafted the recommendations that appeared in the report? Is that right?

ZETTERBERG: That's my recollection.

DOUGLASS: It is an overall package. Are there any particular points in the recommendation of the committee you want to comment on? I have pulled it out for you, but it is in the document.

ZETTERBERG: I haven't reviewed that part of the study.

DOUGLASS: Here are the recommendations of that committee.

ZETTERBERG: Going down the list here, these are all things that the What are you asking me?

DOUGLASS: I was asking, are these all pretty equal in importance? Or were there any particular things that you felt very strongly about? There is a lot about the aged in here.

ZETTERBERG: OK. One of the things would be item 2, your principles of rehabilitation, that rehabilitation, like Casa Colina is called a hospital. Typically, in a hospital you have doctors who have their patients, and the doctors treat their patients in the hospital. It keeps them there for the benefit of the doctors and their services. In the rehabilitation you have to include other programs too. Educational programs, schools, physical therapy, occupational therapy, you

see. You had teams that you had to work with. That should be in here somewhere. Item 5 of the rehabilitation recommendation refers to facilities "staffed with teams of specialists." There was a different emphasis, in other words.

Anyhow, I am sure a lot of the stuff here in the rehabilitation section did come from the testimony of the committee. And it just happened that my own background had been in this.

DOUGLASS: Did these subcommittees, like the financing task force you were on, have people other than the board members? The rehabilitation subcommittee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The same way of operating.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And I see they are listed here but not broken down.

DOUGLASS: There was a transmittal letter to the governor which boiled down the committee's recommendations. I think I gave that to you yesterday.

ZETTERBERG: This is October 17, 1960. It is from Morgan Odell, who was the staff coordinator, to the members of the committee. Shall I read this?

DOUGLASS: That was a memo to the committee. I think he boiled down the essence of the recommendations of the committee. They seem to fall into certain elements. The first one is organization and distribution.

ZETTERBERG: Then extend prepayment and develop more financial support recommendation. Then economical and effective development of health facilities. Then provide manpower. Remember, we noted a shortage of supply of physicians in early manpower. Now we are into nursing shortages. Then we have prevention of illness and disability. Next is to provide more effective diagnosis and treatment of illness and disability. And to extend expanded and improved rehabilitation programs. Then to increase health services for certain groups of the population. And those groups would include such as: aged, children, public assistance recipients, ethnic minorities, seasonal agricultural workers, laborers, peoples in sparsely populated areas, and

delinquents and criminals. So that is a pretty good synopsis.

DOUGLASS: The other, the "Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations," in the report is very detailed.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Going back to what actually happened, towards the end, did the full committee get together very often?

ZETTERBERG: You mean towards the end?

DOUGLASS: Yes. For instance, to review the end product.

ZETTERBERG: We did not get together and vote on it, like a congressional committee might do, as I recollect. What happened was that through Breslow, and probably Morgan Odell, the committee was given a shot--each committee was given a shot--at all of these subjects that I have just been over. They were given a copy of the big report, draft form, and then asked to sign. Every single member of the committee reviewed the report, and every single member did sign it. That's the good part of the report, and also maybe the bad part because you have to take off a lot of the sharp

corners in order to get everybody to sign. I don't know.

DOUGLASS: So there wasn't some big discussion session where people said what they thought?

ZETTERBERG: No.

DOUGLASS: You received the document, which I think you said Breslow wrote pretty much, working from the records of all the work done?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then you read it and you signed off, unless you disagreed.

ZETTERBERG: I said Breslow had written it?

DOUGLASS: Oh, yes, and Morgan Odell.

ZETTERBERG: The staff under Morgan Odell did it. It has them listed. But Breslow was, I am sure, the one who checked through to see if it was correct and consistent.

DOUGLASS: What was the impact of the report, do you feel?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I don't know. [Laughing] It is probably too early to tell. It has only been out thirty years.

DOUGLASS: So you are waiting for the impact?

ZETTERBERG: But I noted the letter from [Herbert] Lintz. It is not listed here, but he is a doctor from

San Diego. He is now working as a doctor covering a number of retirement homes in the [San Francisco] Bay area. I noticed he wrote a letter saying that all of the recommendations of the committee were enacted by 1965.

DOUGLASS: Really?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. So that means we undershot it. The main thing in the delivery of health care services was the so-called one-door policy. We were trying for that. Three departments were combined into one department Hugo Fisher was head of. Then you are supposed to have, at the ground level, a one-door place where you can go and get help with problems. That is reflected to me only through my clients now, who oftentimes have problems with health care. But, anyhow, that's probably true.

DOUGLASS: First of all, it went to Governor Brown. And it wasn't the kind of scene where the seven of you went to Brown, this was just delivered to Brown as a document?

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: But how did he, or the people directly under him who would be impacted, respond to the

report? Do you recall any particular response?

ZETTERBERG: I don't remember. He was busy doing all kinds of things at that time.

DOUGLASS: The intent of this, I would gather, was to have legislation passed that would implement it?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Of the two legislators on the committee, did they each carry legislation to implement it? Cameron and Fisher?

ZETTERBERG: I don't remember now that part of it. I haven't reviewed that to track things down.

DOUGLASS: I did find in your file an interesting article from the Pomona Progress Bulletin, written in January 1961, in which Cameron is quoted as accusing some hospitals and insurance companies of "moral fraud and unethical practices." And he speaks about a program he will introduce to combat this. That is where I picked up the comment that only 5 percent of the premiums, it could be as bad as that, went to benefits. And he expected CMA opposition. He said his program would change this percentage. He also said he was interested in

putting Blue Cross and the California Physicians Service plans under the state insurance commissioner to regulate practices in cancelling policies. That was a subject of great concern, I gather?

ZETTERBERG: In fact, one of the things we arrived at, as I recall, was that when a person leaves coverage, that person has a right to continue with the policy, and wives. There is that, I guess you would call privilege, now. You still have a lot of fights going on with the state insurance commissioner in regard to cost of premiums and Proposition 103.

[End of Tape 3, Side B]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

DOUGLASS: One thing I noticed in the file was that Breslow wrote a letter in February of '61 and said the demand for the report was heavier than in the case of any other project he had been associated with. So there must have been a lot of interest.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The interest could be because this was a lightning rod or it could have been supportive interest. What would your judgment be?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I think that the fact that the governor had undertaken this kind of a project and report was itself of a lot of interest. We would have to ask Lester Breslow what kind of distribution he was talking about. In other words, who was asking for it?

DOUGLASS: For instance he did mention that Charles Johnston of the governor's office had asked for 500 copies. So that is obviously one major interest point.

ZETTERBERG: And then where did they go?

DOUGLASS: I was wondering if organized medicine might have been very interested, too. Meaning the CMA.

ZETTERBERG: I had seen reports before, usually by people like at UCLA or UC [University of California] who have done studies. But this was sort of a comprehensive thing, which still had good academic people working on it. So I think it would be of interest. Even though it is thirty years ago, I would have assumed that, even though it is just the California thing, that the national program would be interested in the technique, at least, that was used here. Maybe it takes too long a time. We only went, basically, for a period of two years this covered and came up with this. I think it was very kind of organizationally, and I had nothing to do with the organization, the organization was a good thing because it enabled using all these resources from various areas and coming up with a report. Which, even though the words were softened at some points, still was agreed upon, and it constituted a general direction of where the health care should go.

The CDC then went with specifics, or immediate things. But the CDC reports and

recommendations are the children of this governor's committee.

DOUGLASS: Right. I gathered--because you recently sent a letter to Hillary Clinton--that you still think this is a pilot or an example of what at the state level you did that could be helpful to what she is trying to do at the federal level?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And the introduction, and I don't know who wrote that introduction to this report, it is a two-page introduction, and it gives conceptually the problem.¹ And it is still a problem that we have today. I thought she should at least see. It is well written I think. It is a good introduction.

DOUGLASS: Looking ahead of this, it was in 1966 that Medicare was passed. Medicare and Medicaid. You were really leading into that. As you say, CDC more specifically addressed that. The need. So I was curious about a statement that by '65 this report was implemented on the state level.

ZETTERBERG: That may be a critical thing of the report because, you see, we are still trying to deal

1. See Appendix.

with the insurance problem, the duplications and the loss ratio.

DOUGLASS: In California?

ZETTERBERG: Right. And the insurance commissioner is still fighting on that. So it is not implemented.

DOUGLASS: Well, I did want to ask you. Did you play any role in the follow-up of this report, in terms of testimony or advocacy for legislation or policies?

ZETTERBERG: No and yes. [Laughing] At this point, the California Democratic Council was very powerful, as impecunious lobby groups go. But it represented roughly 70,000 members throughout the state. It was a grass-roots organization. And the recommendations from the California Democratic Council did get to a lot of the state legislators, who were, many of them, in office because of the California Democratic Council.

And so we had this issues conference in Santa Monica in March of 1961. The recommendations there, I am sure, got distributed to the people who were in the senate and assembly. So I was chairman of the

Health Care Issue Conference, and we had a very good group of people there. Very, very broad group of people who were not Democratic necessarily. They were in the issues conference because of their interest in health care. So it was still carrying on. That would be sort of a grandchild or child of this 1960 governor's report.

DOUGLASS: I see your point. That is the sense in which you continued to be an advocate.

ZETTERBERG: I brought a lawsuit. When Reagan became governor, he cut the services that were being done and cut the funding in the State Department of Public Health. He wrote me a nice letter, thanking me for being on the board, and sent me on my way.

But they were doing studies in health care that I thought were very important, at the department, including on smog. And I brought an action to require the State Department of Public Health to continue its studies. And I went up and talked with the people in the department, and they said they would be glad to follow through and do it. I had met with, I don't know, five or six people

in the group, the head people in the State Department of Public Health. If this action were successful, they would be pleased to proceed with their studies on smog. But they didn't hold much hope.

I lost that on appeal because the appellate court held that you can't tell an agency what to do. I was not trying to tell them what to do. I was trying to suggest that they should do what they thought needed to be done. But I lost that on appeal.

DOUGLASS: So, basically, you were questioning whether the governor could just arbitrarily cut a program that the department felt was worth doing?

ZETTERBERG: Right. Now they did not ask me to do that. But I went up and talked with them, and they would have been glad to continue their program to try and cut smog.

DOUGLASS: Did Reagan ostensibly do that for financial reasons? Or just as a policy he didn't particularly want to be carried out and cut? Was this part of budget cutting?

ZETTERBERG: My recollection was that I talked with them up there before I filed the action, and my

recollection was that they were sort in midstream in their work and they would like to continue it. I was not representing them. It was just a citizen's action. So I got shot down.

DOUGLASS: So was that about '66, when Reagan first came in to office?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. It was about '66.

DOUGLASS: So you persisted.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: The 1961 CDC issues conference was in an interesting setting because at that point there were a lot of people going to the convention who were fairly newly elected. If you take the '58 sweep, you had all the constitutional officers, except for Secretary of State Frank Jordan.

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: And they were expected to come to this convention, according to what I read, and Brown was going to make a speech. In other words, I am trying to get the setting of the convention. Democrats were feeling pretty heady, I suppose, at that point?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But I have to say that--you have seen my file on the health care part of that convention--I was pretty heavily involved with that. I had to do a lot of recruiting of people to come and preparation of discussions outlines, and so on. So it was not one of the CDC conventions that I was sitting in on the main thing. I was off to one side here.

DOUGLASS: You were very busy. The issue conferences format, perhaps you could explain how it connects with the overall convention. In other words, this is the big annual meeting of CDC.

ZETTERBERG: I don't think that's necessarily true. We had the issues convention, and then we had organizational conventions. It seemed to me that we had two meetings in 1961. One was in February and one was in July. I may be wrong on that. The organizational part.

DOUGLASS: As I read the brief in your file, it said that the conference went from March 3 to March 5, and the 4th was the day the issues conference was held. Then I remember you were going to be through by 3:30 [P.M.] on that. That was a Saturday. And there were going to be

preprimary endorsements. Then the next day the convention was meeting. They had to elect officers. So that particular year they seemed to be conjoined.

ZETTERBERG: I am trying to recall here. I talked with Joe Wyatt, and he was president from 1957 through February (he thinks) of 1961.

DOUGLASS: That would figure.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And then Tom Carvey became president of CDC. I think you are right. I guess I am wrong on. . . . I thought there was a meeting in July of that year. In '57, Alan Cranston (he was president from '53 to '55) resigned to run for state controller. And the vice president was Glenn Anderson, and he resigned to run for lieutenant governor. So that's where Joe Wyatt came in and became president. He had been secretary, as I recall. Well, you are right.

DOUGLASS: Then at this convention Carvey was elected to replace Wyatt.

ZETTERBERG: Now this convention was in Santa Monica in March?

DOUGLASS: March 4 was the issues conference. It was March 3 to 5.

ZETTERBERG: So OK. What?

DOUGLASS: Because you were involved with issues conferences in various ways and we are following the health care subject right now, I was interested in how these issues conferences worked. In looking at your files, as to the steps you went through in order to get ready and then how you did it during that day in order to come up with some kind of group consensus.

ZETTERBERG: OK. Now my recollection is at that this conference it was Marvin Schachter of Pasadena, who was a very able person, who was head of the issues conference. Is that correct?

DOUGLASS: That's what I understand.

ZETTERBERG: And he was really on top of that. He wasn't just figurehead.

DOUGLASS: Who was Marvin Schachter? Was he a lawyer?

ZETTERBERG: Marvin Schachter was not a lawyer. He started working in retail sales to finance his education. He had a lot of graduate education, but he found that he was so successful in marketing that he couldn't afford to leave it.

DOUGLASS: He was just "marketing," not marketing some particular thing?

