

California State Archives  
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

**WILLIAM E. FORBES**

Regent, University of California, 1959-1961, 1962-1977

March 21, April 5, 17, May 2, 8, 24, and June 7, 13, 1990  
Pasadena, California

By Dale E. Treleven  
Oral History Program  
University of California, Los Angeles

## RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

Access to portions of this interview, sessions 7 through 9 generating tapes 11 through 17 and transcript pages 393 through 658, is restricted until January 1, 2000, without written permission of interviewee.

## 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 Head, Department of Special Collections, University Research Library, UCLA.

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

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

or

Department of Special Collections  
University Research Library  
405 S. Hilgard Avenue  
UCLA  
Los Angeles, CA 90024-1575

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:

William E. Forbes, Oral History Interview,  
Conducted 1990 by Dale E. Treleven, UCLA Oral History  
Program, 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
Research Room	(916) 445-4293
Exhibit Hall	(916) 445-4293
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



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY . . . . .	i
BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY . . . . .	iii
SESSION 1, March 21, 1990	
[Tape 1, Side A] . . . . .	1
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Forbes's return to California--Southern California Music Company--Small businesses in Los Angeles in the 1950s and 1960s.</p>	
[Tape 1, Side B] . . . . .	27
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Forbes's social activities and organizations-- Political orientation--UCLA ties while on the east coast--UCLA Alumni Association--Pauley Pavilion--Recruiting Franklin D. Murphy.</p>	
[Tape 2, Side A] . . . . .	54
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Franklin Murphy--Issues before the University of California Board of Regents--Robert Gordon Sproul.</p>	
SESSION 2, April 5, 1990	
[Tape 3, Side A] . . . . .	67
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Attending regents' meetings--Clark Kerr--Regent- alumni relations--Robert E. Alshuler--Forbes's appointment to the board of regents--Composition of the board.</p>	
[Tape 3, Side B] . . . . .	92
<p style="padding-left: 40px;">Regent committees--California governors on the board--Issues meriting closed sessions--Pre- session discussions--University funding sources-- <u>Master Plan for Higher Education.</u></p>	

SESSION 3, April 17, 1990

[Tape 4, Side A]	119
------------------	-----

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

[Tape 4, Side B]	146
------------------	-----

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

[Tape 5, Side A]	173
------------------	-----

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

SESSION 4, May 2, 1990

[Tape 6, Side A]	191
------------------	-----

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

[Tape 6, Side B]	215
------------------	-----

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

SESSION 5, May 8, 1990

[Tape 7, Side A]	238
------------------	-----

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

[Tape 7, Side B]	263
Regents meet with Soviet officials--Angela Davis--Eldridge Cleaver--Developing UCSB campus-- Expansion at UCLA--Constraints upon expansion-- Plan to buy Marymount High School property.	
[Tape 8, Side A]	289
Married student housing--University acreage-- Special Forbes Committee--UCLA Extension.	
SESSION 6, May 24, 1990	
[Tape 9, Side A]	312
University of California, Riverside (UCR)--UCD-- University of California, Berkeley (UCB) expansion--Radiation laboratories--University's role in military research and development.	
[Tape 9, Side B]	337
Resolving budget problems--Need for health sciences facilities--University takes over struggling county hospitals--Medical facility funding problems--Legislative demands.	
[Tape 10, Side A]	363
More on funding--Education Aboard Program-- Charter Day--Notable Charter Day speakers.	
[Tape 10, Side B]	389
Other Charter Day speakers.	
[Tape 11, Side A through Tape 17, Side A sealed]	

## INTERVIEW HISTORY

### Interviewer:

Dale E. Treleven, Director, UCLA Oral History Program

### Interview Time and Place:

March 21, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena, California  
Session of one and three-quarter hours

April 5, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of one and one-quarter hours

April 17, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of one and three-quarter hours

May 2, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of one and one-half hours

May 8, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of two hours

May 24, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of two and one-quarter hours

June 7, 1990 (morning)

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of two and one-quarter hours

June 7, 1990 (afternoon)

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of two and one-quarter hours

June 13, 1990

Forbes's residence in Pasadena  
Session of three hours

### Editing

David P. Gist, editor, checked the verbatim manuscript of the interview against the original tape recordings, edited for punctuation, paragraphing, and spellings, and with the interviewer verified proper names. Insertions by the editor are bracketed. Gist drafted the table of contents and the interviewer prepared the introductory materials.

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

### Papers

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

### Tapes and Interview Records

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

## BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

William E. Forbes was born on May 30, 1906, in Anoka, Nebraska. The Forbes family moved to Redondo Beach, California, in 1913 and shortly thereafter to Los Angeles, where William Forbes attended the Normandie Avenue Grammar School. In 1924, following graduation from the Manual Arts High School, Forbes enrolled in what was then the University of California, Southern Branch, now University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). He was awarded a bachelor of arts degree in economics and political science in 1928.

From 1928-1937 Forbes was employed by a retail credit company, a fine printing company, the Los Angeles Daily News, and Los Angeles radio station KHJ, an affiliate of the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS). From 1937-1944 he held managerial positions at CBS, New York City, and from 1944-1951 executive positions at Young and Rubicam, also in New York City. In 1951, Forbes returned to Los Angeles to operate the Southern California Music Company, first as executive vice president, then as president. He retired from the music business in 1986. In 1970, Forbes served as Norton Simon's campaign manager when Simon challenged George Murphy in the Republican primary for the United States Senate; in 1974, at Simon's request, he became a trustee and member of the executive committee of the Norton Simon Museum of Art.

A member of the UCLA Alumni Council since 1956 and president of the UCLA Alumni Association from 1959-1961, Forbes became a member of the Board of Regents of the University of California during the latter period, 1959-1960 in attendance but without a vote, 1960-1961 as a voting ex officio regent as provided for in the California State Constitution, Chapter IX, Article 9. In 1962, Democratic Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Sr., named Forbes, a registered Republican, to a full sixteen-year regental term to succeed Victor R. Hansen (1946-1962). Forbes served as a regent until he resigned in January 1977 prior to the completion of his term because of Mrs. Forbes's serious illness.

During the period of his regental appointment Forbes served four times as chairman of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings. He was a member of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and was a director of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. In 1965 he chaired the Regents' Special Forbes Committee that prepared the widely disseminated and controversial Byrne Report, named for committee counsel Jerome C. Byrne, a Los Angeles attorney.

Forbes and his wife, the former Madeleine Carpenter, reside in Pasadena, California. His first wife, the former Ann Fontron, passed away in 1977.

[Session 1, March 21, 1990]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

TRELEVEN: I guess by way of introduction, Mr. Forbes, at least for the future user of this interview, this picks up where David [P.] Gist left off with you in June '89 when he interviewed you for the former student leaders of UCLA project. My sessions with you, beginning today, will focus primarily on your tenure of more than seventeen years, minus eight months, as a regent of the University [of California]. But first I'd like to go back and explore a few areas that you touched on with Dave, and we will have a little bit of repetition here and a little bit of overlap.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: But if that's okay, I'd like to proceed that way. And I guess picking up or going back to '51, you and your family left New York and returned to California where you became the



president and general manager of the Southern California Music Company. What were the push and pull factors involved in making that decision to come back?

FORBES: I think there were economic and personal, both. After you have lived in California a good many years, you appreciate all that it offers. We had been in New York for nine years and had an interesting experience. But I would say it would have been. . . . It was nice to think about returning to California. And, in addition to that, I had an aging father-in-law, who was president of the Southern California Music Company. He was not too well. And the business wasn't doing too well. A family conference of my late wife and her sister, who was the other involved person, indicated that if something weren't done about the music company, the music company would cease to exist. So I made an exploratory trip out here and visited with my father-in-law and looked at the situation and determined that it was something that I was interested in. As a challenge. So I accepted the challenge and came back to California and

carried on. . . . I want to correct that statement. I did not come back as president. I insisted that my father-in-law, [Louis E.] Lou Fontron, retain the presidency. I said I would be executive vice president. But I did, before I came back, have the assurance that I would call the shots. I had to have that as the basis for returning.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now what was his name again? His full name.

FORBES: Fontron.

TRELEVEN: And his first name was?

FORBES: Louis Fontron.

TRELEVEN: And you had married his daughter . . ?

FORBES: Ann. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Back in 1930.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now, how did your children feel about coming back? They had probably . . .

FORBES: They were teenagers. I'm sure they realized that they would lose some friendships at schools in Scarsdale, New York, where we lived. But it was an adventure and part of their lives. Actually, as we drove west, I insisted that we route

ourselves through my birthplace, which is Anoka, Nebraska, population eighty-seven. I don't know if I told David Gist this or not, but as we went into western Nebraska, the roads got awfully narrow, and there were really no maps that would indicate where Anoka might be. I finally stopped the car, climbed a fence, and talked to a farmer, asked him. He said he thought it was over that hill, but he wasn't sure. [Laughter] And I said, "Well, I know it's right near Butte." And he said, "Well, Butte's there." So I went over the hill and went into a lumberyard. And the lumberyard was where the post office was at Anoka. We found Anoka. But it is a long way of saying that we had an adventurous trip coming west. And the music company was quite an adventure. Things did work out quite well.

TRELEVEN: Right. Oh, I imagine it was quite a thrill for your children to see where your origins were.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And have a little better understanding of who you were as a result.

FORBES: Yes. They laughed at me for my excitement about Anoka. All that was left of the house where I

was born, we found out, was the foundation. The foundation was still there in the corner. The house was gone.

TRELEVEN: And then did you move here to a place in Pasadena?

FORBES: Yes, we routed ourselves through Las Vegas, and in Las Vegas we bought a Los Angeles paper. We saw that there was a house for rent on Oak Knoll [Avenue] in Pasadena. We had checked out where we wanted to live here by where our friends lived, some on the westside and some here. We decided that we wanted to try to be in San Marino. And Pasadena, being nearby, we drove by the house and rented it and stayed there for three months while we bought a home in San Marino.

TRELEVEN: Oh, in San Marino.

FORBES: Yes. And lived in that on Darby Road for a year. And then sold it and bought another home on Chelsea Road. We were there for sixteen years before we moved here to Pasadena in 1969.

TRELEVEN: Right. Just for comparative purposes, I mean it's a standing joke in Southern California what housing costs, but do you remember at that time

what you paid for either of those houses in San Marino?

FORBES: Yes. I remember the first one I paid \$26,000. [Laughter] After a year I had committed myself to buying another. . . . Buying Chelsea Road. And pretty anxious to sell. And I sold it for \$25,000. I bought Chelsea Road for \$43,500 I think and sold it sixteen years later to the University of Southern California for \$83,000. And I thought I was a real winner. It became the home of the president of the University of Southern California in those days, for a while. Then I bought this property, and it has accelerated substantially.

TRELEVEN: Sure. Now you told David when you interviewed with him that in seven months you had the red ink of the music company turned into black ink, and in about three years time, the business was really booming. Now, how did you go about doing that?

FORBES: When I left Young and Rubicam, the advertising agency in New York, [Sigurd] Sig Larmon, who was president, said, "Bill, before you go, before you leave us, I'd like to have you talk to [Jacob]

Jake Geis." Well, Jake Geis was the treasurer of Young and Rubicam and was one of four people who were there at the start of Young and Rubicam. He was a quiet, lovely person. So when I went to see him, I said, "Jake, Sig Larmon suggested that I see you before I go out to California, that you might have a thought or two for me." Jake said, "I don't have much to say. Just be sure that you take in more than you pay out." Which was very fundamental. And I never forgot it. We had thirty-three employees at the time. I found that some departments had no cost controls, such as refinishing of pianos and organs. So I began trimming out the deadwood. Someone had to do it.

TRELEVEN: So you had sections of the operation of the store that were not paying for themselves.

FORBES: That's right. For example, I asked, "Now, what did it cost to refinish this piano?" Here's a lovely small grand piano. But no one had any idea of actually the man-hours and the actual cost to the company of doing the work. Well, there were seven people in the department, and I closed the department. And it was shocking and sad. But either you do those things and face the

truth or you don't survive.

TRELEVEN: Or the whole operation gets jeopardized.

FORBES: That's right. Yes. We had a couple of piano tuners and a girl who would schedule their appointments. I looked into it and found that they could make more money for themselves as independent contractors, not working for us, but for themselves, and we would give them the business as the telephone calls would come in for tuning. And thus I could eliminate the girl and eliminate overhead.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Just cut that out. So that's what I did. In essence, I tightened it up. We had 700 harmonicas, we had 175 violins, we had 8 harps.

TRELEVEN: Wow!

FORBES: We had tremendous inventory that it was stagnant. I would pull things out of big oak drawers, merchandise, and then I personally went around with a hammer and a nail and nailed the doors shut--the drawers shut so they couldn't put anything back in. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: So was part of the reason for this that your father-in-law was trying to continue to run the

business in 1950 the same way he had for years and years?

FORBES: He was a traditionalist. It was a five-story building, 55,000 square feet. And it was of the old school. I, fortunately, had developed friends: Harry Callaway of Thearle Music [Company], in San Diego, was an extremely successful merchant. Through my father-in-law, Lou Fontron, I met him and I searched out his profit sources, his areas of the business that were profitable. One was not very exciting, but very fundamental: renting pianos. Renting pianos with an option to buy.