ZETTERBERG: He was with a marketing firm that was out on what is now the Interstate 10 freeway, right where the freeway bends, near San Gabriel, to go towards Los Angeles. He was in charge of basement sales. Would you believe it? Eventually, he had his own retail concern-- maybe he still does--he was out here talking for CAMASU [Claremont Association for Mutual American-Soviet Understanding] here a year ago at the Presbyterian Church. He still is very active. He also wrote a radio program, as I recall. He is a very bright guy. His brother also was a lecturer of Yale Law School, as I remember.

DOUGLASS: So Marvin Schachter was hands-on with this conference?

ZETTERBERG: Hands-on. He has a very good mind. Anyway, he had me doing this issue on public medical care. And I had the benefit of all the people who had been tapped for information on that governor's committee. You see the committee we had there. You have seen the file of all the letters that I wrote inviting people to

come, and their comments. Shall I just go down the list quickly?

DOUGLASS: Yes. Quickly mention the people you had on your committee.

ZETTERBERG: All right. We had Assemblyman [Philip] Phil Burton, who was chairman of the assembly committee on social welfare. We had [Arthur] Art Carstens, with UCLA, Industrial Relations. We had Ted Ellsworth, also at UCLA.

DOUGLASS: You had mentioned him on the other committee.

ZETTERBERG: And we had [Robert J.] Bob Erickson, an attorney in San Francisco who was a very able guy. Then we had Goldie Krantz, who was secretary of the International Longshore Workers Union and their welfare fund. We had Philip Lee, who I have mentioned before, who was Russel Lee's son, Palo Alto Medical Clinic. Cricket Levering, assistant to the chaplain of the Claremont Colleges, who did a lot of the research work, very ably for the issues conference on medical care and had done research for stuff that was done for Pat Brown earlier. Harry Polland, the economist from San Francisco, I mentioned. [Gareth W.] Gary Sadler. He's an attorney who later became

state director of savings and loan associations, if you will pardon the expression, on Brown's appointment. He was my law partner for a period preceding his appointment.

DOUGLASS: Oh, was he. In Claremont?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. He was in Pasadena, and I realized that he wanted to. . . . He had a lot of cases and so he became a partner in my firm, and shortly thereafter Brown appointed him. So I had his cases and had to follow through with his clients. And David Solomon, M.D. He is a very good medical doctor, thinking about health care things. Don Vial was Director of Research and Education, California Labor Federation. And [E. Richard] Dick Weinerman, M.D., who is one of the real creative doctors in the medical care field, and he died in a plane crash going to advise one of the governments of eastern Europe on health care programs. These guys were all on the committee.

Other guys came too. For example, Governor Brown sent Alexander Pope, who is still a good friend of mine. He was one of

the secretaries to Brown, and I think Brown put him down there to see what in the world we were doing with his report. But he participated and helped draft the thing.

DOUGLASS: Did the committee ever meet all together?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. We met. We met in Santa Monica, and we broke up into little subgroups.

DOUGLASS: No. I meant did you meet ahead of time? I am talking about preconference activity.

ZETTERBERG: No. This was the committee for this particular issues conference, and we had correspondence. You have seen the file on that. And we had suggestions, like there was one letter I recall from Daniel Blain, who was head of Brown's [State] Department of Mental Hygiene, for example. We had people sending in suggestions. And there were others who were not on this committee that came too. I don't think of the names.

DOUGLASS: What I was really trying to find was if any people helped you with that study paper. Because isn't the exercise such that it begins with a study paper?

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: And that was your assignment.

- ZETTERBERG: Yes. But I prepared the study paper ahead of time.
- DOUGLASS: I am talking about the preparatory period. This was the major thing you did?
- ZETTERBERG: Well, the study paper was made up of material that I had learned during the governor's committee.
- DOUGLASS: Right. But was this important because how was this going to be used?
- ZETTERBERG: OK. It is about four of five pages long, and it was sent out to the committee ahead of time. It had, just taken at large, some, you might call, dissenting views from people of it and supporting views. There was a letter from T. Eric Reynolds. He had been the head of the CMA in California. And there was a letter from a local physician, Charles Gill, who is still alive.
- DOUGLASS: Yes, I saw that in the file.
- ZETTERBERG: He is a very stalwart, independent person. We had a thing in here from him. Then we had a bibliography for people, which was about a page and a half long.

DOUGLASS: To try to outline here how an issues conference works. First, you did the study paper, and your committee saw that.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. We sent it out to each member of the committee.

DOUGLASS: Was this paper used in the clubs and in the regions?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know how it was used. I don't know whether it was sent to units of the California Democratic Council, apart from members of the committee. I assume it probably was because a lot of people participated in this that were from various Democratic clubs.

DOUGLASS: Let me just help out here in a way. In going through your files, I found reference to how this was being organized. It said that the papers--I remember at a meeting you were the only person who recorded actually having your paper done--were going to be used by clubs. That perhaps a club would devote one meeting to an issue.

ZETTERBERG: I guess that's right.

DOUGLASS: And then they would also be used at the regional level for a meeting. So I gather this was sort of an educational preparation

type of exercise to get people up for the actual conference.

ZETTERBERG: You are reminding me now that Marvin Schachter had organized it so that for every issue there would be a paper.

DOUGLASS: So the paper was pretty important because it set the stage?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I think that's true. I have found here--you have extracted from the files--discussion questions, a list of questions which I presumed that I prepared. But I probably relied heavily on Dick Weinerman's outline and discussion.

Now, can I say just a word about discussions?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

ZETTERBERG: The CDC way of operating in clubs, as well as in the issues conferences, was to have discussions on issues and not to have top-down directives from legislators, for example. So we were following that in the issues conference in 1961. And I see here you have made copies of the three-page, basically single-spaced list of questions for discussion. When we met in Santa Monica, we

would have used this to break up into smaller groups, assigning these people to the groups. The discussions would then be reported back to the committee of the whole. That is just a sort of a self-starting way of getting things going.

DOUGLASS: I did pick up you said that you expected about 400 people to come to that issue meeting. Which is a lot of people.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then did you divide them into subgroups that were discussion groups and then you pulled the group together in a plenary session?

ZETTERBERG: That is my recollection. Right.

DOUGLASS: So it would be in one of those plenary sessions that people would come to some sort of consensus?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I can't remember specifically what we did, but the way we were working at that time was drawn pretty much from the brainstorming thing that came out of UCLA. Helen Myers.

DOUGLASS: Oh, Helen Myers and the group-dynamics approach.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. You were trying to have groups that would draw forth discussion, and then you had someone who would record the discussion.

DOUGLASS: In fact, you have a letter in there asking her to be a discussion leader.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: So you spotted various people?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. The reference to Helen Myers because she did that with the Los Angeles County Democratic Central Committee earlier with this technique.

DOUGLASS: So apparently what you came up with was a policy statement. We have found a draft of a policy statement.

ZETTERBERG: I am sure that this draft was really accepted and agreed to. The issues conference itself did not generally have much debate about what the issues subcommittees did.

DOUGLASS: They pretty much agreed to what you had done?

ZETTERBERG: You and I have talked about that some of my papers were sent up to Sacramento. We can't find them. But I am sure this that we have here--it says proposed draft, that's redundant--proposed draft statement of medical care with CDC issues conference. And I am

sure this is the first cousin once-removed of the list of stuff from the governor's committee.

DOUGLASS: Remember we found two statements in your file. One draft is a policy statement, which I think you may have brought with you to the conference. And the other may be what resulted. We discussed that. Do you think the one with less changes in it, "The Proposed Draft Statement on Medical Care," is probably the one that was passed?¹

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I would look at this two-page thing with a lot of interlineations and check marks. And that, to me, would mean that the interlineations by the drafting committee that worked--I am sure that we had that session--made these changes, and the check marks mean that they were accepted. So somewhere in the CDC files, if they still have them, they have that particular statement.

DOUGLASS: And this other document may have been something you pulled together before the actual conference?

1. See Appendix.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I see I've got some interlineations on that also. The first one is a list of separate points in little short paragraphs. This [other] is more of a text, and it might have been used, too. I think this draft of the CDC medical policy statement, which is in paragraph form, is in some ways really a better thing than what the governor's committee came up with. But it is the result of the governor's committee. The thing is that the members of the governor's committee would not all have signed this particular thing.

For example, there is a recommendation of using Social Security for financing medical care for the aged. See, that wasn't specifically in the governor's report, but that's where it came from.

DOUGLASS: Incidentally, there was reference to the fact that you were getting a keynoter for your area. Someone who sets off your particular issue. Do you remember who you got as a keynoter? This is supposed to be the big inspirational speaker who starts things off.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

- DOUGLASS: I think you had asked Governor [Abraham A.] Ribicoff, and he couldn't come.
- ZETTERBERG: Oh, you are talking about the general CDC Issues Conference?
- DOUGLASS: I thought we were talking about your health issues keynoter. Because each issue chairman was supposed to get someone to be a leadoff speaker.
- ZETTERBERG: Then they would be proselyting people who were coming anyway. I can't remember. I guess that we may have used Richard Weinerman, M.D., but I can't remember for sure. My files indicate he wrote a paper for our use at the conference.
- DOUGLASS: All right. To wind this up, the convention would adopt these policies, and they would become part of CDC's active legislative program?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes.
- DOUGLASS: As a group, they would pursue these through the governor and the legislature?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. And I have tried to find the 1961 issues committee report from CDC, and I cannot find it. It must have been sent up to Sacramento. But I am sure, reading this stuff that you

have really dug out of my files, that's the way it would have been done.

DOUGLASS: And so, actually, what we don't really know is what happened after that. In other words, CDC probably did testify at hearings on proposed bills?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Because now they are really committed very specifically. Would you consider then that as a satisfactory end point of your organized work on health?

ZETTERBERG: I am still going. [Laughing]

DOUGLASS: Well, I meant coming out of the report.

ZETTERBERG: I know. I am kidding. That is the really end product, to have it in this way. Because then, in 1961, you can say to reluctant legislators, an organization of 70,000 members, and clubs, throughout the whole state have come up with this as an issues program which is drawn from resources from the field.
[Interruption]

DOUGLASS: That is fascinating. So if Hillary Clinton gets interested, you have the collective experience for her.

ZETTERBERG: She probably won't have time to get into ancient history, but the problem is that these things are still there. We still have duplication of operating costs and duplication of insurance coverage. We have another thing. We have even duplication in the Medicare thing. I've got my own little situation with Medicare recently from one of the insurance companies that are doing the kind of job they are good at, namely trying to cut costs of people's providers. They sent me a five-page thing with one page in each letter.

[Laughter] So they sent me five envelopes. I don't know how that came about. One document and in five different envelopes.

DOUGLASS: Looking back at this exercise you were involved in, starting with the small committee and through the [governor's committee] report and then to CDC, do you think this was sort of ahead of its time, in terms of the national picture?

ZETTERBERG: I think it was ahead of its time because I think its time is still there. For example, Lester Breslow. He was director of public health in California. He is now professor of

public health at UCLA, but he is working in the same area, the Watts area, in providing health care and trying to figure out ways to handle things.

He said that he had been working on a plan which is very similar to what Clinton had announced. He is still working on this plan. He told me that he was thinking that another way to expand the application of Social Security was to go to the other end of the age scale and apply it to younger people who don't have care, don't have insurance, and cover younger people. That is a way of increasing the use of the Social Security system.

DOUGLASS: That is an interesting idea.

ZETTERBERG: Of course, we keep thinking of, you know, we are [at age] sixty-five, how about sixty-two, how about sixty, how about covering the whole population? He says start with the uninsured people in the children's area, where they really need care, where they aren't getting it, especially in the poor areas. And I would like to get that to Hillary Clinton. I am trying to get his name before them. As you see in that letter that you mentioned, I

mentioned both Breslow and Roger Egeberg, who is right handy there to her.

DOUGLASS: That would coordinate with her interest in children, too.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. [Congressman] Henry Waxman, who is a CDC person and very active in health care, told me he was probably going to use Lester Breslow to testify when his committee gets it. I have heard that Waxman is taking a neutral stance on the Hillary Clinton report until then. But, anyhow, Breslow may be able to get his ideas across yet.

DOUGLASS: So the original group is still out there pounding the table?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, it is still there. I don't really know how old Egeberg is now. He was older than I was when he took this thing.

DOUGLASS: Of these three experiences, the small committee, the 1960 governor's committee, and the CDC issue chairmanship you did, as far as something you experienced, what was the most exciting?

ZETTERBERG: The most exciting was the six-person committee. Because you see them reluctant to talk at first with each other--they have to go

through their directors--and realizing they could talk and sharing ideas from their different areas that dovetailed. That was the most exciting.

The most interesting, intellectually, to me was listening to all the stuff on the governor's study committee and being able to put together conceptually a statement on health care; and the CDC medical issue conference. That was the most interesting thing, personally, you know, doing that.

DOUGLASS: And that was the fountain from which the rest of it flowed pretty much?

ZETTERBERG: I don't know. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: The '61 issues conference, what was the attitude of Brown towards that, do you know, in terms of what you were doing in medical care?

ZETTERBERG: Well, as I said, he did send one of his secretaries down on this particular thing. Alexander Pope. Pope was his secretary, not the poet.

DOUGLASS: Yes, I understand. Was he the one who became an assessor for Los Angeles County?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. He is a very, very able guy. I see him every once in awhile at legal meetings. I think I probably owe him a lot. He was very helpful. He became a workhorse on the CDC committee. I am sure some of these things on this draft are suggestions of his.

DOUGLASS: To get back to clarify one point, did this committee every meet physically before the conference?