TRELEVEN: Oh, sure.

FORBES: So I started with three pianos that we had out on rent. And before I finished that we had 806 pianos.

TRELEVEN: My gosh!

FORBES: But it took years.

TRELEVEN: Incredible.

FORBES: And slow growth. But very, very steady. And when I sold the business in '86, the focal points of my operations were renting pianos and carrying the conditional sales contracts after the pianos



were sold. And instead of thirty-three people on the staff in 1951, when we finished we had five.

TRELEVEN: My gosh.

FORBES: The business is carrying on with a fine young person owning it, and he is doing good business.

TRELEVEN: Now this is the person you sold it to in '86?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And it still operates under the title of . . . ?

FORBES: Name of Southern California Music Company, established in 1880.

TRELEVEN: Established in 1880. Wow!

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: So it is 110 years old this year.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: My goodness. Now, going back to the fifties, where was the music company located?

FORBES: At 737 South Hill Street.

TRELEVEN: I see. Right in downtown L.A.

FORBES: Right. It turned out that it had been there since 1923. By the time we moved from 737 to 637 South Hill, it had been in the 737 location for forty years. I could not make an agreeable lease with the owner, so we moved a block away, opposite Bullock's, and got a favorable ten-year

lease there. Stayed there for ten years. By that time the downtown area was changing, and I could see more change. I had a successful branch in Glendale, so I moved it out of Los Angeles. Made Glendale my headquarters. There was an apartment above the store, and I made that my office so I could stay on top of it, actually.

TRELEVEN: Literally and figuratively. [Laughter]

FORBES: Both. [Laughter] So it worked out.

TRELEVEN: When did you establish the branch?

FORBES: Well, I found out. . . . I found out, soon after coming out in '51, that the Los Angeles metropolitan area was moving out in all directions and that it wouldn't be long before a good many people would not go downtown to shop.

TRELEVEN: Was that already beginning to happen? I mean, could you discern . . . ?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Yes. There was a little piano mom-and-pop store in North Hollywood called Critchett Piano Company. And I timidly bought them out. He was actually a tuner, and he was losing his hearing and really forced to sell. I bought the Critchett Piano Company, and it became our first

branch.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: I changed the name, of course, to Southern California Music Company, and later opened branches in the Crenshaw area, and Inglewood, and Glendale. But these were small operations. I learned, as I said, that renting pianos was profitable. So I made these one-man or one-woman operations. A choice of pianos that people could rent with an option to purchase, no obligation to buy, but credit for a year's rent if they did.

TRELEVEN: So you installed a manager of each branch, somebody that you salaried.

FORBES: That's right. A salaried person.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: And they were happy. It was rather quiet, easy work for them. Profitable for us.

TRELEVEN: And then ultimately you bought out. . . . Was it that you bought out a place in Glendale?

FORBES: No, I just established a branch there.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: I found a location on Glendale Avenue. It was the right size and the right location, and the business is still there.

TRELEVEN: So that would have been about--you said a ten-year lease downtown--about 1961 or so that you . . . ?

FORBES: I had a ten-year lease, as I recall, from '63-'73 on the 637 South Hill location.

TRELEVEN: Oh, so it was much later. Now, you've talked about pianos, but just to get some sense of what the music company carried in the way of inventory, the product lines that you had. Were there a range of, what, highbrow musical instruments, but also--you know, strings and so on--but also brass and . . . ?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. The music company had as its finest piano product a Mason and Hamlin, which was part of the American Aeolian Company, and sister brands were Chickering and Knabe. We had Mason and Hamlin. We did business with Winter Piano Company, and then acquired a subfranchise for Wurlitzer. Wurlitzer was a very well known, respected manufacturer in those days. So that was pianos. And we dabbled a bit in electronic organs. Penny Owsley had the Hammond organ franchise, so we couldn't get it, so we bought a brand called Minshall and sold a good many of

them. Then we had a good brass and wind instrument department, band instruments. And accessories: guitars, trumpets, cornets, saxophones, violins, violas, bass, a good full line of musical instruments. But we found. . . . Accordions. But we found over the years that the profit sources we wanted to go after were the piano rentals and contracts, conditional sales contracts like General Motors has GMAC, General Electric has General Electric Credit Corporation. Profit sources, good. Simple. And straightforward operation. That's the way we directed it. Actually, as time went on, I just telescoped things in. How do you sell eight harps that have been there for a number of years?

TRELEVEN: Good question.

FORBES: Well, I had had a meeting with Harry Callaway to talk about renting pianos, so I said let's rent the harps. Well, people around said, "Rent a harp?" I said, "Sure. Let's get it moving, get some money."

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Did you get into phonograph records sales and that sort of thing?

FORBES: We had phonograph records and sheet music as two

concessions. In the store itself, the departments were not owned and operated by us, but we leased the space to someone who had a record department. We leased the space for someone who had sheet music, Harold Preeman. And that's the way that operated.

TRELEVEN: Well, obviously lots of individuals are your customers, but did you also have customers like, what, school systems, things like that? Did you get into the musical instrument business with them?

FORBES: No, I had a thought on that and went down to the Los Angeles city school system [Unified School District] purchasing department on the east side of town one day to find out about bids and procedures, the mechanics of trying to sell. I quickly concluded that it would be unprofitable for me to try to make bids. The margins were too narrow. It wasn't my cup of tea. And so I didn't do any business with school.

TRELEVEN: Colleges or universities, either?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: You stayed out of that entirely.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Were you the type of place that, say, Los Angeles Symphony [Orchestra] players would get instruments fixed or repaired, or . . . ?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Were they part of your clientele?

FORBES: I can't cite any names of people specifically, but we had on the fourth floor some repair shops. Fred Artindale repaired violins, cellos, anything in the strings. He was a wonderful violin maker, and he still is at age eighty-six.

TRELEVEN: Oh, really.

FORBES: In San Luis Obispo. I talked to him on the phone the other day. He is writing a book, "It's Fun to Make a Cello."

TRELEVEN: Oh, wonderful.

FORBES: At that ripe old age. Going blind, and facing it with great strength.

We had [Philip] Phil Campo who repaired brass. So professionals and amateurs would bring problems to these shops in the music company. The music company had a very good reputation through the years, and earned it. It was, and is, a good company.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's all very interesting. I just think

about the fifties, and I think of the kinds of changes in some way that were taking place in the whole field. The old long-play 78s [r.p.m.], and then the 45 records [r.p.m.] came in.

FORBES: That's right. Big changes.

TRELEVEN: And new kinds of instruments through technological change and all of that. It must have been . . .

FORBES: It was.

TRELEVEN: Well, since I am an oral history person, I'm just curious. Did you sell tape recorders?

[Laughter]

FORBES: As a matter of fact, I draw a blank on tape recorders. I didn't. We had another concession department with TV and radio.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

FORBES: And they may have had them. But tape wasn't too big an item in those days.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: It was perhaps just coming in.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Ampex [Corporation] began about '47, '48, for the professional market. Then ultimately they developed these huge open reel machines for the consumer market.



FORBES: That's right. No, I didn't get involved with that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess just to restate what I think I have been hearing, and that is in terms of, say, a product line which really did the best in terms of, maybe not only gross but net income, it was the piano rental?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: That really was . . .

FORBES: Piano rentals and sales. It was always nice to make a sale.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But we found that. . . . I wasn't of the mood to want to forever have sales and slash prices, etc. I would rather do it the slow way of renting pianos and, with those who wanted later on to buy them, have them buy them. It was slow, but it was steady, and still is.

TRELEVEN: Right. At the same time, can you think of any product lines where you really took a plunge and it turned out to be a loser?

FORBES: Isn't this awful? [Laughter] I really don't recall a big loser. I would say. . . . I mentioned earlier that we had Minshall organs.

It wasn't the greatest product. It didn't compare to Hammond [organs]. And we sold them. The Minshall is now out of business many years. But we were not losers. We sold all the Minshalls we had. It worked out all right.

TRELEVEN: What kind of a manager were you? If you were to articulate, say, some principles you had for managing people, managing your subordinates, how would you describe yourself?

FORBES: I would try to select good people to begin with and then let them run with the ball. I wasn't on the sales floor in selling. I kept myself away from that. I gave people responsibility and let them work the situation out. I just liked the people that I hired, and they were not only employees, but friends. And it usually worked out pretty well.

TRELEVEN: So, even though it was a rather large business, it was really more akin to a business family, you might say?

FORBES: Yes. Yes, but with certainly management. I made the decisions. But it was always in a-- hopefully--always in a warm way.

TRELEVEN: What did you find most rewarding about being

involved in that, say, compared to working with CBS [Columbia Broadcasting System], or Young and Rubicam?

FORBES: I found a great satisfaction in making decisions. I didn't have to ask anybody. It's what a good many people dream about, having their own business, being their own boss. I had some wonderful people with whom I worked at CBS and Y&R, but there was no way that I could schedule my time without checking the specific situation in the big company. This leads in to UCLA and the University of California, but it was only after getting the music company on its feet and prospering in a general way that I knew that I had time to devote, that I could make time as I wished to serve the university. Had I been an employee of CBS, as I was out here in Hollywood, or Young and Rubicam in New York, I wouldn't have been able to schedule a 2:00 appointment and make sure that I could meet it. It reminds me of the time when I was sitting in Sig Larmon's office at Y&R. President of the company. It was a Friday afternoon, and the telephone rang, and it was a

client of Y&R's in Akron, Ohio. And, "Yes." The conversation went on. "Yes. No. Okay. What time?" And so on and so on. "All right. I'll see you." And Sig Larmon hung up the receiver and turned to me and said, "Well, there goes my golf game for tomorrow. I've got to get on the train tonight to go to Akron."

TRELEVEN: Wow.

FORBES: Quite a difference.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, you are reading my mind a bit because in a few minutes we will turn to the beginning of your active involvement with the [UCLA] Alumni Association. Just one more question, though, in terms of the music company. In '62, I believe you became simply president, instead of president and general manager. Why did that come about at that time?

FORBES: It only came about on the death of Lou Fontron.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

FORBES: When he passed away, I became president. But in deference to him, as long as he lived, he was the president of the company. I made the decisions, but he was president.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. But at about that time, did you

have a key subordinate as general manager, say, beginning in the early sixties?

FORBES: Not really, no. No. I was chief cook and bottle washer.

TRELEVEN: Okay, which means. . . . We don't want to get ahead of the story, but we will. . . . During the years you were a regent, you remained head cook and bottle washer of the music company?

FORBES: Yes. Right. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Just a few more questions about expanding a little from the company, itself. I take it there were music-related trade associations. Were you involved in those quite actively?

FORBES: Yes. I served two terms on the National Association of Music Merchants, headquartered in Chicago. The organization is composed of music merchants around the country. So I served on the board twice, two three-year terms. Then I was also involved, invited in by Harry Callaway of Thearle, to a research group called the Scull Group for E. H. Scull, who was the head of a research company. This organization, or group of about fifteen merchants, were the owners of stores in cities such as San Francisco, Chicago,

St. Louis, Washington, D.C., Pittsburgh. We would meet twice a year for a two and a half day session and exchange ideas. And we would exchange sales reports weekly and monthly. So each one would have a feel of how business was going in other parts of the country and who was doing what.

TRELEVEN: Kind of identify trends. Yes.

FORBES: That's right. Yeah. And extremely helpful. For example, the owner of the music company in Minneapolis, Schmidt Music Company, related in the Depression days of '29 the thing that kept them from going broke was the sheet music business. The sheet music department.

TRELEVEN: My gosh.

FORBES: They sold sheet music throughout Minnesota and the Dakotas, and around. And that held the company together. Well, others in the group would laugh at sheet music and say it's a terrible part of the business. So there was ebb and flow. Some people liked piano rentals, such as Harry Callaway. And later I liked them. Other people would laugh and say, "Why do you have all your money tied up in that?" I said,

"It seems to work out."

TRELEVEN: Of course, you were involved in a business in a part of the country that looked like the population explosion was going to continue. Which means that the risks, I suppose, were a little bit less than some of your colleagues in other parts of the country.

FORBES: Perhaps so. The music industry is a very steady industry, however. It plods along.

TRELEVEN: Despite the . . .

FORBES: Despite the curves. It plods along. Oh, one is hurt in hard times, sure. Sure. And we could notice it when [Dwight D.] Eisenhower was elected president. In 1953 his treasury people stopped the flow of money as it had been. Business noticed it immediately. We just stopped buying things from wholesalers. You just pull in your horns and learn how to live with it.

TRELEVEN: Did you attempt to predict some of this through, say, the Kiplinger [Washington] Letter, Washington sources like that? The so-called inside newsletters about what the short- and long-term trends might be?

FORBES: Only as it related locally to the local

situations.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: If something happened. But we wouldn't seek to pontificate about general, national trends. No.

TRELEVEN: Right. So there were more like sources of, say, southern California economic indicators? Things like that?

FORBES: Yes, there would be that. And I would read . . . . Security Pacific [Bank] put out an excellent monthly publication which I followed and charted on retail sales so I could see what was going on.

TRELEVEN: Well, in addition to trade associations in Los Angeles or Glendale, were there organizations like merchants associations, chambers of commerce, and so on, that you were involved in?

FORBES: I did not get involved with the chamber of commerce. I got involved a bit with the Better Business Bureau and served on its board.

TRELEVEN: In L.A.?

FORBES: In Los Angeles, yes. Then the piano dealers, Barker Brothers and the various people who sold pianos, would get together weekly for a luncheon. We were friendly rivals, but we were



friends. And just to keep things on a friendly basis we would meet. But it was an informal group.

TRELEVEN: We have a little more tape here. Now, you were living in Pasadena--well, San Marino and Pasadena--in terms of other organizations you belonged to, how about the organization that began the Tournament of Roses, namely the Valley Hunt Club? Did you become a member of that?

FORBES: Yes. We became a member of Valley Hunt Club. I was a member of Valley Hunt. Actually, playing golf, I was interested in Annandale [Golf Club], which is a golf club here in Pasadena.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: I applied for membership and found that there was a three-year waiting period.

TRELEVEN: Wow!

FORBES: So I joined as a nonresident member La Cumbre [Country Club] in Santa Barbara, where I had a friend, Harley Bennett, who had the Bennett Music Company up there. We later went into a partnership and had a Hammond organ studio in Ventura. But I remained a member of Valley Hunt for a while. Later Annandale came along with its

membership and I joined Annandale and dropped Valley Hunt. Which I regret. I wish I were still a member of Valley Hunt. It's a wonderful organization.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Well, we are back on with the other side of the tape. Are there any other professional or social organizations, I suppose in and around Pasadena, in which you are active? You mentioned the Annandale, before we turned the tape over, and Valley Hunt Club, where you remained a member for a while. But any others that you were particularly active in or took leadership positions in?

FORBES: No. No. I found that in the early to mid-fifties, I became engrossed with UCLA activities and I devoted my time that I could give to those things and not. . . . I didn't spread around with other local organizations. I became a member of the Rotary Club in downtown Los Angeles early on because the past treasurer of the music company had been a member for thirty-two years, and he felt it should be something it would be good to

carry on. And I carried that on for seventeen years. When we moved to Glendale, I dropped that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Then to round it out, looking at what I might call the political side, to what extent, since the early fifties, have you been involved in I guess what we might call electoral politics, either at local or state levels?

FORBES: I didn't get involved in anything pertaining to politics until 1970 when Norton Simon ran for the [United States] Senate. Then I got deeply involved with him on that. It was a tumultuous, wonderful experience. Short and sweet, but it was great.

TRELEVEN: Which is. . . . We will have to come back to that a little later.

FORBES: I would think so. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: You, yourself, have never run for an elected office?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: There is some old adage about business and politics not mixing too well.

FORBES: Well, business and politics mixes all the time.

TRELEVEN: I guess what I meant is when you are a relatively

small private entrepreneur.

FORBES: Yes. I just wasn't involved. On a national basis and a party basis, I voted regularly and have been involved in casting my vote. But I haven't been involved in organization.

TRELEVEN: So you would donate money to, maybe, the party campaigns and that sort of thing.

FORBES: I did a little for a while.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, the first time we met--it's when Dave Gist and I came over for a preinterview before the student leaders project when you agreed to be interviewed for that--you defined yourself as a moderate Republican, I believe. What do you mean by that?

FORBES: I mean traditionally, from the days of my youth and my mother and father, the family, we were Republican. So I grew up as a Republican. As I have seen the political scene through the years, I've become an independent, let's say, Republican. I vote for the person and what he is seeking to do--or she--rather than a straight party line. And I don't hesitate to cross lines. I think [President Abraham] Abe Lincoln said to go with a person as long as he is right,

and go against him when he goes wrong. It's almost as simple as that. So I'm a moderate Republican.

TRELEVEN: Right, but going back a ways, your family really comes. . . . Well, your family lived in I guess what one might call William Jennings Bryan country.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: So . . .

FORBES: But I left. I left Nebraska at the age of one, and I left South Dakota at the age of seven, so I really grew up in California.

TRELEVEN: Right. I understand. But in terms of your parents, certainly, Bryan was extremely visible.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: For a long time. So just clarifying though, say in the forties and fifties, if we looked at the national level, does this mean that your Republicanism would be--what--more akin to a [Vice President Nelson A.] Rockefeller than a more conservatively inclined Republican?

FORBES: You mean such as [Senator Barry M.] Goldwater?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah. I would say yes.

TRELEVEN: And at the state level, you would have been a [Governor Earl] Warren Republican as opposed to, say, a [Senator William F.] Knowland Republican?

FORBES: I would say yes. I would say yes. But it is more the issues of the time and the person and what should be the solutions.

TRELEVEN: Now, just to extend that, and then I will leave politics alone, in the mid-sixties when there was a rather serious fight within the Republican party here in California, and the so-called [Governor Ronald W.] Reagan forces emerged victorious and the rest is history, in terms of Reagan becoming governor and then president, where did you feel you stood in the midst of that?

FORBES: Well, when you now talk about the mid-sixties, I was appointed. . . . I, a Republican, was appointed by a Democratic governor in 1962.

TRELEVEN: Right. Yes.

FORBES: A fine Democrat was my pusher, my stalwart supporter in the appointment: [Edwin W.] Ed Pauley. In the sixties I grew to understand more and more that it is important for people, no matter whether he is a Republican or a

Democrat or what, it's the person and his attitude about subjects. For example, [Edmund G.] "Pat" Brown [Sr.] and the University of California. I couldn't do anything other than to support him, because I saw what a staunch supporter he was of the University of California. And he has remained so. I found that whether a person is a Democrat or a Republican, it's what the issues are. It's what the person does, actually, that to me is important.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, we are creeping up on UCLA and the Alumni Association and the Regents of the University of California. I guess the first question I wanted to ask is, especially after you moved to the east . . .

FORBES: After I moved . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . to the east.

FORBES: . . . to the east.

TRELEVEN: How did you keep informed about the goings-on at UCLA?

FORBES: When I was in the east . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah, this is after you had gone to New York.

FORBES: When I was in the east, I was probably. . . . I

was not too well informed. Occasional letters from friends. But I was too busy with what I was doing in New York to think much about anything else.

TRELEVEN: Raising a family.

FORBES: Raising a family and working for CBS and working for Young and Rubicam. Those are full-time jobs. You don't have much time for anything else.

TRELEVEN: Were you able, though, to get back for class reunions, or homecomings and whatnot?

FORBES: No. No, no, no.

TRELEVEN: Really? Were there alumni publications that you received that would . . . ?

FORBES: Not that I can easily recollect. No, I would say when I was there in the east those nine years, I was very involved with Madison Avenue, New York City, Scarsdale, and family.

TRELEVEN: Right. At the same time, your wife's father was out here.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Would you come back to visit California? And would you go to see him?

FORBES: Infrequent. Infrequently. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: You must have been very busy. [Laughter]



FORBES: We were. We were. Yeah. We were involved. We were busy.

TRELEVEN: But when you got out here, did you have time to get over to the campus, say, in the late forties, and take a look around?

FORBES: I must say that I didn't. I didn't. I knew it was growing. But my involvement started in the fifties, really.

TRELEVEN: Okay. From time to time, I guess it was usually the Hearst [news]paper, or one of the other mainstream Los Angeles newspapers, would. . . . Well, it would make a crack about UCLA being the "little red schoolhouse." Did that kind of information get to you when you were in the east?

FORBES: Sure. Sure, it got to me, and it didn't bother me. I knew what UCLA was when I was on the campus, and is. It didn't bother me.

TRELEVEN: Well, that would come up from time to time.

FORBES: Yes, it would. Oh, yes. Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: But you indicated you were aware of an expanding UCLA during World War II, for government funded work, especially engineering and the post World War II crunch of returning GIs to UCLA. I just thought of one question in regard to that period,

namely the late forties to the early fifties.

The last provost was Clarence [A.] Dykstra, who was a business man, he had been a city manager.

FORBES: Cincinnati.

TRELEVEN: Right. Did you know him personally?

FORBES: I'd say I did. [Laughter] I knew him as a student and professor. He taught a wonderful two-unit course on municipal government. And, yes. Yes. We knew one another. A wonderful person and a pragmatic professor. By that I mean that he swept the idealism out of one's mind by saying, "There is going to be graft in municipal government, and you better recognize that there will be. But," he said, "let's discuss the various forms of municipal government. Let's learn about, perhaps, the best ways to run a municipality." A fine professor and a great guy.

TRELEVEN: Now, before he died suddenly, and after you returned, did you have a chance at all to get reacquainted with him once you got out here?

FORBES: No. No, I did not.

TRELEVEN: Very sudden, shocking death.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Well, finally, in terms of keeping up (and maybe you've answered this already--you were very busy in the east) but did you at least check the sports page and see how the UCLA teams were doing? [Laughter]

FORBES: Oh, of course. [Laughter] Oh, yes. Sure. Sure. I must say, though, that the New York Times and [New York] Herald Tribune in those days didn't give too much lineage to California. In California things happened three hours later, anyway, and it's tough to make deadlines. Maybe you would hear in the New York Times on Tuesday what happened on a Saturday or a Sunday.

TRELEVEN: My gosh.

FORBES: Yeah. That's the way it was.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You began to answer this a bit in that previous interview, and I'll just go back again. You are back in Southern California in '51, and you are rapidly turning a business around. At what point did you begin to participate more actively in the Alumni Association?

FORBES: If I were to try to pinpoint it, I would say about 1953.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: About 1953 would be the year.

TRELEVEN: And you have indicated that you were thinking more about providing service to UCLA because of the business going very well. But in addition to that, were there some other individuals who helped to encourage you to get involved in the Alumni Association?

FORBES: Well, I would think. . . . The answer would be yes. UCLA had an organization, a loose organization, of past presidents of the Alumni Association. A good many of them were my friends, such as [Frederick F.] Fred Houser, Paul [R.] Hutchinson. People who had stayed on the scene here and been active in the alumni association.

TRELEVEN: John [E.] Canaday?

FORBES: And John Canaday. I can't tell you quite when this started, but let's call it '53-'54, in through there. We were troubled. UCLA was troubled by problems within the Pacific Coast Conference. Football. Because of academic differences, or enrollment in various universities, some of the teams we would play, we

thought, took unfair advantage of the conference by using players who couldn't qualify for admission into UCLA, Berkeley, Stanford [University]. We were troubled by some of the others.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so schools have players on the football team. So it was a matter of entrance requirements?

FORBES: Entrance requirements.

TRELEVEN: Scholastic standards, things like that?

FORBES: Scholastic standards.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: And we thought that it was inherently unfair.

TRELEVEN: Now, were UCLA and Berkeley being beaten regularly by some of these teams?

FORBES: I would have to have Berkeley speak for itself, but I would say, I would say a qualified yes. Yeah. But it was more the principle of it rather than the beatings, the scores. You don't mind getting licked once in a while when it is a level playing field. That's no problem. But we thought that the Pacific Coast Conference, as it was then operating, was an unhappy situation. The past presidents association would meet

occasionally on this subject. I don't know if you are aware of this or not. I don't know if this is part of it, but this happened. I was invited by John Canaday, or one of the old-timers, two or three of them, to sit in on some of these meetings, which I did, and I expressed myself a bit. And one time someone suggested, "Well, Bill, why don't you draft some kind of a presentation on this? And we can discuss it sometime at a subsequent meeting?" And I said okay. So I did, and presented a plan at a later meeting. And someone said, "Well, I think this ought to be presented to the board of regents." Then there was discussion as to who should do it. Well, they thought I should do it, and I wasn't a past president. In that stack of papers over there, I found a copy of the presentation, which reminded me of it. But I think it was 1955 when the presentation was made.

TRELEVEN: That sounds about right.

FORBES: And Clark Kerr had just taken over from [Robert Gordon] Bob Sproul. Right in through there.

TRELEVEN: Then it would be later, because. . . . Well, let's see.

FORBES: Well, maybe Sproul was still the president but Clark was active in it.

TRELEVEN: Kerr was the chancellor. He was the chancellor at Berkeley at that time.

FORBES: Okay. I recall some of the regents who were there at the time, and the meeting was in what is now Murphy Hall.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: I made the presentation, and as a result of that, both Berkeley and UCLA withdrew. It caused quite a change in the Pacific Coast Conference. It shook up the situation and improved the situation immensely. It was a very wise move that the university made. But that's how I got involved with it.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now, you've talked about the past presidents association, but as I understand it you were a member of what was called the Alumni Council. I take it these are two separate entities.

FORBES: Well, Alumni Council, now that as such doesn't ring a bell to me. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But I. . . . In the late fifties I began serving

on committees of the Alumni Association, and then became more active as president.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you were really drawn in. The specific incident that drew you in was the annoyance over and chagrin over the Pacific Coast Conference set-up. I think--just to fill in--I think as a result of your presentation and your Berkeley counterpart, the regents, I think, gave permission to each of the schools to drop out.