ZETTERBERG: You are pointing to this committee, you are pointing to the CDC issue committee on health?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

ZETTERBERG: I think we didn't. It is enough of an expense to get people to fly down from north.

DOUGLASS: So it was by letter or phone or various communications? Mailing materials?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I noticed the papers that were in your file-- the one by Weinerman and one by Lee--were those circulated to the committee? Or were those just for your information and background?

ZETTERBERG: Weinerman's outline is attached to one of the appendices in the study paper.

DOUGLASS: But there are several papers in there.

ZETTERBERG: They are pretty long. Yes.

DOUGLASS: They had been delivered at various conferences. So they were background for you?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: That winds it up, unless you have any parting words on the issues conference.

ZETTERBERG: Sorry. Like all lawyers, too many words for what they have to say.

DOUGLASS: No, no. Very concise. Thanks.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Session 3, May 9, 1993]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

DOUGLASS: What I would like to do is pick up on a couple of loose ends in this interview. When we were talking about the governor's committee in the last session, we did not specifically go over his charge to the committee. Do you have that in front of you? Basically, the nature of my question is: do you think that the committee met the charge, more than met the charge, didn't meet the charge?

ZETTERBERG: Was this to the . . . ?

DOUGLASS: This was to the large governor's committee.

ZETTERBERG: The large governor's committee. That charge, by the way, was drafted by the small committee.

DOUGLASS: The small predecessor committee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I am sure we gave that; this is the way it should be outlined.

DOUGLASS: You were on a steady course, as the person directly involved in that?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: So as you look at these four charges, do you feel like you went more than the distance?

ZETTERBERG: Well, let's see. Shall I go over them?

DOUGLASS: Yes.

ZETTERBERG: Number one is to study broadly citizens' health needs. Number two, investigate "present provision for and cost of health services." Number three, outline long-range health program and its support. Number four, recommend immediate specific action to assure high standards of medical and health care for California.

DOUGLASS: Now that is a big assignment?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, that is. What was your question?

DOUGLASS: The question is did you feel that the committee had minimally met the charge, maximally met the charge, or just met the charge? In other words, do you think that went beyond the distance?

ZETTERBERG: Well, I guess the answer to that is twofold. We had this sort of book, Health Care for California. It is, in many ways, a wish list

of those who wished to have better health care. This is the report of the governor's committee.

DOUGLASS: It seemed very thorough to me. In the last session we did not state the charge, what you were being asked to do specifically.

ZETTERBERG: That was it. You remember the seven-person committee?

DOUGLASS: Right.

ZETTERBERG: When this was converted to a larger committee, they were very careful--and this was Governor Brown's thought but it was also the thought of our committee--to get health care providers in a majority on the committee. So, from that standpoint, I think it was very good. The results are very good, because what would you expect? You would expect more of the same from each of the interest groups. The doctors, the nurses, the dentists, the osteopaths. All of the people.

DOUGLASS: But that was part of the politics of it, though. That was so inclusive in bringing those voices to the table.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Particularly the doctors, to not feel threatened. And I think I have told you one

of the doctors who had been the former president of the California Medical Association soon afterwards left the practice of medicine and entered into public health work. So that was a real plus right there.

DOUGLASS: But in terms of the written document, let's say, do you think that you fulfilled the charge?

ZETTERBERG: Yes, except, like [Ralph Waldo] Emerson said, "You hitch your wagon to a star and maybe you will clear the tree tops," the appendix is pretty thin in specifics.

DOUGLASS: Yes, but the body of it is what we are talking about because that is what most people will look at.

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: Obviously, it was intended for both the governor and more of the lay public?

ZETTERBERG: And for the legislature. Yes. The one thing that really stands out in my mind is that everybody agreed that every person in California, without regard to ability to pay, should have access to health care. That is what we are still wrestling with on the national scene. Then how do you get it more

or less started up, taking little footsteps in that direction? Like, at that time we were short on hospitals. And number two, where hospitals were going in, they were often private hospitals for the convenience of real estate developers, and they were trying to get some program to place hospitals.

And, secondly, trying to increase educational opportunities for doctors. California has never really produced the doctors it needs. The doctors were being educated by eastern medical schools, and now more recently, as you know, by Asiatic schools. This is where we are getting our doctors. So that was one of the objects. In my mind, I remember I had a strong background in law school in antitrust work. I, myself, felt that if we could have more doctors, we would have more competition. And, therefore, more available health care at a lower price. That is pretty simplistic, but still it has some validity, I think.

DOUGLASS: Interestingly enough, I was reading an article in a hospital journal about the nineties. It was going over the history of hospitals in

California. The fact is that California has always attracted a lot of doctors. Then the article relates part of that to today's escalating costs of health care because we have so many doctors, particularly some of the specialists, who find things to do so that it is kind of a catch-22 situation. But there was a definite shortage of doctors in the period you are talking about here?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And I am not sure, looking at the report, but a shortage of family doctors. What we used to call general practitioners.

DOUGLASS: The other thing I wanted specifically to deal with, which I failed to do last time, was to go over your dissents. You have the report there. I think you were the only person who was listed as having dissenting opinions.

ZETTERBERG: No. In the hospital section there was a long dissent by Harry Polland.

DOUGLASS: Sorry. I was watching for the name Zetterberg. Why don't we take it from the beginning of the first section, "Paying for Personal Health Services," in which you dissented from the recommendations. It is number eleven.

ZETTERBERG: Of course, as we say in the courts, it speaks for itself.

DOUGLASS: Number eleven was listed as one of the immediate objectives: "Reimbursement for prepaid health services received by an individual be no more than the actual cost of services rendered." Would you speak to your dissent to that?

ZETTERBERG: One of the things that we discovered in our studies was that oftentimes particular health situations are covered by two or three layers of insurance. What I was saying here in my dissent was that the insurance companies should not be allowed to keep the profit of double payment. In other words, if the person has paid for two or three policies, he should have the benefit of that.

DOUGLASS: If they are paying for overlapping coverage.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I think that is an important point. People are still wrestling with that today. The other really interesting thing is that I pulled this article in yesterday's Los Angeles Times. Maybe you saw this. The headline is "Clinton Plans to Meld Workers' Comp, Auto

Insurance in the Health Care System." Did you see that?

ZETTERBERG: I saw the headline.

DOUGLASS: The point of it is that they are considering in Hillary Clinton's task force recommendation to put the whole thing together. We are talking about medical care. You have auto insurance, workers' comp, and regular health insurance. What they are saying is that in the national program they might try to package it. So you would not be double paying in, and neither are you double receiving benefits. It makes sense. It is kind of a novel idea.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Well, of course, this would be insurance of a person injured. Auto insurance. . . .

DOUGLASS: They are talking about the facet of auto insurance that deals with medical care. Also, workers' compensation.

ZETTERBERG: One thing occurs to me which is how the premium is paid on that. For example, on the workers' compensation, if the worker himself is covered with his own insurance, then that shifts the tax burden to him from the industry for which he works.

The same is true, in another way, with auto insurance. It shifts the burden from the person who caused an accident to the person who carries the medical insurance. But, as you point out, that is very much a no-fault approach. And I suppose this is something that is funded in such a way that the burden of the insurance on those aspects is carried by the injured person.

DOUGLASS: Your dissent speaks to that situation, it seems to me. You are saying that in the various ways they are covered, they should not be penalized.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Let's go to Number thirteen, which says that the state should "extend its premium rate regulating authority to all organizations providing for prepayment of health services, including commercial insurance, nonprofit corporations, medical partnerships and others." Would you speak to why you differed from that?

ZETTERBERG: I might say that too often the state insurance premium rate regulations develop into carrier control price fixing. This is not just in

insurance. So oftentimes your governmental agency. . . . For example, the Interstate Commerce Commission, it seemed to me, developed into a way of the carriers setting freight prices.

DOUGLASS: In other words, they become a real arm of the industry that is involved?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. That is what I was aiming at there.

DOUGLASS: These are all still quite valid points today.

ZETTERBERG: Of course, now they are talking about controlled competition. And controlled by whom? If it is the insurance companies that are doing it, then you have exactly that situation.

DOUGLASS: Then to go on to the section on "Health Manpower for California."

ZETTERBERG: You skipped the hospital one ["Hospitals for a Growing California"]. I had a dinky one there.

DOUGLASS: Pick it up then.

ZETTERBERG: That is the one that had a long dissent by Harry Polland, who was a San Francisco economist. This thing is really pretty long.

DOUGLASS: Why don't you speak to your statement and then refer to his?

ZETTERBERG: Fine. I say, "I concur." [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: Oh, you concur with him, is that it?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But I do say that . . .

DOUGLASS: What is the recommendation that he is dissenting from?

ZETTERBERG: All right. Let's check that. To attain the goal of hospitals for a growing California, the committee recommends [Number one]: "The State establish a basis through which regions of California can develop long-range programs for coordinated expansion and use of hospitals and related health facilities and services. The State Department of Public Health should...." That is a trick word. "Should" (is a very handy word to have) "be responsible for developing regional plans based on recommendations of Regional Advisory Councils composed of representatives of the public, hospitals and physicians. State funds for administration of the program should be appropriated."

Number two: "The State make funds available to counties for local programs

designed to reduce need for hospital beds through rehabilitation and related health care should be extended." That reflects Roger Egeberg's very strong feeling, which is very valid. He used to say that if you can get a person out of bed and get him to wipe his own nose and get him to be able to go next door and visit a neighbor, you have done an awful lot. He pointed out that the health care management of hospitals was designed to have patients in bed, pristine, ready for the doctors to come and service them. And the nurses are trained to do that. And that's counter to the idea of rehabilitation. That is a good suggestion. It picks up his idea.

DOUGLASS: So you said, "Amen" to that?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Also, [Number 3], "The State establish a program to guarantee construction loans by banks and other lending agencies to nonprofit community hospitals...." That emphasizes nonprofit community hospitals rather than the smaller for-profit hospitals that take the clean stuff and leave the accidents and emergencies and all that.

DOUGLASS: That take the easy money?

- ZETTERBERG: The easy money. Now let me just read what Harry Polland says about this. It is pretty long.
- DOUGLASS: Just a little bit.
- ZETTERBERG: He says: "This chapter deals in an unsatisfactory way with the most important issue raised by the Governor's Committee: the need to develop effective regional planning of California's health services. It limits its efforts to a program to control the mushrooming of substandard proprietary hospitals. Important as this problem is, it is only one of many hospital problems, and it can be dealt with more directly than proposed by regulations requiring all hospitals to conform to reasonable standards...." You have a copy?
- DOUGLASS: Yes. I can check the text. I think this gives the gist of it. OK, so you were making the point that serving the patients and being in the community, serving the appropriate community, is what the hospitals should be doing. Is that right?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes. But it does go on to say that the "major emphasis of this chapter is on saving money

rather than on creating an efficient and economical hospital system that meets the needs of our people." And he says there are a multitude of omissions. I can see that because it is a very big problem.

I said, number 1, that I concurred with his analysis. And, number 2, "More attention should be given to specific ways of reducing the high cost of hospital care in California." Number three, "I do not think that capitalization charges and loans costs should be billed to patients in the form of high fees for hospital services; such practices makes the sick people and those least able to pay bear the capital costs of hospitals."

Number four, "The accounting practices whereby hospitals make 'income-producing' charges on certain items should be reviewed and eliminated." Number five, "Dr. Russel Lee's suggestion...." He was the head of the Palo Alto Clinic and his son is very active at the present time, Dr. Philip Lee, in the planning of the Clinton program. "Dr. Russel Lee's suggestion for dividing hospitals into less expensive 'going in' and 'coming out'

areas, in addition to the 'in' portions of the hospital should be given consideration for future hospital activities."

He said you ought to have like a motel right next to the hospital, and when a person has been in the hospital a short time, he should be transferred to a low-cost motel. There were some studies shown in some of our hearings--I think they were mostly in the East Coast, New York--that hospital charge times tended to coincide with times when the money would run out. Like, it would be seven days and then you are out. [Laughter] And then maybe the next time it would be two weeks, you see. And that that didn't seem to relate necessarily to the medical need.

DOUGLASS: All right. Then now shall we go to the health manpower section?

ZETTERBERG: OK. My dissent is pretty long under that. [Laughter] It is pretty long-winded.

DOUGLASS: Under the recommendations, Number one, which was "to expand medical educational capacity in private and public institutions." That the state should fund 200 additional first-year places in public medical schools and "help

meet the educational costs borne by medical schools by providing students at all California medical schools with funds to pay additional charges...."

You dissented to that. Could you state what you disagreed with in that?

ZETTERBERG: I said, "I believe that many of the organizational and financial problems of medical care in California would be solved, at least in part, by increasing the number of physicians available in California. However, I do not approve recommendation 1.b in its present form." What is 1.b?

DOUGLASS: Section 1.b was to help the costs met by medical schools by providing students with funds to pay additional charges that would more nearly cover the actual costs of medical education.

ZETTERBERG: I say, "In addition to administrative and technical difficulties this recommendation runs counter to other Statewide educational programs. In other programs the State is assuming the responsibility of providing college facilities to take care of the population shift to California and the

population growth of California; in this recommendation, it appears that an effort is made to shift this assumption of responsibility to private organizations. I feel that State should meet the needs for medical schools squarely and set its sights high...."

DOUGLASS: All right. So, basically, your dissent stated that you felt it was the responsibility of the state of California to provide medical training facilities?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: And with reference to committee recommendation number two, you made the same comment with reference to dental schools. It is exactly the same.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Especially where it is the population growth. That is a problem the state has to deal with.

DOUGLASS: Actually, I think the reason it is interesting to go through these is the problems are still there. And these comments that you made at this time are things you still, as you speak, seem to concur with. Let me just look at the answers here.