FORBES: Oh, we had. . . . Yes. Yes. Berkeley and UCLA had to get the approval of the regents to do that. Yes, indeed.

TRELEVEN: So you had the green light, and the rest is history. UCLA dropped out. Before you gave the presentation or after or whenever, had you discussed this whole thing, say, with Wilbur Johns?

FORBES: No. Wilbur might have sat in with those past presidents, but I don't think so. I think I would remember if he were there.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I take it when you did that presentation for the regents, in what is now Murphy Hall, that was the first time you had ever attended a regents' meeting?



FORBES: That's right. Yeah. Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Of those who were there outside of Canada, at that time were you that familiar with or friendly with some other southern regents?

FORBES: You mean like [Cyril C.] Cy Nigg? I can't remember precisely when he was president, but . . . . See, I knew everyone from the twenties: Houser, Hutchinson, [Frank S.] Balthis, Judge Balthis, I think was there.

TRELEVEN: Judge [Victor R.] Hansen was there then.

FORBES: Vic Hansen.

TRELEVEN: [Edward W.] Carter.

FORBES: Yeah. Those were the people who were involved and were really incensed by this. They held several meetings, and that's why they said, "By golly, we want to make a presentation to the board of regents on this and ask to be heard."

TRELEVEN: Well, given your concern and interest in intercollegiate athletics, it wasn't long thereafter that J. D. Morgan came and replaced Wilbur Johns as director of athletics. There was a whole transition from the administration of the intercollegiate athletic setup from the Associated Students to the university

administration. Did you play any part in getting that worked out?

FORBES: No. No, no, no. I knew Wilbur, of course. And I knew J. D. But, no, as far as the mechanics of any changes, I wasn't a part of that at all.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Just telescoping in this area of athletics, just telescoping up to the present, how have you . . ? I take it you have continued to be very interested and supportive of the athletic program. Anything in particular you would like to mention in that regard?

FORBES: Well, yeah, I think, just in fairness, for the record, and I might be stepping on some toes, but, you know, you ask a question and I give an answer.

TRELEVEN: Good.

FORBES: A number of us were involved actively in the birth of Pauley Pavilion.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Some of us went to Sacramento and lobbied for the money. Like [William Thomas] Tom Davis and [M. Philip] Phil Davis. I went up for sessions, and this is. . . . So we had a deep interest in getting a place to play basketball besides the

girls' gym. It wasn't very easy to get the money. We wanted to have an all-purpose facility for meetings and for important guests. When Prince Philip [of Great Britain] came and got an honorary degree, he spoke in this lovely auditorium that was sometimes used for basketball. But it was an all-purpose facility. The state, on that basis, made some funds available, like \$2 million, and the regents set up a \$2 million fund, as I recall. We had to raise from various sources enough to get \$6 million to do the job. I may have talked to David Gist about this. But . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, there is . . .

FORBES: But it's quite important.

TRELEVEN: No. It is. What I wanted to mention, though, is that some years ago, long before I came to UCLA, someone did a tape with you on Pauley Pavilion, and that was transcribed in draft form. I think it was the beginning of a whole project interviewing various people on Pauley Pavilion, which somehow got stalled. But we still have that material. I am having the archivist dig it out, and I want to take a look at the transcript,

and I think I want you to look at it. I think we can figure out a way to kind of fold that segment into this interview.

FORBES: Fine. Fine. Fine. It's an important part of UCLA.

TRELEVEN: It certainly is. It certainly is.

FORBES: Oh, yeah. When Franklin [D.] Murphy came out to look at the campus, we swung around Kerckhoff Hall and looked kind of down. "And what's that hole there?" [Laughter] Sure. You bet. But I could go on about it, but you handle it any way you want to.

TRELEVEN: Well, why don't we hold it in abeyance until I dig out that transcript, and I will be bringing that over.

FORBES: Fine. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Let's take a look at it and see if you disagree with anything you said. Let's see, at the time this was taped, which could have been fifteen years ago, it was . . .

FORBES: No. No. My negative. . . . The only thing that I was going to talk about comes later.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Two or three or four or five years later.

TRELEVEN: Oh, back to my original question?

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Would you like to proceed with that?

FORBES: Well, I would simply, briefly say that after having put a few thousand dollars into the project and having some seats on the third row for a number of years supporting Pauley in basketball, I didn't enjoy getting a letter saying that unless I gave some more money at that particular time, I would be moved to a less good location. It didn't. . . . It didn't seem right. And I cling to that view. I think it was too bad. I gave up the seats and haven't attended a game since.

TRELEVEN: Really? You were incensed.

FORBES: Yes. I had given . . .

TRELEVEN: [Charles E. Young] Chuck was the chancellor by that time?

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Did you talk to Chuck about it?

FORBES: No! The decision was made. It was his decision.

TRELEVEN: Wow!

FORBES: But I have a clipping from a UCLA graduate down on the bottom of that pile, I think, who lives

out on the Westside. He had written a letter to the [Los Angeles] Times about it. I never contacted him, but I just tore it out and put it there, just. . . . No, it's too bad. And fund-raising is very important. And we need more money. But there was a price that we paid for that. In my view.

TRELEVEN: Well, fund-raising now often blankets sorts of things, and distinctions aren't made. And I'm afraid. . . . I really don't know that. I am speculating.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: But I can see why that was a little bit--more than a little bit--painful.

Well, let's go back to the Alumni Association. About the time you were elected vice president, I think that would have been about 1957.

FORBES: That's about right.

TRELEVEN: How would you assess the effectiveness of the association at that time?

FORBES: I think it was reasonably good. By today's standards it's minuscule. It was just nothing. But I think that Harry [J.] Longway was the paid

head of it. I think Harry had good ideas, and I think he had a vision of the future that was probably ahead of some of the rest of us. And the Alumni Association has expanded remarkably and beautifully. It is just great.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And we were just a little bit of an entity at that time.

TRELEVEN: And at that time what do you recall about the main functions, major activities of the Alumni Association? Again, this is back in '57.

FORBES: Membership, broadening membership. More support. More services to alumni through various chapters around the area. Support of homecoming events. Pretty basic.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Improvement of the publication.

TRELEVEN: So really fortifying the whole communications network amongst graduates.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. And modestly. We were a very small, little thing in those days compared with the operation today.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, part of the reason we do interviews like this is to talk to people and provide little

pieces of information that will help in the future, as well as the present, to understand how it all came to unfold. But, now when you became president, did you see needs in the Alumni Association that were unmet? Did you see things that could be improved? Did you have ideas for improvement? Do you recall?

FORBES: I think the answer is yes. We were strapped because of funds. We didn't have a great amount of a budget to work with. And we may have lacked the imagination to aim higher. I've mentioned the various parts of the operation. I think we were involved in '59 in a campaign for a new chancellor.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: I think that that probably took precedence over everything else.

TRELEVEN: Now, you say that you--in other words, the Alumni Association--and you, leading it by that time, were involved in finding a new chancellor. What exactly was the involvement of the Alumni Association in the selection of the new chancellor? In the assessment and selection, I should say.



FORBES: The. . . Let's. . . If I could rephrase that just a little bit.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: The involvement was not so much that of the Alumni Association as it was the past presidents of the Alumni Association. The past presidents were a very strong group of visible people. When you have a Phil Davis, and Houser, and Balthis, and Hansen. . . I think Hansen was among those, but whether Vic was or not I am not quite sure. Are we all right on the tape?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But when they put themselves behind something, they could get some action. The involvement was that the past presidents asked Clark Kerr for a meeting to discuss the situation when Raymond [B.] Allen was leaving.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Let me interject here that Kerr had become president in July '58, so Kerr was the new president.

FORBES: President, that's right. And we asked him for a meeting. He came south and met with us, once at Phil Davis's home, and he brought down some names of some people that he had in mind for

consideration as chancellor. We discussed the list, and the past presidents, as a group, was not impressed and told Clark Kerr that. He said, "All right. I'll bring another list." Whether he had mentioned Franklin Murphy as a person at that first meeting or not I can't tell you for sure. But pretty soon it was apparent that if Clark Kerr could get Franklin Murphy to come out for a visit, he'd like to get him. And one day he telephoned me at the music company.

TRELEVEN: Clark Kerr?

FORBES: Yeah. And said that Franklin and [Judith] Judy [Murphy] were coming out that night and arriving on TWA [Trans World Airlines], 12:30 A.M., LAX [Los Angeles International Airport], and would I meet him? He said, "I think it would be a good idea. It would be nice if Ann would join you." My late wife. And I said, "I will be there." And we scheduled a meeting of the past presidents to meet Murphy the following night. I went to the library, downtown library, and was able to find a Kansas KU [University of Kansas] alumni directory that had a picture of Murphy so I would know what he looked like. And we met him. Got a

reservation for the Bel Air Hotel. Up Stone Canyon.

TRELEVEN: Sure.

FORBES: And Judy carried a paper box under her arm [Laughter] as she got off of the plane. Took them to the Bel Air Hotel, and it was, you know, not too early by that time. "Would you like to come in for a nightcap?" I said, "Great." And we sat there in the lobby and visited for a while. And then the next night he met the past presidents of the Alumni Association.

TRELEVEN: The group?

FORBES: The group.

TRELEVEN: Of past presidents?

FORBES: That's right. About ten. And the fellows would come to me and say, "Who is he? What's the talk about him?" And I would say, "He's from KU, and so on, so on [inaudible]." "Hey, I like him." The buzz was just contagious. Murphy was such a guy. And by the time the meeting was over, why, the past presidents were clicking their heels. This was the greatest thing ever. And Kerr had arranged for a meeting of the board of regents the next night in San Francisco. So we flew up

there.

TRELEVEN: You went with him?

FORBES: Yeah. Well, yeah, I was at the meeting, sure.  
Sure. See, I was on the board.

TRELEVEN: Oh, you were regent designate by that time.

FORBES: That's right. No, I was a regent.

TRELEVEN: You were a voting member by then.

FORBES: I was a nonvoting. In those days you were on for  
two years as a regent, first year nonvoting,  
second year voting.

TRELEVEN: Voting. Right.

FORBES: He came in 1960. Maybe by that time I had a  
vote. It wasn't that important whether I had the  
vote or Berkeley had the vote.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right.

FORBES: It didn't make any difference really.

TRELEVEN: We will get back to that.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Anyway, you went up to . . .

FORBES: But, anyway, we went up there at the club, a  
prestigious club in San Francisco, and I. . . .  
Red napkins and stuff. And the regents would say  
the same thing to me. "Well, who is this?" You  
know, "Bill, what about him?" "He seems pretty

good." Exactly the same reaction with the past presidents as the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: Excuse me, we are going to have to pause for just a second.

FORBES: Okay.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Before we put in a new tape you were in the midst of describing your visit to San Francisco with Dr. Murphy.

FORBES: Yes. And the regents were extremely and favorably impressed with Franklin. When the session adjourned, Ed Pauley said, "Let's get Murphy and a few of us have a drink with him." So we went to the top of the Mark Hopkins [Hotel], about five of us. And in essence, Ed Pauley said, "What will it take to get you out here?" And Murphy was extremely cautious and didn't give him a direct answer, of course, and the matter was dropped there. But in essence, the university very much wanted Franklin Murphy to become chancellor.

Maybe I put this on the tape with David Gist, I can't tell you if we got into this, but

it's kind of interesting. I went down to the L.A. Times, and paid them cash rather than anything else, and then started a subscription to the Los Angeles Times for Franklin Murphy back in Kansas.

TRELEVEN: Ah, sent back to . . .

FORBES: Right. Because I knew he had four children and Disneyland and Hollywood and whatnot. So, all of a sudden, the Los Angeles Times began appearing every day in Lawrence, Kansas, which was part of the plot. But it went on for a few months, maybe two or three months, and then there was a call from. . . . I guess Franklin called me from New York City, where he was back there on business. As I recall it, he said, "I've just talked to Clark Kerr, and I'm coming out."

TRELEVEN: Ah!

FORBES: So that was the end of the beginning. But Franklin in his eight years as chancellor just did a tremendous job for UCLA.

TRELEVEN: A couple of follow-up questions. What so impressed you about, perhaps not only Dr. Murphy, but Judy as well?

FORBES: Judy had charm and simplicity and

straightforwardness, just an All-American gal. Franklin had a wonderful background educationally and administratively, having been dean of the School of Medicine in Kansas City before KU. I had had a luncheon. . . . This is not a direct . . . . This is turning around. But I had a luncheon date with a friend of mine who was a graduate of Kansas. I pledged him to secrecy, and then I said that we were trying to get his chancellor away from him, from Kansas. I wanted him to be totally honest with me about his appraisal of Murphy. And he couldn't have been more enthusiastic about Murphy. He ended up by saying, "But, Bill, I don't think you will get him." Murphy had these great associations with business, being on the board of several corporations.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: He had a background of culture with his interest in art. He was our man. And he loved libraries. Loved books.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: He was someone to get.

TRELEVEN: Did you get a sense in talking to him that he had

some sort of vision about what might happen at UCLA were he administering it? That's a very, sort of oblique question, but . . .

FORBES: Well, I think. . . . Yes. I think he was able to see a tremendous future. Yes. I think he had visions of it. And early on, in early meetings with the board, he almost shocked some of the people by saying that he wanted UCLA's library to be on a parity with Berkeley's. Well, Berkeley with, at that time, three million copies, Bancroft [Library], and just a tremendous reputation. . . . They wondered if it was affordable, or if it made sense. But he stuck to his guns. He had the stature and the ability and the capacity to lay it on the line. Great advocate.

TRELEVEN: And this was apparent from almost minute one when you met him?

FORBES: Right. Right. Right. Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: Now, I don't want to read something into what you said, but I'd like you to clarify. You indicated that the past presidents wanted Kerr to come down with a list of potential candidates for the chancellorship. Was there a sense that Kerr was



not moving fast enough? That he was dragging his feet? Or what? I don't want to read something into that.

FORBES: No. No. Not at all. We were simply asking for his cooperation at an extremely important point in UCLA's life, to get the finest person we could get to lead the campus properly. No. We were not at any time critical of Clark Kerr. Not at all. No, sir.

TRELEVEN: Was there some concern over what might happen because of the sort of interim status that was at UCLA with--I guess we call a triumverate--the three individuals who were sort of acting as interim chancellors at that time?

FORBES: Yeah. Well, I don't know. Maybe you could restate that question for me.

TRELEVEN: Well, Ray Allen had gone. The former chancellor had left. And then there were three individuals who were running . . .

FORBES: Okay. Yes. All right. Well, we were simply seeking the best possible successor to the status quo.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I suppose what I am asking is was there some sense that there was a bit of a drift until

you really got a chancellor in place? That there would be a . . .

FORBES: I think that there was. I don't know. I think the seas were too calm. We needed some vigor. And we got it.

TRELEVEN: Well, Dr. Murphy arrived in 1960. He attended his first regents' meeting on July 22, according to the minutes. And not long after, following a model that he developed at the University of Kansas, he moved to set up a UCLA Foundation. How were you involved in that?

FORBES: I was not involved in that.

TRELEVEN: At all?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: Because this would have a rather profound impact on the Alumni Association, in that it was tied into the Alumni Association.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: As the fund-raising vehicle outside of the central administration of the university.

FORBES: Yes. No, I wasn't. . . . I was involved in the Alumni Association, but I did not get involved in the Foundation.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But you certainly knew this was going on.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And I take it. . . . Well, how did you feel about that being set up?

FORBES: Fine. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Needed more private money?

FORBES: Sure. Sure. But I can't be more responsive, because I wasn't a part of that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And in those days, in those days I devoted 30 to 40 percent of my time to the university, away from the music company. I was involved in the Alumni Association, and then as a member of the board of regents. I was not a special advocate for UCLA. I served for the whole university picture. And just as Pat Brown said to me when he appointed me, he said, "Be a good regent for the people of California."

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: It was as broad as that. So I was traveling to San Diego and to Riverside. Flying in a blimp over the acreage at Irvine with [Dorothy Buffum] Buff Chandler to see the red stakes where the campus was proposed to be. To Davis, to Mount Hamilton [Lick Observatory], to Los Alamos

[Scientific Laboratory], to [Lawrence] Livermore [Laboratory]. So maybe I am making that as an excuse, but I was involved with the Alumni Association, but I was very involved as being a member of the board. Without a vote for the first year. It didn't make any difference.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Someone said to me, "Don't raise your voice, but be ready at any moment to respond to the discussion."

TRELEVEN: Right. We are going to want to. . . . Well, we will get back to that either today or next time.

FORBES: Okay, maybe you want to . . .

TRELEVEN: I was also going to throw in that you also got to Lake Arrowhead [Conference Center, University of California], because that's where you went to your first meeting.

FORBES: That was the first one, yes. That's right.

TRELEVEN: As an ex officio regent.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: I had a. . . . I know what you are saying, that when you are a regent, it's not just UCLA, it's not just the southern campuses, it's the entire ball of wax, which was, even at that time, very

extensive in terms of what the University of California was doing. But at the same time, what would you identify, say, on the eve of Murphy's arrival, what were some of the key problems at UCLA?

FORBES: Well, the key problems were housing, were library, were budget. Just the meat and potatoes. Expansion, proper expansion of the medical school. Funding of the dental school.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Just a broad range of problems. Problems with our neighbors in Bel Air. The parking lot at Hilgard [Avenue] and Sunset [Boulevard]. Very controversial. And "You are going to put a parking structure here?" "Yes, but we will do it. . . . We want so many spaces and all this, but we will have trees and we will have this." And it came out wonderfully.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Then on the west side, over there where we had the tennis courts and the swimming pool and the recreation area, that had to be sold to Bel Air. Those were the problems.

TRELEVEN: So, on one hand there are problems attendant to

campus expansion, and on the other hand, there are problems about those who are concerned with campus expansion.

FORBES: Correct. That's right.

TRELEVEN: And here you are, the regent, in the middle of it. [Laughter]

FORBES: That's right. Yeah. That's right. And they . . . . You know, we had some discussions about a stadium with fifty thousand, twenty thousand, thirty thousand, fifty thousand seats that got put up and were shot down.

TRELEVEN: On the eve of Dr. Murphy's arrival to assume the chancellorship, were there I guess what I would call complaints, perhaps, under the surface, by the past presidents, by perhaps some southern regents, that UCLA was not being treated equitably?

FORBES: You mean on the eve. . . . You mean before he came?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, as compared to Berkeley.

FORBES: Oh, there might be. Might be. But I was there. I was in office before he arrived and after he arrived, and I am not aware of any acrimony that amounted to anything.

TRELEVEN: I bring this up because in past interviews with

various people, there is some sort of theory, that at least in the Sproul period, that Sproul would take on a new provost or chancellor and promise autonomy, and the autonomy never came. That it was always under the thumb of Sproul, located at Berkeley. It gave the appearance at least, if not in fact, that UCLA was being in kept as sort of a second status university, being held back in a way. How do you respond to that?

FORBES: I respond that Bob Sproul was a very strong person, and he was Berkeley oriented, but he was a good friend. And I respond that I thought . . . . I got the feeling. . . . Somehow there might be an impression that there were southern regents who would vote a certain way, and northern regents who would vote a certain way. But I must say that that was never apparent to me. When I got right down to cases, it was person to person. And I saw no attitude like that. I would negate that. Sure, Bob Sproul was a strong Berkeley-oriented person, but Bob Sproul. . . . Just as an example, when I was the first editor of the [UCLA] Daily Bruin, back in the twenties, and he was either controller or

assistant controller of the university. Not a very big job. But he was an outgoing person. And we had an edition that ran twenty-six, twenty-eight pages. Something like that. It was the biggest Bruin we ever put out for some reason. And I got a letter from Bob Sproul congratulating me on that. Now, he was an outgoing person. He didn't know me from Adam, and here is a fellow up in Berkeley writing a note to someone down. . . . Pretty good. So, Bob Sproul was Berkeley oriented. But he was our friend, and others would maybe disagree with me on this, but. . . . And UCLA had to fight its way. It had to fight its way into stature. And part of the way it fought its way was by the past presidents insisting that Clark Kerr, in the north, get a good man. And we got him.

TRELEVEN: Well, listen, if it's okay with you, next time I would like to take a trip with you up to Lake Arrowhead, figuratively speaking. Because that is where you attended your first regents' meeting. I would like to get into such areas as your initial impressions. Then, really, do a little overview of your entire regency. And then



sort of circle back and look at some specific areas and issues, if that's okay.

FORBES: All right. All right. Sure. We will go wherever you suggest.

TRELEVEN: All right. So, for today, thank you.

FORBES: All right. Entirely welcome.

[End of Tape 2, Side A]

[Session 2, April 5, 1990]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, Mr. Forbes, last time we discussed your successful business operation and your progressively greater activity in the UCLA Alumni Association. Today I'd like to move on with your tenure on the University of California Board of Regents. To begin with, you automatically became an ex officio regent after succeeding to the presidency of the Alumni Association. What did ex officio mean in terms of what you could or could not do at regents' meetings?

FORBES: Well, there are a number of ex officio members, such as the governor of the state of California, and the lieutenant governor.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Ex officio members get the same kind of a vote as regular members. They simply come to the board in a different route. My particular situation was that. . . . I'm pretty sure I was the

youngest person. And I was advised by a good many people to participate quietly by listening to what was going on, and, perhaps, not speak until requested.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Knowing that my contributions probably would be minimal for a while. But I took the stance that I would be prepared to comment on the conversation, on the subject before the regents, at anytime I might be called on.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But did you tell me before that in year one, the [University of California] Berkeley [Alumni Association] person had the vote and you didn't?

FORBES: That's correct.

TRELEVEN: And then in year two . . .

FORBES: That's right. And that should be said.

TRELEVEN: And then in year two you did have a vote.

FORBES: That's right. I was appointed for a two-year span, the length of my office as president of the Alumni Association. The first year without a vote, the second year with a vote.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We alternated then with Berkeley.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And as ex officio regent, then, you would receive beforehand all the materials that an appointed regent did?

FORBES: Right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Minutes and president's reports and etc.?

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: What did you think when the first batch came?  
[Laughter]

FORBES: Well, I thought that there was a lot of work to do. And there was. Month after month. A tremendous volume of material, not only to read, but to study and analyze, and perhaps pick up the phone and telephone other members of the board about specific questions that one might have.

TRELEVEN: And you participated also in committee meetings?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. I attended all meetings that I was permitted to attend. I think in those early days, the Investment Committee was rather a closed situation for most of the board. In the years as they passed, more and more regents attended the Investment Committee, but I think at the beginning, it was pretty much closed.

TRELEVEN: So, at a typical regents' meeting, you would go to Grounds and Buildings [Committee], you would

go to Finance [Committee].

FORBES: Educational Policies [Committee], Finance.

TRELEVEN: Educational Policy. Right.

FORBES: Correct.

TRELEVEN: How about executive sessions? When the regents went into executive sessions, were you as an ex officio member allowed to participate?

FORBES: Yes. Oh, yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were you given any specific committee assignments during that first year?

FORBES: I don't believe I was. It rings a slight bell, but I can't recall if I was on any committee that first year. I rather doubt it.

TRELEVEN: All right. I couldn't pick it up from the minutes. In fact, the minutes would record you as being in attendance.

FORBES: Yeah. Right. Yeah. I think that's the way it was.

TRELEVEN: Instead of being in the upper line as a voting person. And the Berkeley person was in that upper line.

FORBES: Correct. That's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: But then, I take it when you got to the second

year as an ex officio regent, you were possibly on committees.

FORBES: On committees? I might have been. The easiest way to check that is the little printed cards that showed all regent assignments. I have some around and I can check if you'd like to have me.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, according to the regents' minutes, you attended your first meeting on June 19, 1959, at Lake Arrowhead. Do you recall the trip up?

FORBES: I don't recall the trip up but I recall the first meeting. The regents, at times, would explore various geographical parts of the university system. We had a meeting later at Mount Hamilton. And it was significant because of the importance of Mount Hamilton. And Arrowhead we had then rather recently acquired, and the regents were interested in seeing what it looked like. So we had a meeting there.

TRELEVEN: Did you go up with anyone else?

FORBES: I don't recall. I don't believe I did.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Who among the regents at that first meeting--especially those from Southern California--were friends or acquaintances of

yours?

FORBES: Well, of course I knew Ed Carter.

TRELEVEN: Sure. Canaday, perhaps?

FORBES: And John Canaday, of course. Yes. But it was really a meeting of getting acquainted with regents whom I did not know. I had seen. . . . I had met a number of them, such as [Donald H.] Don McLaughlin . . .

TRELEVEN: Sure.

FORBES: . . . and Jesse [H.] Steinhart in the earlier days, in the mid-fifties when UCLA was seeking to help revamp the Pacific Coast Conference.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. Which you talked about last time we met.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Who among the regents served you as kind of a mentor during that first year? Filled you in on the background of some of the issues and some of the subtleties of agenda items, that kind of thing.

FORBES: I don't think that there. . . . No one comes to mind as a crony. I simply would ask questions of a number of the members of the board. I studied the materials alone and would talk to Canaday,

and perhaps Ed Carter. But no one in particular.

TRELEVEN: Of course, regents' meetings moved around from place to place. Is it true that it was pretty impossible to coordinate travel plans and so on? You pretty much would go up on your own and come back on your own?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Now, are we talking about the first year or two?

TRELEVEN: Yes, first year or two.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. The first year or two, in the early years, we would sometimes go up together. Ed Pauley had a plane and we would be invited at times to join him and others for a trip north. [Samuel B.] Sam Mosher had a plane, and I rode with him a time or two, as I recall. Sometimes together, sometimes separately.

TRELEVEN: I'm just curious, was Pauley a pilot himself, or did he have someone . . . ?

FORBES: Oh, no! No. No. He had a pilot and a copilot, and he had a nice comfortable seat and was very generous and thoughtful in asking others to go up. And we would meet at the Santa Monica Airport and fly up. It took longer than the



regular plane, but it was very comfortable, and drinks were served.

TRELEVEN: Wow! [Laughter]

FORBES: Very pleasant.