ZETTERBERG: I am sorry to be so long-winded.

DOUGLASS: I am trying not to just read from the text. All right. "Diagnosis and Treatment," Chapter 8. The first recommendation is that all "Californians have a personal physician as the key element in medical care." I thought your dissenting comment was pretty interesting because you seem to be talking to the fact that there is more than one physician involved. It is a matter of teamwork. And you made it parallel with and compared it to the legal profession.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I was suggesting that you need a team. You need different skills to treat illness and what we are trying to aim for now, apparently, is to have the primary-care physician, which means someone who knows the whole person, and then refer to the experts. And the trouble financially is that everybody in medical school wants to be an expert.

And I had an experience with Casa Colina Rehabilitation Center where the patient was in the, as they called it and still call it, hospital, but what was done for the patient was the result of teamwork. The doctor, the

nurse, the occupational therapist, the physical therapist, and so on. In other words, if you deal with the whole person, then you must have parallel skills--parallel personnel with skills--dealing with it.

DOUGLASS: As you think back to 1960 and what we are dealing with now, do you think the times has arrived? The problem is still there. Would you say the tendency now is more a team approach in the way doctors are setting up their practices?

ZETTERBERG: I think you are right on the facility and the hospital. At Pomona Valley [Medical Center] they had a very good physical rehabilitation program, and the doctors would simply give a prescription, "Physical therapy as required." You see, the doctor didn't know what he was prescribing. That is to say, the physical therapist did. But, on the other hand, there was a great article in The New Yorker, two or three years ago, on a New England general practitioner, showing how he, as one person, dealt with all the facets of the lives of his patients. And he would know psychologically, physiologically, and so on, more about the

patient than simply treating the one item. So maybe that is an alternative that I hadn't thought of.

DOUGLASS: Under that same section, number five, the recommendation that there be "Regional Medical Disciplinary Committees, composed of five physicians" elected by licensed physicians and surgeons from each region. And also this would apply to osteopaths. You made an interesting comment in terms of your attitude toward governmental policy-making. I wonder if you could just comment on how you should discipline professions?

ZETTERBERG: OK. We shouldn't give the disciplinary function over to the tender mercies of the groups to be disciplined. Can I just say a little footnote to that? I am aware that there is in Sacramento an organization that can discipline physicians, and dentists, too, if you get over a certain value amount on a claim. And the effect of that is to make the dentists and physicians resist settlement of claims, which then means that the case goes to court.

I just got through with one of those situations, where the doctor didn't want to be on the list up in Sacramento. And so we actually went to an arbitration trial, and the damages were greater than they might have been arrived at if there hadn't been this sort of ceiling. There are some problems to be worked out there, but I am sure it has some beneficial effect in making doctors--they don't like to be judged by their own doctors--so, in some ways, I am looking at too thin a slice of it.

DOUGLASS: In that kind of a situation that you just handled, is there any tendency to go to this rent-a-judge type concept? To not wait until it goes through court but come at it from this other direction?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. The society's desire to punish criminals has had an impact on the courts so that it is hard--in both the federal courts and state courts--to get a case to come to trial.

DOUGLASS: You can wait four of five years, almost?

ZETTERBERG: And then in five years it is chopped off, under California state procedures. That then

puts it back to the courts to start the trial. So you have a lot of ADR, Alternative Dispute Resolutions, which is working pretty well, as long as you have the fact that a jury of twelve people can still, in the background, make a determination.

DOUGLASS: So, in other words, you could appeal from that situation still to a trial by jury?

ZETTERBERG: That's right. That works against me in my case because the lady is eighty-five years old, if you wait for several years, she might not be alive.

DOUGLASS: To wind this up, I found one more dissent in that section, recommendation number seven. The California Hospital Association's "Guiding Principles for Hospitals" and the CMA's "Guiding Principles for Physician-Hospital Relationships" would be adopted by hospitals and their medical staffs. You took a policy stand on that.

ZETTERBERG: As I look at it very quickly, I am just saying that we shouldn't give over to private groups. If we want to make guidelines, the public should make them and not private organizations. There are two sides to that.

DOUGLASS: Fine. I thought your differences of opinion, which were obviously minority opinions, were pretty interesting. Otherwise, it seemed to be pretty smooth sailing?

ZETTERBERG: I think it was smooth sailing from a personal standpoint. We had good working relationships with all the members of the nineteen-person committee.

DOUGLASS: Let's move to your appointment to the California Board of Public Health. You were appointed on January 21, 1959, by Pat Brown. That was right after his election to the governorship. We earlier discussed about his asking you about your interests.

The person who chaired the board was Charles Smith. who was equivalent to a professional representative on the board. You were replacing Mr. Francis A. Walsh, whose term had expired, and the usual routine was gone through of the change in board membership that goes with a change in governors.

ZETTERBERG: The terms were four years, and I had two appointments. I went out in 1967, and Reagan was elected in '66. So when he came in

office, he sent me a nice note, thanking me for my service, and sent me on my way.

DOUGLASS: I made a list of what the function of this board was. In other words, what the State Department of Public Health did at that time. At this time, there was the Department of Mental Hygiene and the State Department of Public Health. Later on, the Reagan administration, in '73, established a new State Department of Health, which was to combine all agencies into one big department. I am just giving you the overall picture of the structure on the state government side.

The list of functions is to remind you that you were on a board that was overseeing the department that had those responsibilities.

ZETTERBERG: I recall that Pat Brown was organizing the state government into departments. You remember Hugo Fisher, who was a state senator who was on our committee, under Pat Brown he became head of a superdepartment which had at least nominal supervision over the State Department of Public Health and the Department of Mental Hygiene.

DOUGLASS: Looking at the list there, this is just to remind you what that department was responsible for. You made a comment to me that you of the board were sort of flunkies to the medical industry. I wondered if you could explain what you meant by that?

ZETTERBERG: Gee, is that my word? Maybe it was.

DOUGLASS: You said it on another occasion. You had referred to the fact that you thought a lot of what you did was pro forma.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That's right. Mostly these functions, which are: prevention and detection of chronic infectious diseases; health programs for mothers and children; crippled children's services; prevention of disease and job-related health hazards; hospital construction and licensing and standards in setting up various health facilities.

When I first came on the board--well, all the time I was on the board--there were an awful lot of approvals of licenses, approvals of standards for bottled water, approvals of water systems. I remember seeing pictures of community water supply systems with cows

standing in the water. [Laughter] And what should we do about that?

DOUGLASS: Would the staff make a study and bring their recommendations to you? Or were there subcommittees functioning?

ZETTERBERG: We did not function on a committee basis. We were only on a board basis. Met just about every month. The staff really did a good job on bringing up subjects. We would sometimes have discussions. I remember big discussions on water quality. That seemed to be an important thing. The water quality of California being set by what was served on pullman cars in trains that were crossing the country.

DOUGLASS: Really? How interesting.

ZETTERBERG: Right. That was the standard.

DOUGLASS: That was the Dark Ages?

ZETTERBERG: Well, that's interstate commerce. So that would impact a development in, say, Ventura County which was getting up (or down) to water that had too much magnesium in it. Then you couldn't subdivide until you got a better water supply, so that it had an effect in most subdivisions [in Ventura County].

- DOUGLASS: It is interesting that that was the standard to use. The interstate carrier.
- ZETTERBERG: I think that is still the standard.
- DOUGLASS: So when you got your agenda, for instance, you had these various things to approve. And pretty much your packet would be staff recommendations for each of these items? Is that right?
- ZETTERBERG: Well, it is my recollection the staff recommendations were done verbally. The staff would sit there. When they were called upon, they would tell what the situation was.
- DOUGLASS: So it doesn't sound like you had a lot of heavy-duty homework?
- ZETTERBERG: No. That's true. We did have some deep problems in the city of Elsinore, where they had foul-tasting water that was supposed to be health water. You had the people living there in the town and wanting to have drinking water that didn't have bad flavor. And then you had the motels and all that wanted to have the bad water piped. And then you had the cows standing up in the reservoir up above. So we ended up allowing them to furnish bottled

water as a public service. Just like your milk used to be delivered.

DOUGLASS: In the Elsinore area?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. That was one thing I remember. That was beyond the jurisdiction, shall I put it, of the staff. We got into a discussion of . . .

DOUGLASS: Who was responsible for delivering the bottled water? The community? The subdivider?

ZETTERBERG: As I recall, we gave the community options. A Solomon-type decision.

DOUGLASS: I see. Either clean up the water or provide bottled water?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. And you see there was also too much chlorine in the water, and it was making, dark, mottled teeth, as I remember, of the children. I think there was a requirement that bottled water be served to schools.

DOUGLASS: I had no idea that situation occurred.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. They had come to kind of an impasse there in Elsinore.

We sometimes had licenses where we would approve water that was offered for subdividers so that it met the Pullman car standards. Then you would consider that they needed more housing there, but they would still have to

have water. And then the effect of if you watered down (if you will pardon the expression) the water with another subdivision, how would that impact the rest of the community? That was kind of fun.

DOUGLASS: I was noting, in looking at the board's composition, that Malcolm H. Merrill, Director of the State Department of Public Health, was on the board automatically as head of the department?

ZETTERBERG: Let me count up. He was there as the tenth person.

DOUGLASS: So he was there as the staff?

ZETTERBERG: He would be executive officer.

DOUGLASS: I see you have a list of the board members. I would like to verify who was on the board. You mentioned that you were one of two laypersons who were appointed to the nine-member board. And the other one was a woman. Who is that?

ZETTERBERG: Mrs. P. D. Bevil from Sacramento.

DOUGLASS: Who was she, do you know?

ZETTERBERG: It doesn't say. She was just a layperson.

DOUGLASS: So you two were the lay representatives. Then who do you have?

ZETTERBERG: Charles Smith was president of the board.

DOUGLASS: Was he a doctor?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. He is a doctor. And there is David Dozier;, who was a doctor from Sacramento. And there is L. B. Goerke, M.D., from North Hollywood. He was really very good in public health. I think he was a dean of public health at UCLA at the time. And then Harry Henderson, M.D., from Santa Barbara. I don't remember all these people. And Errol King, a doctor from Riverside. And Henry Vollonte, D.D.S., from San Mateo.

[End Tape 5, Side A]

[Begin Tape 5, Side B]

ZETTERBERG: And then Herbert A. Linto, a medical doctor in San Diego. We were the two who were appointed by Governor Brown.

DOUGLASS: There must have been some change in the board because didn't you say that Breslow and Egeberg came on later? I noted that at least Egeberg came on the board later.

ZETTERBERG: If he did, I don't know who he replaced because he was working beyond the time that I went off the board.

DOUGLASS: First of all, a quick point, I believe you told me that it was Brown's intent to bring some of the initial task force with you onto this board as soon as he could. That would appear to be what he had done because he put you on, and then later he put Egeberg on. And I think you said Breslow.

ZETTERBERG: Breslow became executive director in place of Malcolm Merrill. Malcolm Merrill, what happened to him? Did he retire or die?

DOUGLASS: But still it is the same task force. The same characters were beginning to show up on this board?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I remember particularly your comment that there was a group of you interested in getting away from the technical, kind of rubber-stamp type agenda on the board. I wonder if you could speak to that.

ZETTERBERG: Well, a lot of that came from the technical staff of the State Department of Public Health itself. For example, Frank Stead, who was a senior, I guess you would say, civil service officer in the department--he was not a medical doctor--I remember him giving a review of Rachel Carson's Silent Spring. A review in depth, causing a really good discussion in the board. Looking ahead at the problems of the environment.

DOUGLASS: Your bottled-water situation spoke to that.

ZETTERBERG: That's right. He was very dedicated to public health in the long-term sense. I have no idea whether he is still alive. His brother, who was an attorney in Pomona, a very good attorney, deceased, fell on a different side of the political fence.

Then Breslow was the creative person. He introduced the concept that public health involved more than just the items we listed.

He had done some studies, for example, on statistical analysis of cancer and cigarette smoking, and I am sure that is the source, or one of the sources, of use of statistical analysis to prove that relationship between smoking and cancer. The tobacco industry always likes to say that there is no clinical evidence.

DOUGLASS: Was he so far ahead of his time as to talk about the secondary dangers for those exposed to the smoke?

ZETTERBERG: I have seen some of his studies, and I am sure he would have considered it. And later on the courts have adopted those reports.

Another thing that he did was to talk about seat belts. I remember the board being almost startled by the concept that the use of seat belts in cars was a health matter. As you think about it, it is.

DOUGLASS: That you can carry on to the law that people who ride motorcycles have to use helmets.

ZETTERBERG: Right. I don't know how that jumped the gap, but the use of seat belts has become law, as you know. I give him (and the board) credit. That is where you get the start. . . .

Sweden, of course, was first in that.

Somebody, I think Breslow himself, went to Sweden and made a study.

DOUGLASS: I believe you also said that he brought up the question of smog as a health concern. We are talking about the period between 1959 to '67.

ZETTERBERG: You have reminded me. Yes, I am sure he had the staff working on the dangers of smog. I remember a study showing the illness cause and effect of smog in very heavy smog times. I think I told you that when Reagan became governor . . .

DOUGLASS: Yes. We got that story on tape that you filed a lawsuit.

ZETTERBERG: All right. But the essence of that was to try to get the health department to continue its studies of smog. It failed because of the change in administration.

DOUGLASS: Were there any other staff you recall from sitting on that board?

ZETTERBERG: I don't remember any particular person. There were several younger people who were quite dedicated that he brought in. I remember they had a department of vectors to see how diseases spread, to try to anticipate the

spread of diseases, how they would be spread. One example, of vectors would be like San Joaquin Valley fever, the effect of wind on that. There you have literally the vectors.