TRELEVEN: That's very nice. So this was, what, the corporate plane that he needed for his construction business, and he'd have to fly quite a bit?

FORBES: I don't know whether he owned it, or Pauley Petroleum, or what.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: It was just his plane.

TRELEVEN: Now, I would guess you were familiar with the operations of boards in the private sector. Do you remember what struck you initially as the major differences between a public university board and a board in the private sector?

FORBES: No. Private boards are serious entities, just as the board of regents is. I was impressed by the board of regents because of the quality of people on it and their dedication to the university, illustrated by the great amount of time they took and gave to the university. These were fine people serving a tremendously important cause.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Over the years, much has been made by some observers, some speakers, certainly some UCLA Oral History Program interviewees, about north versus south factions. I guess what that really means is Berkeley versus the rest of the campuses. Was this in any way apparent to you in that, say, in the first or second year that you attended regents' meetings?

FORBES: It was not. I had heard rumors about the north and south, and I was pleased that there was no such feeling that I saw exhibited by members of the board. There might have been some undercurrent, but it wasn't to my knowledge at all. I think the board members took their appointments seriously, and they were serving all of the university all of the time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think last time you spoke about you and others having met with President Kerr in regard to UCLA chancellor candidates. So you had met him previously, but now you saw him in the context of regents' meetings, beginning at Arrowhead. What was your initial assessment of Clark Kerr?

FORBES: Of Clark Kerr? An extremely bright, alert person

with extraordinary talent for administration. I was extremely favorably impressed with him.

TRELEVEN: Was he a conversant person? Was he the kind of individual who could walk up to you and strike up a conversation easily?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Yes. He was approachable, friendly, and. . . . Oh, one time at my office at the music company he was announced. He came in without an appointment just to say hello, which impressed me. He was a very friendly person.

TRELEVEN: At the beginning, in contradistinction to later years, which we will get to during our discussions, but in this early period, did you have any sense that there was any antagonism between Kerr and particular individual regents?

FORBES: Antagonism?

TRELEVEN: Antagonism, yeah.

FORBES: No, no. Nothing comes to mind that would indicate that. No.

TRELEVEN: Well, he was fairly new in the job.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: He had taken over in July of 1958.

FORBES: That's right. He was new on the job. He was extremely cooperative, as I believe I've said

before, concerning the chancellorship at UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We, as alumni, were extremely impressed with the fact that we had to get a strong, able, capable person as chancellor. And we said that in several different ways to Clark Kerr. And I must say he came up with a ten-strike when he got Franklin Murphy to agree to come out for a visit.

TRELEVEN: Right. How about key members of Kerr's staff? Initial impressions. We should add that these people were also regents' officers. It's almost like they wore two hats. They were members of Kerr's staff, but they were also officers of the regents. I have in mind, for instance, secretary-treasurer Robert [W.] Underhill [vice president and treasurer, UC].

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And General Counsel [Thomas J.] Cunningham [vice president and general counsel, UC].

FORBES: Right. And the legislative liaison, or whatever the title was, [James H.] Jim Corley [vice president--government relations and projects, UC].

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How did you size up those people that were closest to the regents, closest to Kerr?

FORBES: They were close to the regents, they were capable. While they were part of the president's staff, let's say, they were working for the university, and the regents without remuneration were working for the university. We were all together. There was no problem. Jim Corley, you mentioned Jim Corley. Jim Corley was known as an old Berkeley person, but Jim was fine. Jim was all right. No problem. And you mentioned Bob Underhill. Bob Underhill just grew up with the university. A stalwart and extremely capable person who was the right person at the right time in the treasurer's job. [Marjorie J.] Marge Woolman should be mentioned.

TRELEVEN: Oh, of course!

FORBES: Another stalwart. Great, great person.

TRELEVEN: Right. I guess just generally, what other initial impressions or special recollections do you have of the regents as a policy-making body or of particular individual regents as you were getting started as an ex officio regent?

FORBES: I was greatly impressed with Jesse Steinhart, Don

McLaughlin, old-timers on the board.

TRELEVEN: Right. In fact, I think McLaughlin chaired your first meeting. I'm sure he did. At Arrowhead.

FORBES: He might have. Right.

TRELEVEN: He was the chairman at that time.

FORBES: He might have. But these are men of great stature and thoughtful approaches to problems. They were not inclined to make quick decisions, but would reflect and think out subjects. Also, Buff Chandler. Mrs. Norman Chandler.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Extremely capable. Ed Pauley, outstanding.

TRELEVEN: Strong group. What did you learn that first year? Or for that matter, during those two years that you were an ex officio regent?

FORBES: Oh, there was so much to learn. So much to learn.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Anything that stands out?

FORBES: The responsibility that the university had to the state of California in terms of, for example, agriculture. Your mind turns to [University of California] Davis and to [University of California] Riverside, very important campuses. But it was. . . . The early years are learning

years. You learn about the people at the various campuses. And before long, we realized the importance of expansion that we had to undertake, because we were responsible for the top 12.5 percent academically of high school graduates. And we had to have facilities for them. Gradually, we knew that the time was coming when we had to expand. And we had to do that very thoughtfully, too.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which we are going to turn to rather extensively in five or ten minutes.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Now, you were the Alumni Association representative on the board. In what ways did you report back to the association in regard to regents' agenda, regents' deliberations, that kind of thing?

FORBES: At our alumni meetings, I would report regularly on my participation with the board and what the board was doing. But it was a continuing routine of keeping the alumni abreast of what was going on statewide, if that's what you mean.

TRELEVEN: Right. So the way you would report is the same way that your predecessors had reported back to

the association?

FORBES: Yes. I would rather think so. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, originally I had planned to discuss specific agenda during that ex officio period, but the more I thought about it, the more it seemed more logical to come back a bit later to particular areas which occur more or less in a continuum across the expanse, not only of those two ex officio years, but that whole period from '59 through '77.

FORBES: Incidentally, let me interrupt and say that I was off the board for about eight months, as I recall. When I said goodbye to them, after the two years, it was about eight months or so before the governor [Pat Brown] appointed me to take a sixteen-year term.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: So I was off for a little while.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which we'll. . . . Just a couple more questions. You were succeeded as Alumni Association president by . . .

FORBES: [Robert E.] Bob Alshuler.

TRELEVEN: Bob Alshuler. And tell me a little more about him. I'm not too familiar with him.



FORBES: Well, Bob . . .

[Interruption]

. . . Bob Alshuler, a little bit younger, and in the mortgage business successfully. He was a basketball player and a leader on the campus when he was attending UCLA. And an outgoing, wonderful person. Just a fine young man. And I was pleased to have him as my successor.

TRELEVEN: So you're out to presidential pasture, you might say, but does that mean that you also remained active with this past presidents group that you referred to last session?

FORBES: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. The past presidents group was an extremely vital part of the UCLA picture in those days. And it, perhaps, still is. I'm going next week to a dinner meeting of the past presidents.

TRELEVEN: Oh, you are?

FORBES: And I had a reminder letter yesterday: "Don't forget." I think it's April 16. The chancellor is there, always in attendance. And there are about a dozen who show up, who attend. We have a lively exchange of comments about the campus. And the chancellor brings us up to date with the

latest information he has on the university.

TRELEVEN: So that brings it right up to date. You've remained active with the past presidents all those years.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Right.

TRELEVEN: That's great. Now, when you were succeeded, that meant the end of your regent's term, at least temporarily. In the ensuing months, after those two years in the regents, did you miss the meetings?

FORBES: Oh, very much. Oh, yes! By that time the university had become a very important part of my life. And, yes, I followed the university activities as best I could from the outside and remained interested.

TRELEVEN: Well, let's get back to Pat Brown. In what way did you receive a first inkling that he was seriously considering offering you a full term on the board of regents, I think to succeed Judge Hansen?

FORBES: I, at no time, had any inkling that he was considering me. I knew that there was a good deal of activity on the part of people who would like to have me appointed. But as to his

reaction, what his thoughts. . . . At no time did I know how he felt about me as a possible appointee until he telephoned me one day and told me he was appointing me.

TRELEVEN: Right. Who were these people who were behind the scenes?

FORBES: Number one was Ed Pauley.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Ed Pauley was a "charge of the light brigade." He was vocal within bounds. But I remember a lovely party at his home with a good many people in attendance, and he made an extremely nice speech, or talk, or comment about me and about his hopes that I might be appointed. I think that if we could pause here a minute I'd like to get something for you that would . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay . . .

[Interruption]

. . . We paused and you showed me an excerpt from the transcript of the meeting of the Regents of the University of California, June 23, 1961. Sent to you by Marjorie Woolman, secretary of the regents. What we have here is a verbatim discussion among Regents Pauley, Steinhart,

Hansen, Carter, and you. And clearly the tone of this is that each of your colleagues is very interested in the governor knowing about the kind of service you've performed as an ex officio regent. And it's not even a subtle implication here that the governor is going to be notified.  
[Laughter]

FORBES: In a quiet way.

TRELEVEN: I'm glad you showed that to me.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: So that really does provide, very excellently, the background and the tone of the individuals who were on the regents with you. Now, I remember when Dave Gist and I first met you last year, you recalled--but we were not on tape--but you recalled how the governor contacted you about the appointment. And I wonder if you would repeat that.

FORBES: Well, I was at Annandale Golf Club here in Pasadena when I was called to the telephone, and it was the governor. Pat said that he was appointing me on the board, and "Be a good regent for the people of California." And, naturally, I was immediately on cloud nine. But that's the

way it happened.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Did you have to consider any pros and cons before accepting it?

FORBES: No. No. There was nothing for me to consider. It was an opportunity to continue what I had done for two years. I was delighted. Actually, it changed my life. Because it meant a continuation of perhaps devoting a third of my time, overall, to the university, and that was exactly what I'd like to do.

TRELEVEN: Did the governor acknowledge to you at all that he realized you were not a Democrat?

FORBES: We never talked politics. Never talked politics. But I'd make the parenthetical observation that he appointed Norton Simon, a Republican, and Ed Carter, a Republican. And much as many people thought that Pat Brown was just a politician, I saw him in a different light in his many participations in regents' meetings. I knew his devotion to the university and his desire to have people on the board who would do the best possible job for the people. He was a stalwart. He was one who went the extra mile to serve the university as a member

of the board, ex officio as he was. An example of that was when we got in a particularly difficult financial crisis, let's say, between Clark Kerr and the chairman of the finance department or the director of finance for the state of California, Hale Champion. And Pat said, "Well, look. Let's get you people together and talk it out." And he and Clark arranged a meeting in Sacramento, at his home, the governor's mansion, with Hale Champion and, perhaps, members of the Finance Committee. I know that I was there, because after dinner and before the meeting started, Pat showed me the top of the governor's mansion and I found that it had six stories. The sixth story being a little bit of a cupola at the top. But it's a long climb up there, and Pat and I did it together. But the importance of that meeting was that Clark said his piece, and Hale Champion said his, and things were ironed out.

TRELEVEN: Any idea what year that would have been?

FORBES: I would say that might be around '62.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I want to do a little looking back at my notes. I think we may well want to come back to

that particular crisis in a larger context of this sort of dynamic tension that exists often between the Department of Finance on one hand, and the regents on the other. But I'm glad you mentioned that. But, just one more question about your appointment. Before that telephone call, how well had you gotten to know Pat Brown at regents' meetings or in other contexts?

FORBES: I had no social contact with him or with Mrs. [Bernice Layne] Brown except at regents' functions. There was no other contact.

TRELEVEN: Well, he was obviously very impressed by what you did during your ex officio term and very impressed by what others told him. Well, for the sake of future users of this interview, I was wondering if we could sketch in some general information and clarify some areas about the University of California and its governing structure. This is a little synthesis I'll read, and if you'd like to have me pause and interject something, please do.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: The regents is the policy-making body of the University of California, by dint of the

California State Constitution [Article IX, Section 9]. At the time you joined the regents, there were sixteen gubernatorial appointees for sixteen years, and then eight additional regents, including the governor of the state, the president of the university, and other ex officio members. Those on the board by dint of office or position, which I think is Webster's definition of ex officio. [Laughter]

FORBES: Yes. Including the member from the Mechanics Institute of San Francisco.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Which is extremely interesting. Because the Mechanics Institute, "What is that?" people will say.

TRELEVEN: Yes. I was going to ask.

FORBES: The Mechanics Institute, still very much in existence on Market Street in San Francisco, was the first, let's say, educational entity that the state of California had. It existed before the university, and it provided a source of materials, books for people who were building the state. Now this is about 1862, '63. In through there.



TRELEVEN: Just before the Morrill Land Grant College Act was passed.

FORBES: Yes. And before 1868, the start of the University of California. So when the University of California came along, and I won't belabor this, but it's important historically to recognize the stature of the Mechanics Institute in education in the early history of California. So it was logical that a member from the Mechanics Institute would be on the board of the university.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Certainly.

FORBES: And we had some of our finest members, [Theodore R.] Ted Meyer, for example, a stalwart. Chairman of the board. President of the Mechanics Institute. Fine San Francisco attorney.