DOUGLASS: Yes, littoral vectors. [Laughter]

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But then there was some bubonic plague also. I remember seeing one technician studying the body of a rat that had bubonic plague and trying to see what might happen. Then they were trying to anticipate the prevention of it.

DOUGLASS: Actually, you were on a board that was overseeing the department that did everything on the health side except for mental health. Which is pretty broad.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then as far as going off the board, you expected, of course, the changes? Were you sorry to go off the board?

ZETTERBERG: No. I think eight years is a good time, and I did think that some of the creativity which I had the fun of observing would be lost, as it was.

DOUGLASS: All right. Then I would like to move on to the 1966 Pat Brown gubernatorial campaign,

which he lost to Ronald Reagan. What participation did you have in that campaign?

ZETTERBERG: You know, I get so mad at my memory. It's so slow.

DOUGLASS: It is very good.

ZETTERBERG: I tried to do research on that yesterday. I got lost in the hassle over Vietnam and Simon Casady.

DOUGLASS: We'll get to that.

ZETTERBERG: Because I don't remember. You probably could hit the button somewhere in the back of my mind. But I don't remember that particular campaign.

DOUGLASS: OK. One thing I did want to get on tape was that you mentioned to me that you recall Reagan speaking at a meeting in Los Angeles. It must have been in the early sixties, I suppose, or earlier. Could you tell that story?

ZETTERBERG: In the early days of. . . . I can't be sure whether it was Americans for Democratic Action (which sort of was the foster parent of CDC in some ways) or whether it was CDC. I remember being in one of those old, turn-of-the-century houses immediately west of downtown Los

Angeles. People sitting around holding a meeting. As I recall, I remember Judge Jerry Pacht, who was then not a judge, was there at the time; and maybe some others. I don't know whether Stanley Mosk was there. Frank Mankiewicz was there. Frank Mankiewicz, the son of Joseph Mankiewicz, was head of National Public Radio.

I remember we were waiting for an "important speaker." I was sitting kind of on the stairs by the door, and I remember seeing this big, black car roll up outside. This person came in. His name was Ronald Reagan. They introduced him. I remember having the feeling that he was sort of talking to someone behind me. You know what I mean. And, basically, he gave his speech and then he left. And the essence of the speech was that we were all too conservative. I think it must have been Americans for Democratic Action. "That's not the solution," he said. "You really have to break with past." Then he left.

I was telling this to a table at a dinner party given by the president of Pitzer College

when Frank Mankiewicz was at the next table. He had been a speaker. He heard me. I remember him calling over, "I was there, Steve, and I remember exactly what you say." Reagan was saying we were all too conservative.

DOUGLASS: Can you place that time at all?

ZETTERBERG: Well, it had to be in the late sixties. How can that be? It can't be.

DOUGLASS: It must be before he was governor.

ZETTERBERG: It was at Pitzer College. When did Pitzer start?

DOUGLASS: Pitzer College was started in 1963.

ZETTERBERG: Well, it would have been in the early days. They had this prize person, Frank Mankiewicz.

DOUGLASS: Do you know if Reagan then was still head of the Screen Actors Guild?

ZETTERBERG: I think he was there in terms of his position in the Screen Actors Guild. But I don't really know.¹

DOUGLASS: That is fascinating. But you never actually met him?

ZETTERBERG: No. I was back there, and he just cruised right by.

1. Ronald Reagan was president of the Screen Actors Guild from 1947-1952 and in 1959.

- DOUGLASS: So he breezed in and out? He didn't sit around and chat?
- ZETTERBERG: Yes.
- DOUGLASS: How did the group respond to what he said? Can you remember?
- ZETTERBERG: I don't remember any particular applause. I don't remember any applause at all. It was sort of like, "Well, what's next on the agenda?" [Laughter]
- DOUGLASS: One other question I want to ask you about the '66 period is in the November 8th general election, Proposition 1A passed. It was the very fundamental decision on the part of the public that they wanted to have a full-time legislature with a salary increase for the legislators from \$6,000 to \$16,000 a year.
- ZETTERBERG: Once, before passage of Proposition 1A, I rode on an elevator in the capitol with two assemblymen. One said to the other, "This is a lousy job! We're only paid \$7,000 a year, and I can only make \$20,000."
- DOUGLASS: The legislators were to meet annually, instead of having a budget session one year (with possible extraordinary sessions) and a regular session the next year. This was radical

change. The reason I am asking you about that is did you see that have an effect on the amount of activity an organization such as CDC would engage in? You were having substantive bills come up every year now, rather than every other year (except for special sessions).

ZETTERBERG: I don't put my mental fingers on anything in particular in that respect, except I am sure it had a long-range effect--something which will probably come through in our conversations--about the relationships of the amateurs and the professionals involved.

DOUGLASS: Fine. I remember that election vividly. Let's go back to CDC. I have on the record that you served as the CDC board director from the Twenty-fifth Congressional District from '59 to '62. Then that became the Twenty-fourth Congressional District in 1962. So you were named as the director representing the Twenty-fourth District. How long did you stay as a director on that board?

ZETTERBERG: You know, I have no idea.

DOUGLASS: It must have been quite a while?

ZETTERBERG: My thinking then and now was that the directorship was only one of the things that one did in this volunteer organization.

DOUGLASS: I understand that. You were active. I think you mentioned that you were active under presidents Wyatt and Carvey, in terms of your putting more of your energy into it.

ZETTERBERG: The frontline. The directorship was more like housekeeping.

DOUGLASS: OK. Although it gave you a base, an area in which you were very active, as the board director from that region, namely the Los Angeles area.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I can't remember.

DOUGLASS: Let's discuss the issues conferences, which I am trying to track through this. We have discussed some. The first one was in 1959, then '60. The '61 conference is the one we went over in great detail because you had the health issue. I want to ask you what happened after 1961? This brings up the Carvey confidential memo, a copy of which I just gave you, which I found fascinating. It is the memo of July 24, 1961.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I have that in front of me.

DOUGLASS: He is bringing up the subject of the role of the issues program. If you go to page 3 of the memo, he has a section, "Potential Ingredients for the 1961-62 CDC Program." There he speaks of Dollars for Democrats. I wonder if you have any comment about the fact that he would write such a memorandum. Because this was after the February 1961 meeting in Santa Monica, where you did the big scene on the health issue.

ZETTERBERG: You see, the letter I have is addressed to Steve Zetterberg but the same thing was sent, I am sure, to all of the board directors and officers of the CDC.

DOUGLASS: Yes. It is marked confidential. It was something to think about and talk about but nothing to go public on?

ZETTERBERG: He didn't want to go public on it. Let me see if I can get my thoughts straight on this. It seemed to me that there were a couple of things that he was wanting us of CDC to think about. One is the organization itself. He talks about regional conferences or perhaps even congressional or assembly district

conferences. And do you have issue conferences as a part of those conferences?

You have two functions going. One is the endorsement of candidates, because you are still trying to get Democrats on the ballot, and good Democrats. That's the mechanical part. The other part is on the issues. Suppose you have different issue positions taken in northern California and southern California. How do you handle that? I think he starts a good blueprint there for how to handle that, which showed up later in the policy of CDC.

For example, what is the relationship between an issues statement and a resolution. There was a concern that there would be resolutions on issues that were taken up by the issues conferences. Which means you have to develop ahead of time what you are going to have your issues policy statements on. That played out to a lot of work I had to put in. In 1966, they made me chairman of the resolutions committee. So all of the garbage I got. In this file here I have just a fraction of resolutions that we had to

consider all through the night to present for approval.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You were screening. Everything came in to you from issues reports?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: You had to handle the resolutions?

ZETTERBERG: Right. So you had two different streams coming up to the conventions. You see, you have the issues conference and then the issues statements adopted and then sent up. And they would present them to the convention for approval. Resolutions, oftentimes you had to have them enough ahead of time and enough copies so they could be passed around. And you held hearings on them, just like the legislature would.

DOUGLASS: Before the convention heard them?

ZETTERBERG: Right. And then you approved them. But they still went to the convention with the committee's recommendation. I remember in '66, for example, that Pat Brown sent over a memo that he wanted to see what the resolutions were. So we sent him a copy before they were presented on the floor and our resolutions report was approved.

But the winnowing was done in the committee. And there were other committees doing the same kind of thing.

DOUGLASS: When you say issues conferences, you mean in the various regions?

ZETTERBERG: No. If I remember correctly, for example, in 1961 we had the issues in March?

DOUGLASS: We talked about this before. It is important to straighten out. Because the issues conferences we discussed in the last session. It was March of '61. You met Saturday, and the convention was meeting. Then on Sunday there were preprimary endorsements. So at that time your issues conference was part of the period in which the convention was held.

ZETTERBERG: I think you are absolutely right because that was one of the things that got me goofed up on the 1966 Pat Brown election. Because while the politicking was going on, I was sitting in the resolutions committee. And I didn't know what the hell was going on.

DOUGLASS: But what I am trying to find out is when they did, at one point, make the issues conference separate.

ZETTERBERG: Well, I think there was another convention. Wasn't there another convention in July of 1961?

DOUGLASS: No. I don't think there was. The Carvey memo was on July 24. And then I want to next ask you about an issues committee report which I found in your file.¹ I think it was issued in August of 1961, recommending what they would do for 1962. Maybe we should talk about that now. I either referred you to it or gave you a copy of it.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I judged, from the way this was placed in your file, that it was issued perhaps August 25. The basic thing is that after cross-filing was abolished, was this indeed an element that kept CDC going, the fact that you had the issues meetings?

ZETTERBERG: I think that is certainly true. You had basically 70,000 individuals who were members of local clubs, who were interested in issues and were not interested in the high-level politics of the assembly or of the state

1. See Appendix.

senate. I wouldn't say not interested, but they. . . .

DOUGLASS: Would you say they weren't as interested in the endorsing of the candidates?

ZETTERBERG: No. I wouldn't say that. This is where you get the schizophrenic aspect of CDC, which is reflected in the other part of Tom Carvey's letter.

DOUGLASS: Exactly. In other words, what to do with these two elements?

ZETTERBERG: Your Exhibit J (report of the issues committee) refers to what I was talking about. This is a proposed resolution: "...policy statements shall not be issued by regional issues conferences; however, the viewpoints of the regional conferences shall be transmitted to the issues Committee in some manner for consideration by the statewide CDC Convention." That is a nice way to combine different local interests and yet have it sent out to a statewide conference or meeting of some sort so that you get unified policy from various parts of the state.

DOUGLASS: So there apparently was an overall issues committee in the structure of CDC?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I suppose this became the modus operandi--that the various regional meetings on issues would occur--and they defined here (in the overall committee) what issues there would be. Here we have in the committee report: foreign policy, human rights, and broadcasting (radio and television). The regional meetings had to be before December 8, 1961, leading up to the 1962 convention. Then I assume whatever those regional groups came up with would go on to the overall issues committee?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: And then they would prepare resolutions that would be put forward at the state convention?

ZETTERBERG: Not resolutions. They would adopt issues statements.

DOUGLASS: Which would represent a consensus of all the statements that would come in to them?

ZETTERBERG: Right.

DOUGLASS: Then they would be taken to the state CDC convention. But would those be taken to the resolutions committee or go straight to the floor?

ZETTERBERG: No. The resolutions committee was not allowed to do anything in these fields that would be covered by the issues committee. And if we would get something, we would send that over to the committee.

DOUGLASS: Then I also noted the last paragraph of the issues committee report we have referred to states that the program herein discussed "is obviously an interim program geared to meet the apparent desire to have some tangible Issues activity during 1961 and as part of the Fresno Convention."

It continues: "The basic problems of the Issues program, including its true role in CDC, must be given serious and sustained attention during the next several months." Again, I thought that was a very strong statement, as you just explained, of the dilemma.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then, on October 6, 1961, Frederick S. Wyle, who was chairman of the foreign policy typic committee sent a statement to Gerald Hill, president of CDC. He states there are two unresolved issues. One is whether there is to

be a statewide convention or any program beyond the regional conferences. Two, what is the nature of the expression of CDC views on the issues considered? Is there to be a statement of CDC positions, and what would be the relationship of the statement to the resolutions committee at the CDC convention in January of 1962? So that is further reinforcement of what you were just saying.

ZETTERBERG: He is raising the question of whether the resolutions committee would be preempted.

DOUGLASS: It is a very interesting item.

ZETTERBERG: This is sort of a model of what any statewide, for that matter nationwide, policy-forming program would be. You have that network. You end up with a centralized statement which would be something other than from the central committee. That's my only addition.

DOUGLASS: All right. I am trying to plumb your memory of what you can recall about what happened to the fall issues idea. In other words, by 1966, you were on the resolutions committee. Were there separate issues conferences?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes.

DOUGLASS: Were they separate from the convention?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. See, Les River, who later became chairman of the Democratic county central committee, was chairman of the statewide issues program of 1966. I have the folder that was passed out at that time.

DOUGLASS: Was that a separate meeting, separate from the convention?

ZETTERBERG: It was in the same place and probably starting before. I think there was one time--and I think this was maybe it. . . . That can't be, though, it can't be '66 because. . . . Well, maybe it was. It was in Fresno. At Fresno I was chairman of all of the issues programs except foreign policy. And the foreign policy was sort of being fostered by the Ford Foundation in the Center for Democratic Institutions in Santa Barbara. Fred Warner Neal was on that. This paper I am showing you was done by Fred Warner Neal

My part, if it was 1966, this is it. Anyway, at one of the Fresno conventions I had to get discussion leaders. You see, we had this group discussion format in all of our issues conferences, where little groups were discussing in the larger gatherings. I had

various issues and I set up discussion leaders and recorders.