TRELEVEN: Right. And then you. . . . Other ex officios, let's see, speaker pro tem of the senate.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Speaker of the Assembly.

FORBES: Agriculture.

TRELEVEN: Public instruction superintendent. Is that right?

FORBES: Yes. And [California State Board of Food and]

Agriculture [president].

TRELEVEN: Agriculture. Well, that just about covers all of them.

FORBES: I think that would count up to eight.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, the meetings are presided over by the governor. And in his absence the elected chairman of the board of regents. Is that right?

FORBES: Right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And as I said, according to my notes, McLaughlin was the chairman of the board when you first joined as an ex officio member. Policy is created by the regents, and they take the form of standing orders.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Is that . . ? And that policy is implemented by university officials. But the taxpayer-supported purse strings are controlled by the legislature and the governor through the budget-making and budget-approval process.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: So that, in turn, sets up what I have perceived as an ongoing dialogue among the UC administration, the governor and his administration, and the legislature. Is that

fairly accurate?

FORBES: Yes, it is. And I'm glad you mentioned specifically the word legislature. Because that is very important, that that part of the state structure is involved. Correct.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think we have a little more tape, but I think I am going to turn it over anyway because I wanted to get into a series of questions.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: We will pause for a minute.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we are back on the second side. Now, the regents would meet how often as a full board?

FORBES: We met, in those days, every month, with the exception of about two in the summertime.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And business that would come about in the summertime, let's say urgent business, would be handled by . . . ?

FORBES: A special meeting.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

FORBES: We were subject to call special meetings at any time, on proper notice.

TRELEVEN: Now, in addition to the regular monthly meetings,

except for those months in the summer, how often would committees meet?

FORBES: Well, committees would meet when they needed to. There might be special reasons for special committee meetings, whether Grounds and Buildings or Finance. But usually the committee meetings would be held monthly, the day prior to the board meeting.

TRELEVEN: Okay. A committee might meet if there is a very special kind of issue that came up.

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

TRELEVEN: And I think there were some instances of that during your tenure which we certainly will get back to.

FORBES: There were.

TRELEVEN: And the board was structured. . . . We mentioned committees, and we had. . . . You had a Liaison Committee when you first came to the board, because those individuals were helping to work out things with the master plan, which was being restudied. It was called a Liaison Committee, and I believe the members of the Educational Policy Committee, three individuals on the Educational Policy Committee belonged to that.

But in addition to that, there was Finance,  
Educational Policy, Grounds and Buildings . . .

FORBES: Investment.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Investment was a separate committee from  
Finance?

FORBES: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: So it was not a subcommittee of the Finance  
Committee?

FORBES: No, it was not.

TRELEVEN: It was a committee in and of itself?

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And I know that you headed that for a while. And  
we will get back to that later.

FORBES: I'm not sure that I ever chaired Investment  
Committee. Maybe the record will show that, but  
I don't recall it.

TRELEVEN: Oh. Okay. Of these committees, which would you  
consider to be the most sought after?

FORBES: Oh, perhaps Finance. Perhaps Educational  
Policy. Those two were, in my view, major  
committees. But perhaps no more major than  
Grounds and Buildings, because Grounds and  
Buildings covered that wide area of expansion.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But those were the committees.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And in terms of, let's say, power.  
Finance?

FORBES: Power. . . . You'd have to describe it.  
[Laughter] When you get right down to it,  
everyone has a vote, and all the committees  
report to the board itself. Then all members on  
the board vote. So power? Yes. But it is well  
spread about.

TRELEVEN: Okay. In your mind, just subjectively--I'm sure  
somebody could go through the regents' minutes  
and add this up, but I just want your sense of  
how frequently governors attended regents'  
meetings? And you were a regent when Pat Brown,  
Reagan, and [Edmund G.] "Jerry" Brown [Jr.] all  
sat on the governor's chair.

FORBES: Right. Three governors.

TRELEVEN: Who was best about making it to regents'  
meetings?

FORBES: Numerically, the record would show it, but I  
don't know. I think it would be somewhat of a  
standoff. Each governor, as he comes along, is  
quite interested for a while.

TRELEVEN: Initially.

FORBES: Initially. And then, as Pat Brown once said, "You members of the board, you keep on doing a good job. As your governor, I am pressed for time in many, many directions and can't be here as many times as I'd like to be. But you carry on, and I'll get here when I can." That was his approach. Each governor had an agenda of his own concerning the university, whether it was Pat or Reagan or Jerry Brown.

TRELEVEN: Did Reagan ever express a philosophy of how he felt the regents should operate and what his relationship should be with the regents?

FORBES: Not that I recall.

TRELEVEN: Not in the same way that Pat Brown expressed it?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: How about Jerry?

FORBES: Jerry was very involved at times in some phases of the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Fair enough.

FORBES: I don't want to . . .

TRELEVEN: How would you describe the ongoing functioning between the board of regents and the president of the university?

FORBES: You mean the governor? Oh, the president of

. . .

TRELEVEN: President of the university.

FORBES: Oh!

TRELEVEN: We've touched on that just a little bit, but I wondered if we could elaborate on it.

FORBES: Okay. Well, it would be a continuing contact between the board as a policy-making entity and the president as the head of administration. Just an ongoing relationship that was simply a part of the operation of events from day to day and year to year. One is policy making, the other is, not necessarily interpreting that policy, but carrying that policy out.

TRELEVEN: Carrying out.

FORBES: Executing the policy administratively.

TRELEVEN: And the same question about the [University of California] Academic Senate. How would you describe the ongoing functioning between the board of regents and the Faculty Senate?

FORBES: I found that the board, on a continuing basis, had great respect for the faculty and for faculty committees. And gave the faculty representatives or spokesman--spokesperson ample opportunity to lay before the board any problems, any



situations. Great respect both ways.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And one other question has to do with open sessions and closed sessions. When were sessions closed?

FORBES: Essentially when we were talking about appointments, personnel matters, and matters that had to be handled without public disclosure. For example, site selection of future campuses. Things that had to be discussed in confidence.

TRELEVEN: Because this involved individuals, this involved . . .

FORBES: Yes. For instance, when we picked Santa Cruz, for example, when we were discussing the location of that campus in that general area, well, we were looking at two or three sites.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And we couldn't disclose our feelings or the negotiations publicly because of the impact on people who would get this information. Buy land.

TRELEVEN: And in terms of personnel matters, these would be disputes, perhaps, between . . .

FORBES: Personnel matters on a new chancellor. Yes. Or . . .

TRELEVEN: The university being sued by somebody.

FORBES: Yes. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Which seems to occur increasingly over the years.

FORBES: Occasionally. Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Finally, in terms of the structure of a typical regents' meeting, and I think you alluded to this a few minutes ago, what we might call day one is devoted to committee meetings?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And then the full board would meet the next day?

FORBES: That's right. And sometimes there would be some committee meetings on the day of the board meeting, in the morning, and then the board would meet as the board in the afternoon.

TRELEVEN: Full board in the afternoon.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And generally finish up with the agenda? Get through the agenda in that afternoon?

FORBES: Yes. That's right.

TRELEVEN: And that could happen because you have been sent this mountain of material ahead of time.

[Laughter] To wade through, study, raise questions about, probably often in committee, before it went to the full board.

FORBES: That's right. Yes. And I think it would be

interesting to comment that there were some of us who were quite interested in subjects coming before the board to the extent that we would meet, let's say, we would meet at the site of the meeting, San Francisco, or north or south [campus] the night before. In other words, I would go up many times on Wednesdays, and meet for dinner and an evening discussion with [Philip L.] Phil Boyd and [Elinor R.] Ellie Heller about things that were coming up the following day in committees Thursday. And then finally getting to the board on Friday. But rather than wait for the committee meetings, we would sit down and talk out some of the information even earlier, and discuss it. Again, in the days of--sad days of--the fall of '64, the Mario Savio days, Phil Boyd and I went to Berkeley a day or two early just to see the campus and walk the campus and talk to students about the situation so that we would have firsthand impressions of what was happening, rather than rely on hearsay or newspapers or radio.

TRELEVEN: Right. So you would have these informal meetings, dinner meetings or whatever, for the

sake of clarification, trading information . . .

FORBES: These weren't really meetings, just discussions. Totally informally. But I mentioned Phil Boyd and Ellie Heller because they were both tremendously dedicated to the university and wanted to review items thoroughly before casting a vote.

TRELEVEN: Right. We probably should remind the listener and reader of the future that Mrs. Heller was named to the regents by the governor not long after her husband had passed away.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I believe it was 1960. I think that is very close.

FORBES: You are just about right, because I served. . . . I was there when [Edward H. Heller] Ed was on. He was not on long because of his illness. Passed away. Then the governor, in his wisdom, appointed Ellie Heller, his wife, his widow, to carry on for the rest of his term. And she became the first woman chairman of the board.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: I might say that there was a committee to determine the recommendation for the chairman,

and I was a member of that committee. And I am proud to say it was my suggestion that she be the nominee.

TRELEVEN: Good. Well, that covers a few questions I wanted to talk through with you about the general structure. Now I'd like to turn to resources to support the University of California. It's fine to have a governing board, but if you don't have any money to work with you are not going to be able to do very much. First and foremost, the University of California gets capital and operating outlays provided by the taxpayers.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And this calls for a budget-making process. How is that done?

FORBES: It's done by the president's office and his staff. But I think we ought to comment that some of the funds come from the state of California.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And other funds come from the United States government, federally.

TRELEVEN: Right. I was going to get on to some of these other sources.

FORBES: Okay. Yes. And I think you will find that it is

the state of California contributes less than half of the funds to support the university.

TRELEVEN: So the legislature always convenes right after the first of each year, but in terms of UC budget-making process, beginning with, oh, I guess the president's office and going through the steps . . .

FORBES: Going through the legislature and the director of finance, the various entities in Sacramento. The needs of the university are laid out and then determined by combination of the governor's office and the legislature.

TRELEVEN: And the president's office, I'm sure of this, solicits from various chancellors priorities for capital and operating outlays.

FORBES: That's right. Each of the chancellors has worked up a campus budget, which was submitted to the president's office. And then all that is coordinated. I think I ought to just throw in another parenthetical comment that's up to date. I think one of the finest presidents that we have ever had is David [Pierpont] Gardner. Now. And his extraordinarily excellent ability to express to Sacramento the needs of the

university. He is just great. I just wanted to throw that in.

TRELEVEN: That's great to get on the record. Another form of state support is something called Fair and Exposition funds for agricultural campuses. That must be a fund that goes way back to . . .

FORBES: Well, it does. And I can't be too lucid on that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I can't be an expert there.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Then we have a category that might be called private donations, and this would include corporate foundations and so on.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And monies that can be given for unrestricted use or for construction or expansion of physical facilities.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Might be gifts of real estate. Land, structures, which the university may choose to either keep . . .

FORBES: Or sell.

TRELEVEN: . . . or sell. And then also donations of tangible objects like art, manuscripts, books, things like that.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Then another form can be state bonding measures.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: For capital expenditures. New construction and remodeling.

FORBES: Student housing, for example.

TRELEVEN: Student housing. Right. And you mentioned the national government grants, which come from such places as the National Science Foundation . . .

FORBES: NIH [National Institutes of Health].

TRELEVEN: NIH, National Defense Education Act [of 1958] [NDEA],<sup>1</sup> which provided student support, among other things. The GI bill was still going in the late fifties, on into the sixties. Atomic Energy Commission [AEC], those contracts, as I remember, were extremely important.

FORBES: That brings us to a whole different facet of the university, and that's our operations, if we want to use that word, of Los Alamos and Livermore. And how that came about, and how we conducted those areas of university activity.

TRELEVEN: Which, again, I'll be looking forward to getting

---

1. Pub. L. No. 85-864, § 72 Stat. 1580 (1958).



back to as we . . .

FORBES: Okay. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Then, in addition to that, we have. . . . Well, sometimes the state provides special grants for-- it might be medicine and health related--a particular patient population. The state provides funds for that kind of thing. There are public use fees. Activities and events that take place that provide. . . . There are leasing arrangements, and some of the land is owned by the university oil explorations. I don't know if you call those licenses. I don't think it's a great amount of money, unless . . .

FORBES: I couldn't comment much on that.

TRELEVEN: And student activity fees, and later tuition. Tuition which came in during your regency. Both in-state and out-of-state residents paying varying levels of tuition.

FORBES: I'd like to just interject something about tuition. I was perhaps as vocal as anyone about resisting tuition and student fees. And this goes back to my comments, I think, with David [Gist]. Wherein the first two Nobel Laureates from UCLA, Glenn [T.] Seaborg and Ralph [J.]

Bunche, each told me, and it bears repeating, that if there had been tuition, neither would have attended the university. They simply didn't have the money. I may have said this before, but you can cut this out, but Ralph Bunche, graduating from Jefferson High School, the east part of Los Angeles, had a job upholstering used cars. He was making pretty good money, and there was a debate in his mind if he should go on to the university. And he did because there was virtually a free entrance financially to UCLA. When I went to UCLA, it was a twenty-dollar incidental fee, and that's about what it was in Ralph's time. So I resisted tuition because I felt that the state of California should provide public higher education to those who wanted it and academically deserved it because of their high school records. It's all changed now, and we have fees and tuition, etc., and it's different. But I still feel that there should be every possible means used to give access to public higher education for those who academically can qualify and want to study.