DOUGLASS: So as to issues conferences, one way or another there was always a conference on issues. Whether it was scheduled within the period of the convention or adjacent to it, is a question we can't completely resolve. Would that be right?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. My mind has these two separate compartments. One is the issues people where we were sitting and discussing and coming up with the reports. And the other is meeting in the big halls to endorse candidates for voting. You had maybe three or four thousand people attending and you were approving issues statements, resolutions, and the program.

DOUGLASS: You would tend to spend your time with the issues sector?

ZETTERBERG: At least at the first.

DOUGLASS: Maybe sometime if you happen to talk to Wyatt or someone else, they might just have the answer. The issues activity continued. Is that right?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. It was parallel with the endorsing.

DOUGLASS: Is there still issues activity in CDC?

ZETTERBERG: I have not kept track of CDC at the present time.

DOUGLASS: Let me just verify one other thing. You referred in the very first session which we did three years ago to the Arrowhead conference, which was in 1968. And we have this Democratic Report publication, in which there is a picture of you and various people. Was this indeed the report that came out in conjunction with that conference? Or as a result of the conference? Could you give the thrust of the aim of the conference?

ZETTERBERG: Well, the state chair at this time was Charles Warren. Charles Warren was either a state senator or assemblyman, I have forgotten which. And he was very dedicated to the California Democratic Council, but also to the legislature. And so this conference which was up in Arrowhead in the mountains at Monte Rio, or some such place, was designed to put together on a steady basis and on a fund basis the legislators and the CDC people. And the CDC, we were to show the legislators what kinds of things the CDC could be of help to

them. Almost, it occurs to me now, a little like public lobbying you see, in a sense.

DOUGLASS: He was on both. He was very interested in CDC, but he was also the state chairman?

ZETTERBERG: And a legislator.

DOUGLASS: Do you remember the conference particularly?

ZETTERBERG: Oh, yes. I do remember.

DOUGLASS: Whereas in other situations, you would have the very selected people who were interested in CDC come to the meetings, this was a purposeful meeting that had the elected officials there with the state central committee and CDC?

ZETTERBERG: Right. And the elected state officials. And I remember it being a very good meeting. This was '68, so this would mean this was two years after Reagan became governor.

DOUGLASS: So, politically, was this an attempt to show some unity, or get some unity?

ZETTERBERG: Democrats seem to do better when they are out of office. [Laughter] That's how all this started in the first place, because we were out of office. But he was a very creative person.

DOUGLASS: That was a first, I would gather. Having that kind of a meeting up front as a goal?

ZETTERBERG: No. It wasn't the first. I am trying to remember. Tom Carvey at one time had a winter meeting in Wawona, at Yosemite. We took over the whole place. And we met during the day with seminars. It was a use of the seminar-type format, and yet still have, in this case, primarily the board of directors. I was urging that he do it. Somebody said, "Well, nobody will ever come up there."

There were only two board members that were missing. Everybody came. A lot of other officials came too. But it was mostly a board meeting. So he was pretty creative in getting these kinds of things where you were together both in the business end and then after hours. I remember up at the Monte Rio (Lake Arrowhead) there was a band there, and they had dancing afterwards. I remember getting sleepy and seeing everybody still awake.

DOUGLASS: This kind of brings us to a central question here. Basically, there was some tension between the state central committee and CDC. But was there underlying tension based on the

question of funds? In other words, CDC was out raising funds for candidates. And the state central committee also. Were you in competition that way?

ZETTERBERG: I am holding my fingers crossed, but you started with Tom Carvey's letter. And I said there were two parts to it. And we've been off on the one part. Can I just make a short footnote on the other part. The other part is maybe even more important. And that is in Carvey's letter of July 24, 1961, he talks about sending things downhill, not always uphill. Sending them downhill to the clubs.

In other words, nourishing the clubs, which were the organizational, as well as the intellectual, foundation of the CDC. And that is to have clubs have programs on a local basis to discuss public issues. Public meeting, like a New England public meeting, and that worked.

I mean here in Claremont we used to meet in the civic building there at Memorial Park. There were people sitting in the rafters. There is a place up there where the stairway opens out. They were sitting up there. And

the use of panel discussions, which was an outgrowth of the UCLA-sponsored program of group dynamics, and then bringing in the people, audiences. And that really worked. You didn't just have speakers. Sometimes we had speakers. But you had good participation, and you had a panel discussion. And that was really working throughout the state.

Claremont was one of the best examples of that. You see, instead of saying let's all work to elect somebody, they are saying let's consider what this is all about. And he has that in this letter. That is not an organizational thing, but it is something that really was very important.

DOUGLASS: All right. Part of the overall question is-- and it is brought to mind by the 1968 Arrowhead meeting--was there always an underlying tension between the elected statewide officials and CDC because you are both out plowing the same ground, but in entirely different ways? This could either be competitive or very supportive.

ZETTERBERG: Well, in my mind, that's not quite the way, at least initially, that it was broken down.

Because I felt, and I still feel, a kinship with the people who were successfully elected. Alan Cranston, [Anthony] Tony Beilensen, Henry Waxman. I have been trying to work with him on the health care thing now, you see. I don't feel any dichotomy with them. I feel like these are idea people who are up there. These are just some examples.

The thing broke, I think, more along the lines that you suggested in one of your notes here on the Dime a Day for Democracy and Dollars for Democrats. Now, the Dime a Day people were people that were already in office, and like Chet Holifield's right-hand man, Harold Lane.

DOUGLASS: I was going to get to Holifield.

ZETTERBERG: All right. Holifield himself was never anything but extremely pleasant with me always. But, you see, there was the underlying structure. Maybe you don't want to get into this now. But, anyway, that goes back to that and to the election which you remind me of, of chairmanship of the state party, where I came in third and [William] Bill Munnell was second.

DOUGLASS: Do you want to talk about that right now?

ZETTERBERG: Maybe we should to it.

DOUGLASS: I was coming to that because we don't have it on tape. This was in 1954, when Elizabeth Snyder successfully ran for the chairmanship. Why don't you quickly give that little situation?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I can't remember that election, but now I can remember the scenario of it. Elizabeth Snyder was a very talented, able woman who was a Young Democrat before CDC. She was very able and had a lot of support, even among people who didn't like the so-called professional politicians. She was one of the top persons in the money-raising thing Dime a Day for Democracy. And Alan Cranston and Helen Myers were on the other side of that. It was a question, really, of money. I visualize it as a question of money versus people. It was Dime a Day, but there was no top limit. I mean you can give lots of money and still be in Dime a Day. And so there was always a tension between them. I can't place the time of that split.

DOUGLASS: Of the split between Dime a Day and . . .

ZETTERBERG: If you call it a split. It was more like two parallel. . . .

DOUGLASS: I think I brought that up in the first interview and we discussed that. Finish what happened about the chairmanship of the state central committee.

ZETTERBERG: Well, she was elected.

DOUGLASS: You told me that Zetterberg and Munnell were the two runners-up.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: I think you said the situation was that there could be possibly a vote on the top two contenders.

ZETTERBERG: Bill Munnell and I were trying to get it to a majority between us, but we got about 135 total votes. He got seventy-eight and I got fifty-seven. And Elizabeth Snyder got 152 votes.

[End Tape 5, Side B]

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

DOUGLASS: First of all, it is interesting that you were among the top three running for the chairmanship. But I was looking at a chapter by Francis Carney titled "The Rise of the Democratic Clubs in California," in a book, Cases On Party Organization, edited by Paul Tillett.

He writes about the fact that Snyder was closely associated with Chet Holifield, who was "the best-known critic of the whole club movement and the dimensions it has assumed." Then he points out that Mrs. Snyder drew most of the fire of the Holifield attitude from the regulars of CDC. Could you comment as to the validity or lack of validity of those comments?

ZETTERBERG: What does he mean by "drew most of the fire"?

DOUGLASS: That she tended to be attacked as an anti-CDC person, even though Holifield was a much better-known figure because he was a congressman from the Montebello area.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. The reason for that was Harold Lane.

DOUGLASS: Yes. You have given the anecdote about his saying that if you were really important, you wouldn't be at a certain meeting.

ZETTERBERG: That's right.

DOUGLASS: You certainly know that Holifield wasn't too excited about CDC?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But I think we all felt that it was Harold Lane, who had the local California office of Holifield. We didn't know that Holifield always agreed with him.

DOUGLASS: I have interviewed Harold Lane.¹

ZETTERBERG: Which is ironic because Holifield and Jerry Voorhis were elected at the same time with the same kind of backing. And I look upon CDC as sort of an offshoot from Jerry Voorhis, and Holifield on the other side, which may be explained by his seniority.

DOUGLASS: Holifield's seniority?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. Holifield's seniority.

DOUGLASS: We have covered this question about the tension between CDC and the state central committee, which I believe you spoke to,

1. Harold Lane and Florence Odemar, Pioneering a Congressman's Field Office, typed transcript of a tape-recorded interview conducted by Enid H. Douglass, Claremont Graduate School Oral History Program (Claremont, California: 1975). Developed as part of the Former Members of Congress Project.

unless you want to add to that. Incidentally, I did want to ask you. In the state government oral history project, there is an interview which I just recently received, done by [Lawrence] Larry de Graaf at California State University, Fullerton, with John William Beard, who was a state senator from Imperial County from 1956 to '60.¹ He is referred to in the interview as one of the founders of CDC and that he helped organize the Imperial County Democratic Party. He was a lawyer.

ZETTERBERG: I remember him. He was a friend and perhaps was developed by Hugo Fisher. In fact, I drove with Hugo over to Imperial County once to a program that Beard had over there for CDC. I remember doing that because I got car sick. [Laughter]

DOUGLASS: I think that pretty well winds up that subject.

ZETTERBERG: He was nice. Beard was a nice guy, but I don't remember . . .

DOUGLASS: He was only in office for four years. I want to do a little finishing up of CDC and ask a

1. William Beard Oral History Interview, Conducted 1987, by Lawrence B. de Graaf, Oral History Program California State University, Fullerton, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.

couple of overall questions. Then I think we are through. I did just want to verify something. This publication called A Look at the Future, in which you have an article on the environment. Why was this done? It was published by the state central committee in 1968. Do you remember why this was done?

ZETTERBERG: Shall I read the preface?

DOUGLASS: No. [Laughter] Since you had a lot to do with it, what is your recollection of why you were involved?

ZETTERBERG: The reason I was involved was that I had been in charge of all issues committees at the Monte Rio conference. He [Charles Warren] was trying, as we discussed moments ago, to get a good relationship between the CDC and the state legislature and the state offices. And he had commissioned a very capable woman here, Joyce Fadem. Unfortunately, she died of cancer a few years ago. But she was a very effective person in terms of organizing things. And she was an appointee, as a layperson, on the bar association's hearing board that heard complaints against lawyers. They were trying to get somebody other than

lawyers on that so that you had some lay input, and she was one of the persons who was on that. She just was a very able person.

DOUGLASS: I see in the preface that he was assuming more in-depth writing would be appropriate to address issues. Was that the idea?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. It was something that Charles Warren wanted to do. So we got together, Joyce and I, and got these different people to write.

DOUGLASS: To finish up on CDC, I want to ask you more about the presidents. Here is a list of the presidents with their years of service. We pretty well covered Alan Cranston. You covered some of Wyatt in the much earlier interview and then started to cover Carvey. I just wondered if there is anything you want to say about Carvey. In the earlier interview you referred to the fact that you hadn't looked at your files yet at that time. I don't know if you have found anything more. I would like to wind up with at least the presidents you were involved with, starting with Carvey.

ZETTERBERG: Carvey was more than just a presiding officer. He really worked at this. Particularly, I did

mention that he was given offices down on Ninth Street in Los Angeles of a very big old building which worked well.

DOUGLASS: Yes. I remember you discussed this in the first interview because it was so interesting. Was it under Carvey's presidency that you really put in the most time. Carvey was president from 1961 to 1965. I think you told me at one time your biggest activity period was around 1959 to '63.

ZETTERBERG: I picture Joe Wyatt in my mind as a "presiding officer." I think I was not a board member during his chairmanship. Wyatt went out of office at that '61 Santa Monica convention.

I remember he came in because it was thought by many of the members of CDC that if Alan Cranston was going to run for public office, he ought to quit. So Joe was secretary at that time and maybe vice president, and became president.

DOUGLASS: We talked in a general way about Wyatt. Then there was the change to Carvey. What was that like?

ZETTERBERG: That was just sort of one of those natural childbirth things.

DOUGLASS: In terms of how he managed the operation. We talked about his memo. He sounds as though he was pretty focused?

ZETTERBERG: He was more a hands-on person to try and really do something with the CDC and try to get various people throughout the four corners of the state to be working on it. And, of course, this was in the period when we were doing the two things: the issues conferences and then the candidates, we were trying to develop candidates. He was just the right person at that time.

DOUGLASS: So you enjoyed working with him?

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: Then, in 1965, Simon Casady became president, and he only lasted one year, 1965-66. I think I asked you earlier. You didn't have too many recollections. There was a big battle in Fresno, November of '65, about his remaining in office. [Laughter] And, also, an element of that, as I understand it, was that Pat Brown wanted him out of the scene, in terms of his running for governor in '66.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I have a copy of letter here somewhere. Pat Brown sent his objections to all board members--I must have been a board member then--of why he wanted Casady out.

DOUGLASS: He did?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. He didn't like Casady, as he said in his letter, because of Casady's attitude toward President Johnson. He thought it was not appropriate for the head of CDC to be attacking the president. But, of course, underlying this was Vietnam. And we agonized over that, and I think that the split was around 60-40. The people that were supporting Brown, as opposed to Casady, were proclaiming that they had a majority. But, apparently, I think Casady got booted out.

DOUGLASS: First, there was a request for him to resign, and he resisted. Then it went through several machinations. Actually, he didn't resign until the February convention in Bakersfield in 1966.

ZETTERBERG: That's when [Gerald] Jerry Hill came in.

DOUGLASS: Right. What do you know about Gerald Hill?

ZETTERBERG: He is a very able attorney. I tried to contact him in San Francisco recently, but I

got the wrong Jerry Hill. So I lost track of him. He was a very able person. He was more the parliamentarian, organizational, and meeting presider, and so on.

DOUGLASS: After that I just don't really know the names of the presidents. You told me that Nate Holden eventually was president. Can you think of some other people who followed who might have been outstanding one way or another.

ZETTERBERG: I can't think of any. I have lost track. What happened? We were talking about '66, we are talking about the Reagan years. We began to focus, at least we started to begin to focus more on the Reagan situation.

DOUGLASS: So would Gerald Hill have been president of CDC at the time that you had this meeting at Arrowhead?

ZETTERBERG: He became president in '66 and the meeting was in '68.

DOUGLASS: Well, we don't need to dwell on that. What I am trying to lead up to is what is the status of CDC now? I gather you lost interest. How rapidly did your interest decline?

ZETTERBERG: I have wondered about that. The saddest time in any campaign is when the campaign is won, I suppose. At this point, we had Charles Warren as a dedicated CDC person as state chairman. You have a lot of CDC persons in the legislature. You have CDC persons in the national congress. You have Alan Cranston in the [U.S.] senate. I do remember our going on Alan Cranston's first campaign committee, about six or seven people meeting over in west Los Angeles. That was a direct activity that was not part of the CDC activity.

DOUGLASS: All right. Obviously, in '66 you were still involved because you were on this resolutions committee.

ZETTERBERG: I think I failed CDC by not hanging in there. But one of the fortunate "offshoots" of this great CDC burst of activity over a period of about twenty years was there were lots of spin-offs in other organizations. People began to do what Tom Carvey said they ought to do. To get active in local affairs. I know I became a president of the World Affairs Council of Inland Southern California, which was sponsored by something like twelve

colleges in this general area, and did that for two years. And I spent a lot of time on that. And others worked on the . . .

DOUGLASS: Got into the regional and local action?

ZETTERBERG: Yes. But in other organizations.

DOUGLASS: That's what I mean. Grass-roots activity. You only have so much time and energy. What is the situation with CDC today?

ZETTERBERG: I am maybe not the person to ask.

DOUGLASS: Well, no, just from your perspective.

ZETTERBERG: I think of it as a gadfly organization now, which is in the some of the literature going back to the beginnings of CDC.

DOUGLASS: In fact, in one of these memos we were talking about the comment was made that CDC was not just a gadfly organization.

ZETTERBERG: So I think it became kind of a gadfly organization in the sense of. . . . When we are working in public affairs, do we always have in the back of our mind the thought that maybe we ought not to consider this because it might foul up congressman so-and-so or state legislator so-and-so or it might against the state committee's ongoing policy? And that's the seeds of intellectual defeat. While I am

not active in CDC now, I am interested in reading in the papers what it does. Because if it is doing its job as a gadfly--if that is its job--then our conscience should be listening to that too, as well as to what the ACLU [American Civil Liberties Union] or the American Friends service committee and the local church and all the other organizations are doing.

DOUGLASS: So, in a peculiar way the lack of unity in CDC may, in another sense, be a success story?

ZETTERBERG: Well, let me give you an example. I have told you at the very beginning that Helen Myers was one of the persons who was organizational chairman of the county committee and organizing clubs, which is the essence of the CDC start. Here she is now, living in Claremont. She is active in two organizations. She is very active in the local Democratic club, but she is very active in the Scripps [College] fine arts club. When I will try to get her for months, she says, "I can't do it this week because we are having a very important meeting of the Scripps fine arts club."

DOUGLASS: She is running the Fine Arts Foundation at Scripps.

ZETTERBERG: So that is a good example. But the mind is still working on this thing.

DOUGLASS: Finally, I want to ask a couple of summary questions on health. One of the reasons I have pursued this so much is that the whole question of health policy is on the table, as you pointed out, today. Would you say that is true? That what is happening with Hillary Clinton's committee and what is going on there, which has parallel things happening in California and repercussions for California, is basically the same kind of issue you were talking about in '59 and '60?

ZETTERBERG: Same problem. But the method is different.

DOUGLASS: Let me just add. Of course, we both know that something changed, and that was the federal role being played in terms of Medicare and Medicaid.

ZETTERBERG: Yes. I think that our governor's report of 1960 was essentially watered down because of the consist of the committee. And that the more sharp, the more focused recommendations were in the CDC conference which followed

that. And specifically the recommendation which was for Medicare to do senior citizen health care. I think from what I have seen the method of operation, the same general idea of operation, in microcosm here in 1960 now is going on.

But what seems to be happening now is whereas we had hearings in 1959 and '60 and had testimony--we heard from the people who were the consumers, people that really needed health care--it seems to me the Clinton organization, from what we can hear, is giving more attention to satisfying the providers, the insurers, the doctors, and the medical providers, and so on. That leaves me a little bit unsettled. I would rather hear from Goldie Krantz talking about the needs of the longshoremen in San Francisco than hear the insurance companies' solution to that. It may be a solution, but the users have to be heard, I think. I just hope that is being done.

DOUGLASS: On television I have occasionally seen someone who was a person affected by the system testifying. That is an interesting point. I

wonder how you would manage that on a national level.

ZETTERBERG: Maybe you only can manage it the way they are doing it.

DOUGLASS: Then Hillary Clinton's personal experience with the death of her father, coincidentally, may be helpful.

ZETTERBERG: Yes.

DOUGLASS: What can we learn, what can the efforts that are going on now learn from the experience here in California wrestling with these problems since 1958?

ZETTERBERG: I can't answer that. The only people who would know about that are the people who participated in it.

DOUGLASS: What I meant is I know you wrote Hillary Clinton. I was thinking what is it that this experience you have been through has to give to the answering of this basic question that is still there?

ZETTERBERG: If you want a specific answer to that, I would have to say that, on the one hand, the letters apparently that come into the White House to Hillary Clinton on health care every day are themselves just a big management problem.

Henry Waxman told us, "Well, we will maybe cover some of the things that California has done when we have hearings." And you have seen little reports in some of the papers, The New York Times and maybe the Los Angeles Times, pointing out that Henry Waxman and one other congressman. . . .

DOUGLASS: It is Waxman and Representative Pete Stark (chairman of the Ways and Means Committee) who are considered the two key people.

ZETTERBERG: Right. Henry is a very intelligent guy, and I have always thought of him as a CDC person.

DOUGLASS: The final question is why have you personally sustained this major interest in health policy? If you go way back to the time you were an intern for the National Institute for Public Affairs, but, politically, with your working for the Pat Brown gubernatorial campaign. Here we are talking about it. Why has that sustained your interest?

ZETTERBERG: Well, in the first place, I feel like I have really not done what might have been done in this. I think the thing that really got me going was the work with those other six people and seeing that in the rest of world health

care, especially in the so-called "civilized" nations, the western nations, that we were way down at the bottom, or near the bottom. And that this is a wealthy country and that we should be doing it.

DOUGLASS: And you had a good factual grounding going through those experiences. You had to have. You knew quite a bit of detail. Then my next question is do you think we are close to doing something? Do you think something fundamental is about to happen?

ZETTERBERG: I haven't slept too well any given night since the filibuster. I suddenly realized that there are six people that can hold up things. And that brings back why I left Washington in the first place in 1936. They were having filibusters then. They spent six weeks on the prayer of whatever date it was. That was in essence a filibuster. That was a continuing business. That got me so discouraged, that is why I left Washington in the first place. And now I feel like deja vu, we are back again. And I hope you cheer me up. I feel kind of discouraged.

DOUGLASS: It is a major problem.

ZETTERBERG: You have to have faith in grass-roots lobbying by Hillary Clinton or by Lester Breslow or by the other people involved.

DOUGLASS: A secondary question to that basic question is why do you think it has taken so long? If you go back to Governor Earl Warren's interest or President Harry Truman's interest, which failed. Some kind of universal coverage.

ZETTERBERG: And clear back to the first part of the century.

DOUGLASS: Right. And the fact that lots of things were going on in California that were ahead of their times. These cycles have come and gone. But why are we sitting here in 1993 finally at the national level, at least, trying to come to grips with this?

ZETTERBERG: I was going to ask you that. [Laughter] Is this country too big to do what it is supposed to do? I don't know. It did it with Social Security when you had a president then, President [Franklin D.] Roosevelt, who had a momentary window of power. And then you had Medicare, you had a window of power created by Lyndon Johnson knocking heads, being knowledgeable with a lot of the senators.

DOUGLASS: Do you think maybe the point has come where the providers, meaning hospitals and the medical profession, realize that the problem of escalating costs is now really on the table? Do you think that may bring some people around?

ZETTERBERG: When I say grass-roots lobbying, I mean people realize that maybe something will happen. Something like thirty-million people are without any coverage at all.

DOUGLASS: That combined with this deep recession. Any final words of wisdom?

ZETTERBERG: No. The only thing is that you have done a fantastic job of getting my mind to remember things. I don't know how you do it. I hope you will do some more of this in other fields because what you are doing is very creative and very valuable. Maybe not in this particular situation.

DOUGLASS: Yes it is. You have been very responsive. Thank you.

[End Tape 6, Side A]

Appendix A

Health Care for California, Report of the Governor's Committee on Medical Aid and Health December 1960 Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The evolution of the healing arts has been much like the history of mankind itself—slow development, rapid change, reversals and setbacks, and long stagnant periods. About 400 B.C., Hippocrates introduced the scientific spirit into Greek medicine and enunciated the medical ethics that have come down through the ages. But over the next four centuries medicine left little mark on history and another thousand years passed before Arabian medicine once again advanced the healing arts. During the Middle Ages medicine was at a low ebb and the "doctor's" prestige had declined, his usefulness valued between that of the cobbler and the washerman. Modern scientific medicine began in 1609 with Harvey's proof that blood circulated.

At the turn of the 20th Century, the "horse and buggy doctor", aware of how limited his medical resources were to cure the physical ills of man, gave spiritual support and love to his patients. He became, and still is, the ideal of what a healer should be.

The role of the physician changed, however, as the structure of society and the practice of medicine became more complex, particularly in the past thirty years, when more drugs and medical procedures were developed than in the entire period from the beginning of history to 1930. While patients still want their doctor to be a family friend and counselor, the days are gone when a doctor alone can give his patient all the care he needs; the doctor's time and skill and experience are no longer enough by themselves. He must routinely use laboratories, X-ray, hospitals, numerous drugs, the special competences of other doctors and allied health personnel. This dispersal of medical responsibility has tended to diffuse the personal physician-family relationship.

The use of ancillary services has so increased the cost of medical care that the physician's fee has become an ever smaller part of the patient's medical bill. Although doctors continue to donate their skills to the indigent, they need the help of the laboratory, X-ray, hospital, drugs and other health workers. The expense of these makes it impossible for him to bear all the cost of caring for the indigent as was possible when he could care for them simply by giving his time and skill and experience.

It may be relatively inexpensive to discover a procedure or a drug; developing it is more expensive, but the great cost lies in achieving its practical application to the population as a whole. For example, most "strokes" and "heart attacks" are due to clotting of blood in blood vessels. The cost of discovering that spoiled alfalfa prevented normal blood clotting was small, as was the cost of isolating and making its active principle available to patients. But the repeated tests necessary to determine proper dosage for the hundreds of thousands of patients receiving this treatment each year cost tens of millions of dollars.

Children previously doomed to a few years of invalidism before an early death now can live normal lives because of new techniques in cardiac surgery—but again at huge cost. Hundreds of further examples could be cited, such as the complex chemical procedures necessary in assessing the need for certain hormones.

With the vast increase in medical knowledge has come the need for specialization and subspecialization. Training for the various specialties continues medical education for an average of four years beyond medical school. The average specialist now goes into practice at the age of 31 after his residency training. At the beginning of the century, the average physician could start practice at the age of 21, right out of medical school.

HEALTH CARE FOR CALIFORNIA

The problems presented by the rapidly expanding amount of information, techniques and procedures related to health; the increasing population; the rising medical costs; the difficulties of meeting health manpower needs; the necessity for new equipment, new hospitals and other institutions; the desire to provide medical and surgical care for older men and women; and the need to raise the standards of care for seasonal agricultural labor, require planning if there is to be adequate supply, adequate service and appropriate distribution of health services.

These health services involve a great number and variety of people, buildings and equipment. To insure the proper kind of care at the proper time for everyone, health service organizations must work together on common problems to reach community goals. Coordination of health services can be achieved and duplication of services reduced only through planning. Continuing attention is necessary if we are to keep pace with technological progress and make the best use of available resources—people, money, buildings, equipment.

In the past 30 years, the concept of planning to many people has come to mean centralized power, strong governmental control and Federal interference in local affairs. The Committee wishes to stress a different meaning of planning. The recommendations, on the whole, are aimed at decentralization. Planning should involve more voluntary cooperation at the community level, where desire to help the aged, the indigent sick and the crippled is often born.

The Committee is confident that, presented with the facts properly developed, people will come to the right decisions. Armed with knowledge, they will reject arbitrary authority.

The Committee feels that all factors associated with health—physical environment, active prevention of illness, diagnosis and treatment of the sick, rehabilitation to as great a usefulness as is possible—are, in essence, a unity, no part of which can be neglected.

Appendix B

PROPOSED DRAFT STATEMENT ON MEDICAL CARE¹ 1961 CDC Issues Conference

We hold that health care of high quality is a basic human right in a democratic society, not a privilege. Its provision is a public as well as a personal responsibility, whenever the problem is beyond individual capacity or affects the community at large. The profound changes in science and society which have characterized the past half century call for new approaches to this entire field. It is the understanding of these changes which must shape the form and content of a responsible medical care program for California and the nation.

Public policy should be directed toward long-range solutions of these goals rather than toward an immediate patchwork of proposals the may prevent ultimate accomplishment. To achieve these goals we adopt the following guiding principles:

1. Health Services should be so organized that medical care will always be of high quality.

2. As [a] long-range goal, we urge establishment of a national health insurance program. While developing such a program, the federal social security mechanism should be extended to give medical benefit coverage to public assistance recipients on a tax-supported basis. Voluntary private prepayment programs should be encouraged during the period prior to full development of population-wide programs.

3. Health resources should be developed on a regional basis and the administration of health services should be primarily a local responsibility.

4. Health care should be on the basis of medical rather than financial need, with prepayment procedures based on principles of social insurance rather than on public assistance.

5. Prepayment benefits should be in the force of services or substantially cover the cost of services.

1. From the personal files of Stephen I. Zetterberg. This includes the corrections inserted in the original statement.

6. Plans of organization and payment should be adopted which will foster early detection and care, and prevention of illness.

7. Coverage should be universal. The old, the sick, the mentally ill, the unemployed, the poor should not be excluded and there should be no arbitrary limitations on services available where medically needed. Patients should have free and personal choice of physicians, whether individual or group. There should be no compulsion in the use of medical services beyond the normal public health service requirements.

Within the framework of these principles, we propose the following immediate programs:

1. Medical care of the aged should be provided through extension of the federal social security system. Emphasis should be on prevention, medical care of long-term illness, and rehabilitation, not just on payment of hospital and nursing home costs. No "barrier payments" should be required. Quality controls should be specified. Aged persons not now covered by social security should be included on a tax-supported basis.

2. We favor increased federal-state grant programs for expansion of training of health personnel, construction of hospital and long-term care facilities, development of medical care centers, and support of medical research. In California, 2 or 3 additional medical schools should be established. Additional public funds for scholarship aid to health personnel are also needed.

3. We favor the establishment of State-wide and regional health councils.

- a) Councils to be broadly representative of all interest, with majority voice reflective of public and community welfare.
- b) Councils to be responsible for the development of regional plans for coordinated health services for effective distribution of facilities, for avoidance of duplication and control of standards.
- c) State funds to be provided for full-time technical staffs to perform studies, develop plans and supervise coordination of services.

4. All health service activities of the state government should be combined and reorganized under one state Agency of Health and Welfare.

5. Doctors should not be denied access to use of hospitals for reasons other than medical competency and professional character.

6. We favor the development of non-profit hospitals offering broad community service, rather than proprietary hospitals. The financial records of all hospitals should be open to public inspection.

7. In order to assure adequate consumer protection, we favor state supervision of private medical insurance plans. Such supervision should include conversion and non-cancellability safeguards, premium controls, and clear grading and labeling of policies according to scope of benefits.

8. Standards should be tightened to improve hospital and nursing home license requirements. Demonstration projects such as regional diagnostic centers and regional rehabilitation centers should be developed.

9. Federal and state food and drug laws, and enforcement thereof, need to be strengthened to protect the public adequately. Sales taxes should not apply to prescription drugs, generic names of drugs should be used in all state programs and should be encouraged for general use.

10. We urge special medical care services for seasonal agricultural workers, to include the elimination of eligibility restrictions for local public health and welfare benefits, state funds to the counties for special camp and mobile clinic services, and improved sanitation services.

11. The State of California should take the leadership in establishing and contributing to medical care coverage for state employees. Such private programs as may be included in this coverage should be required to meet careful standards of benefits and premiums and safeguards of quality, and should include direct services medical care programs.

Appendix C

California Democratic Club
Estimated Date - August 1961

EXHIBIT J

ISSUES COMMITTEE REPORT

The basic recommendations of the Issues Committee at this time is that issues conferences should be held in each of the five regions on or before December 8, 1961. Each of these conferences should discuss three general topics, these being foreign policy, human rights and broadcasting (Radio and Television). Due to time limitations and the possible merit of new approaches, discussions will be based on short discussion papers with a brief bibliography of readily available material prepared by expert sources. Discussion questions and a common agenda will also be prepared by the State Topics Area Chairmen.

The second basic recommendation of the Issues Committee at this time is embodied in the following resolution:

RESOLVED---policy statements shall not be issued by regional issues conferences; however, the viewpoints of the regional conferences shall be transmitted to the Issues Committee in some manner for consideration by the statewide CDC Convention.

The committee did not have time to determine procedures for submitting the results of the regional conferences to the statewide CDC Convention at Fresno. However, as the resolution indicates, the committee believes that the results of each regional conference should be submitted to the Issues Committee. The Issues Committee should then prepare a report or resolutions based on the consensus of the regional reports for submission to the Convention. Issues activity at the Fresno Convention in January, 1962, should be limited to discussions, before the Issues Committee, of the consensus of viewpoints of the regional issues conferences and submission of the results of the deliberations of the Issues Committee to the Convention.

Emphasis on regional conferences should be increased and care should be taken to avoid programming which interferes with critical political activity during the primary and general election campaigns of 1962. Discussion of a statewide issues conference later in 1962 was deferred.

The program proffered in this report is obviously an interim program geared to meet the apparent desire to have some tangible issues activity during 1961 and as part of the Fresno Convention. The basic problems of the Issues program, including its true role in CDC, must be given serious and sustained attention during the next several months.

INDEX OF NAMES

<u>Names</u>	<u>Pages</u>
Abbott, Charles	141, 148
Anderson, Glenn M.	42, 180
Arnold, George	63
Bane, Thomas	96
Bassett, James	43, 45
Beard, John William	263
Beilensen, Anthony	258
Bevil, Mrs. P. D.	229
Blain, Daniel	143, 185
Bonelli, William G.	84, 85
Bowles, Chester	69
Bradley, Don	40, 81
Breslow, Lester	119, 129, 132, 134, 135, 139, 140, 155, 157, 159, 167, 168, 172, 195, 197, 231, 232, 234, 278
Browdie, Mrs. Lee	42
Brown, Dyke	4, 5, 7
Brown, Edmund G. (Jerry) Sr.	37
Brown, Edmund G. (Pat) Sr.	14, 18, 20, 21, 25, 30, 33, 35, 38, 47, 48, 49, 71, 76, 99, 100, 102, 103, 109, 110, 113, 116, 118, 121, 123, 125, 126, 131, 132, 133, 134, 169, 178, 183, 184, 185, 198, 223, 224, 231, 235, 244, 245, 267, 268, 276
Brown, James Harvey	76
Brundage, Albert	79
Burton, Philip	183
Cameron, Ronald	143, 170
Carney, Francis	261
Carson, Rachel	232
Carstens, Arthur	183
Carter, Alan	39
Carvey, Thomas	89, 93, 94, 95, 99, 102, 180, 241, 246, 247, 255, 256, 265, 266, 270
Casaday, Simon	102, 103, 236, 267, 268
Chiet, Earl	156
Christopher, George	49
Christopher, Warren	49, 114

Clinton, Hillary Rodham	151, 174, 194, 196, 197, 208, 273, 274, 275, 278
Clinton, William J.	154, 207, 214
Coblentz, William	118, 121, 125, 134, 136
Coffey, Bert	79
Collins, Daniel A.	143, 152
Cook, [] Ed	79
Cranston, Alan	59, 61, 70, 73, 74, 79, 82, 83, 87, 88, 91, 100, 102, 103, 180, 258, 259, 265, 266, 270
Cross, Laurence	17, 18
Cumming, Gordon R.	119, 130
D'Olive, Jean Charles	4, 7
De Graaf, Lawrence B.	263
Diamond, N. Mark	140
Dockweiler, John F.	42
Doyle, Clyde	43
Dozier, David	230
Dutton, Frederick	34, 126, 128
Dymally, Mervyn	76
Edwards, India	43
Egeberg, Roger O.	134, 135, 151, 152, 153, 158, 159, 163, 197, 212, 231
Ellsworth, Ted	156, 183
Engle, Clair	37, 38, 100, 102
Erickson, Robert J.	183
Fadem, Joyce	264
Files, J. Ray	42
Fisher, Hugo	97, 144, 169, 170, 224, 263
Fisk, Winston	22
Fleming, Macklin	27, 32, 34, 110, 113, 114, 124, 127
Ford, John Anson	39, 40, 42, 72
Foster, Paul D.	144, 150, 155
George, Lawrence	95
Gill, Charles	186
Goerke, L. B.	230
Graves, Richard	14, 15, 17, 18
Griffith, William	156
Halverson, A. B.	156, 163
Hassard, Howard A.	156
Heineman, Ben	44
Henderson, Harry	230

Herring, Hubert	43
Hill, Gerald	249, 268, 269
Hillings, Patrick J.	2, 22, 46
Holden, Nate	269
Holifield, Chet	86, 258, 261, 262
Huntley, Chet	43, 45
Jeffers, Gordon	42
Johnson, Evelyn	27
Johnson, Hiram	11, 51, 62
Johnson, Lyndon B.	103, 268, 278
Johnson, Winthrop	41
Jordan, Frank	40
Kefauver, Estes	43, 69
Kennedy, John F.	71
King, Errol	230
Kinison, Ray	43
Knight, Goodwin J.	18, 46, 48
Knowland, William G.	48
Krantz, Goldie	148, 183, 274
Lane, Harold	86, 258, 261, 262
Lee, Philip	154, 183, 214
Lee, Russel V.	154, 155, 161, 183, 199,, 214
Levering, Cricket	183
Lilienthal, Mrs. Ernest	145
Linto, Herbert A.	231
Lintz, Herbert	168
Longstreet, Ethel	79
Lopez, Henry	40
Lucas, Campbell	56
Lucas, Malcolm	56
Lucas, Scott	1, 37
Ludlam, James E.	154
Lybeck, Ruth	78
MacLatchie, Elizabeth M.	120
Mankiewicz, Frank	53, 237, 238
Mankiewicz, Joseph	237
McDonald, Claire K.	24
McFait, William	79
McKinnon, Clinton	72, 81, 83, 86
McNitt, Rolin	42, 50
Merrill, Malcolm H.	145, 152, 231
Miller, George C. Jr.	5, 43, 69, 70, 71, 72, 82, 83
Moore, Minor	42
Mosk, Stanley	38, 237
Munnell, William	258, 260

Murray, Esther	46
Myers, Helen L.	58, 60, 70, 73, 74, 79, 82, 83, 86, 87, 103, 189, 190, 259, 272
Nahm, Helen	145, 151
Neal, Fred Warner	251
Nixon, Richard M.	2, 3, 47, 48
Oddo, Nicholas V.	146
Odell, Morgan	140, 166, 167, 168
Pacht, [] Jerry	38, 237
Parker, Wilbur R.	120, 157
Petris, Nicholas C.	28, 32
Pettingill, Robert	43
Platt, Joseph B.	146
Polland, Harry	147, 155, 156, 183, 206, 211, 213
Pope, Alexander	184, 198
Raskin, High	71
Reagan, Ronald W.	49, 104, 176, 177, 178, 223, 224, 234, 236, 237, 238, 254, 269
Reynolds, T. Eric	147, 186
Ribicoff, Abraham A.	193
Richards, Richard	22, 50, 53
River, Les	251
Rogers, Will Jr.	46
Roosevelt, Franklin D.	278
Roosevelt, James	10
Rose, Don	50
Roth, Erma	4, 7
Roybal, Edward R.	16, 43
Rudin, Edward	120
Sadler, Gareth W.	183
Salinger, Pierre	100
Sayre, Woodrow Wilson	22, 23
Schachter, Marvin	77, 181, 182, 188
Shirpser, Clara	72, 83
Sierorty, Alan	94
Sloane, Harry	144
Sloane, Lucia	144
Sloate, Nathan	120
Smith, Charles	223, 230
Smith, Elizabeth	79
Smits, John E.	147
Snyder, Anne	79
Snyder, Elizabeth C.	83, 84, 85, 259, 260, 261

Sobieski, John	23, 45
Solomon, David	184
St. Sure, J. Paul	147, 155, 156
Stafford, Daly	42
Stafford, Robert L.	24
Stead, Frank	232
Stevenson, Dwight	42,
Stevenson, Adlai	69, 70, 71
Stumpf, Jack E. A.	148
Taft, Robert	36
Taylor, Glenn	43
Truman, Harry	278
Unruh, Jesse M.	96-100, 102
Vial, Don	184
Vieg, John A.	50
Vollonte, Henry	230
Voorhis, H. Jeremiah	1, 2, 20, 262
Walsh, Francis A.	223
Wapner, Joe	53
Warren, Charles	104, 253, 264, 265, 270
Warren, Earl	18, 278
Warschaw, Louis	94
Waxman, Henry	197, 258, 276
Webb, Georgia H.	24
Wedemeyer, John	148
Weinerman, E. Richard	184, 188, 193, 199
Weissman, Arthur	156
Whyte, James G.	23
Wilson, Leonard	42
Witkin, Elizabeth	79
Wyatt, Joseph L. Jr.	29, 33, 35, 77, 86, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 115, 180, 241, 252, 265, 266
Wyle, Frederick S.	249
Zetterberg, Connie Lyon	144
Zetterberg, Alan	160
Zetterberg, Stephen I.	260
Ziffren, Paul	13, 14, 83, 112
Ziffren, Lester	27, 112