TRELEVEN: Well, that does remind me of another source of

income for the university, and that is scholarships. People who give a good deal of money for scholarships.

FORBES: Yes. And support groups such as Gold Shield [Alumnae of UCLA] and others.

TRELEVEN: Right. Then another form of revenue for the university comes from investments of the general endowment pool or fund.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I can't quite remember the exact name of it.

FORBES: I think in that connection it should be pointed out that the university, in my view, has done an extraordinarily good job in investments. Their record of moving into equities, their record of having what are described as bond substitutes, with outstanding financial growth, deserves a special recommendation.

TRELEVEN: It's another area we will come back to--you must be tired of hearing me say this--but investments, in the days of student activism in particular, became somewhat controversial. And even later, in terms of investments in South Africa. But I think that, by and large, was after you had left the board, South African investments.

FORBES: Well, we had, I recall, a regents' meeting on the Berkeley campus, when I sat next to Jerry Brown for lunch on the campus with students screaming on the outside against IBM [International Business Machines Company] in South Africa. So it was active then.

TRELEVEN: It was already active.

FORBES: Right. When I talked to some of the students and asked them if they were aware of what IBM was doing for the blacks in the way of education and advancement, were they aware of these things? Well, they really weren't. But IBM, at that time and through those years, had done a commendable job in trying to move the blacks up the ladder.

TRELEVEN: Well, with that kind of organizational structure and support overview, I think I'd like to turn us back to the late fifties and look at some aspects of the physical expansion and development that carried forth during your entire tenure. And to help remind you, here's what the picture looks like in the late fifties. The fall '59 enrollment is just under 45,000 students. We've got campuses at Berkeley, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Riverside, Santa Barbara, and Davis.

Facilities at La Jolla [Scripps Institution of Oceanography], namely Scripps.

FORBES: Scripps Institute of Oceanography. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And at Mount Hamilton, the Lick Observatory.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Extensive laboratories at Livermore and Los Alamos. And such other property holdings as the Lake Arrowhead property that we. . . . In '57 the regents had recommended funds to implement planning for La Jolla, Southeast Los Angeles, or Orange County in south central coast campuses, with further study to be given to the San Joaquin Valley as a possible site. Also under way, beginning in the early fifties, were some improvement and expansion activities at the Goleta campus in Santa Barbara, at Riverside, Davis, La Jolla, as well as UCLA and UC Berkeley. As we mentioned before, Dr. Kerr had been president since '58. Goodwin [J.] Knight was in the governor's chair until early '59, and then was succeeded by Pat Brown. Now, among the agenda items at that very first meeting you attended as an ex officio regent was the Restudy

of the Needs of California in Higher Education.<sup>1</sup>

And I will go on a minute longer and then I want to lead up to a question.

FORBES: That's right. Go ahead. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: In the spring of '59, both the state assembly and senate had passed Assembly Concurrent Resolution 88,<sup>2</sup> which had been endorsed by both the regents and the state board of education on April 15. Which requested, in effect, an updated Master Plan for Higher Education<sup>3</sup> in California to meet the needs of higher education "for the next ten years and thereafter." A Liaison Committee of the regents and of the [California] State Board of Education was to report to the legislature three days--within three days of the legislature's convening its 1960 regular session, with a plan "for the development, expansion, and

---

1. Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the California State Board of Education. A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1955.

2. A.C.R. 88, 1959 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., r. ch. 200.

3. Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California. A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

integration of facilities, curriculum, and standards of higher education in the state." A plan would emerge from new studies and surveys. What more can you tell me about the background, as you remember it, that led to a decision to do a restudy of the needs?

FORBES: To do a restudy? You mean the study of the higher education plan?

TRELEVEN: Yes. In other words, another way of saying it is can you fill in anymore of the scene that is developing in the 1950s amongst institutions of higher education? Why was a restudy needed?

FORBES: Well, let me comment first that the Liaison Committee that you mentioned was not a committee of the board of regents. That was. . . . You just read that it was the regents and a state entity. So it wasn't totally a regental committee. Just for the record, we didn't have a Liaison Committee within the regents, it was the regents and other state entities that all saw the need for. . . . You can call it restudy or expanded study. Because I can't speak so much for the fifties as. . . . Well, I can for the late fifties, but there was an explosive growth

of population that moved the Santa Barbara campus, for example, in one year, a third more students attended our campus in Santa Barbara than the previous year. We had to do something. The state of California, the legislature, the governor's office, we all realized we had to expand. And I cannot be specific as to the dates on this. You may have them. But in the one year the regents moved forward on three different campuses.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: Santa Cruz, Irvine, and San Diego.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: It was because of explosive growth that we had to get ready for. We had to react to.

TRELEVEN: Well, it was a very short period of time. Here was a far-reaching plan for higher education to be developed and submitted to the legislature in just eight months. That's what the requirement was of ACR 88.

FORBES: That's right. We moved. We had to move quickly.

TRELEVEN: I was stunned because I am so used to university bureaucracies moving ever so slowly, and this is an incredible . . .



FORBES: Well, it was an incredible achievement, and one that the university should be very proud of. We set guidelines for the campus size. We recognized that Berkeley and UCLA, with plus or minus 450 acres apiece, were so cramped physically, that we said that we would not consider a site--and maybe I'm ahead of your story--we wouldn't consider a site less than 1,000 acres. The campus had to have that. I could go on about the three campuses if you want, or you can come to that later.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. We are going to. . . . I think I'll proceed at a level of generality, and then specifically get back, either today, or probably next time, to the individual campuses.

FORBES: All right. All right.

TRELEVEN: And as you indicate, you are talking about the campuses that became San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz. All three new sites were provided for in the master plan. I think UCLA's enrollment was going to level off at 25,000. I think that's what the plan indicated.

FORBES: The master plan had it at 27,500 . . .

TRELEVEN: It did?

FORBES: . . . for all campuses, including the three new ones. And through the years, these numbers have changed. And we can go into that later. But the master plan and the regents' minutes will show that we approved the numerical size of 27,500 for all campuses.

TRELEVEN: Now, in this restudy process in that eight-month period, in what ways were you personally involved?

FORBES: You are talking generally? You are not talking about the specific campuses?

TRELEVEN: No. This is in general. The restudy of the master plan. The resurveying that is going on. The whole look at the existing plan with the idea of shaping a new one.

FORBES: Well, I, as a member of the board, the board-- now, I am speaking generally--was coming to grips with every part of the Master Plan for Higher Education. We had many, many sessions on what that should be. It seems to me that Dean [E.] McHenry was extremely involved with that work. And Clark Kerr took a strong leadership position in developing the Master Plan for Higher Education. That's a general statement about it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. The Liaison Committee, you are right. The Liaison Committee had actually been previously established earlier in the fifties. And three members of the regents who were on the Educational Policy Committee of the regents were members of the Liaison Committee.

FORBES: The Liaison Committee. Right.

TRELEVEN: So I'm glad you corrected me on that, and we can get that substantiated. Now, the legislature received the report, as it wanted, in early 1960. As you recollect, how well did the plan maintain its integrity in the legislative process?

FORBES: Well, I can't speak for the legislature, but I have the feeling that the Master Plan for Higher Education, as set forth, and I think I have a copy of it here, as far as the university is concerned, was adhered to totally. It was adopted. And that was the guideline for the university.

TRELEVEN: I was asking that question in part because the minutes of the regents. . . . There is some allusion by several regents to some mangling going on in the legislature of the plan . . .

FORBES: Well, let's just say that the legislature is composed of representatives from geographical parts of the state of California. And there was a strong sentiment for a campus in the San Joaquin Valley/Fresno area, generally. Representatives of the legislature from there wanted a campus there. We discussed it and determined, finally, where we wanted to put the three new campuses.

TRELEVEN: Well, you mentioned the San Joaquin Valley. Why was that put in the deep freezer for many, many years? In fact, it's only come up fairly recently.

FORBES: Recently. Well, I think I'd answer that positively by saying that the regents determined that the best three sites would be Santa Cruz, Irvine, and San Diego at that particular time.

TRELEVEN: I assume based on population growth criteria.

FORBES: Based on population, based on climate, based on a variety of reasons.

TRELEVEN: Well, ultimately the bill<sup>1</sup> passed the legislature and became the Donohoe Higher Education Act. It

---

1. S.B. 33, 1960 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 49.

was either March or April of 1960. Just in general, what kind of a grade would you give the master plan for effectiveness as a blue print for higher education in California?

FORBES: I give it high marks.

TRELEVEN: It has worked well?

TRELEVEN: Yes. I give it high marks. Yeah. It set out what the university should do, the state colleges should do, and the so-called junior colleges.

TRELEVEN: Technical schools.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And extension.

FORBES: Yeah. I think it's a credit to those who shaped the master plan. I think it has done very well.

TRELEVEN: Good. We are about out of tape so we are going to shut this off for a minute.

FORBES: All right. Okay.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Session 3, April 17, 1990]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, back in Pasadena today with Mr. Forbes.

Today I'd like to continue our discussion at a rather general level to complete a framework for looking at the development of UC campuses during your tenure as a regent.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: But first, however, I thought, with the tape recorder on, I'd mention a few clarifications from our last session, all of which pay tribute to your memory, which is excellent. The Liaison Committee, which as you had pointed out included several regents as members, was established in 1945 and continued through the time of the committee's report that went to the legislature in the early sixties. Also, last time, you were looking at me a bit quizzically when I referred to the Restudy of the Needs in the late fifties. Actually, there was a report, A Restudy

of the Needs of Higher Education, but that was published by the State Department of Education in 1955. Our discussion last time, however, was about the Master Plan for Higher Education, submitted to the legislature by the Liaison Committee as a result of ACR 88. And then, in turn, the Donahoe Higher Education Act, introduced in 1960, was signed into law by Governor [Pat] Brown in April, 1960.

Another correction you made last time, which is on the tape, the coordinating body stemming from the master plan was the Coordinating Council for Higher Education [CCHE]. I had referred to it as Committee. [Laughter] And you were also right about the maximum enrollment at UCLA, as well as Berkeley, called for in the master plan: 27,500. I was a little bit right. At UCLA it was 25,000, plus 2,500 in the medical sciences.

FORBES: Medical. Right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And, finally, I should have added in my generalization about the budget-making process that a proposed UC Operating and Capital Budget goes not only to the director of finance, but

also to the legislative analyst. So, I guess you, as an interviewee, have helped demonstrate how an interviewer must tend to do his homework.

FORBES: Well, I'd say that you have done some very careful scrutinizing.

TRELEVEN: Well, we want to get it accurate.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And thanks to you, I did a little more digging, and a little more refreshing. So we've got that cleared up. Leading into our discussion today, and taking up where we left off on April 5, the master plan, among other things, endorsed a course of university development already laid out by the regents. But public funds are also needed to develop the sites and to build the buildings. What options were available to the regents for securing funds for new campuses and new structures?

FORBES: Well, options. I immediately think of bond issues [bonding initiatives], and I can't be too helpful on specifics of that. The treasurer's office would work on that with recommendations from the president and the board of regents. And gifts.



TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I think those are the two main sources.

TRELEVEN: Then, I take it from the minutes there were also instances where if a property was available that the regents would vote to borrow money from the University Fund or the Nuclear Science Fund to get the site while it was available at a good price. Do you recall that?

FORBES: I can't recall that too specifically, although it would be logical. If it were the will of the regents to accept a site, recommend that. But I can't be too helpful on that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, you mentioned bonds and, of course, they have to be approved by the electorate. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the regents going the bonding route?

FORBES: Well, you put your reputation and your credibility on the line. If historically you have done a good job, that probably would be reflected in a positive vote by the electorate. Also, if your needs are logical and justified, again, that would be positive. But you are serving the people of California, and you are asking them for their support in return.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, the first bonding initiative during your regency came in the June 1962 ballot. It was called Proposition 3<sup>1</sup> State Construction Bond Act of 1962.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: Leading up to election day, what role did the regents play in supporting this initiative or trying to drum up support for the initiative?

FORBES: Lobbying friends. The usual push--development of ideas--that would suggest a positive vote. I guess word of mouth and perhaps some interviews and discussion, talks.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, I know Regent Pauley co-chaired a Citizen's Committee. Were you involved in that?

FORBES: I might have been. We all worked, whether we were on a committee or not, for the good of the university. We all worked on issues.

TRELEVEN: Right. But you were not so wrapped up in that committee that you would remember it?

FORBES: Not intimately involved, no. I think not.

TRELEVEN: Well, despite these efforts, the voters failed to approve Prop. 3, and. . . . Why? What

---

1. Proposition 3 (June 1962).

happened? Why didn't it work that first time?

FORBES: I can not tell you. My recollection is not sharp enough to recall that. Or quite what we did.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, you and other regents were disappointed, and the legislature was disappointed, and Governor Brown was disappointed. He, in fact, called a special session of the legislature after that June election.

FORBES: Good for him. Good for him.

TRELEVEN: So then came Prop. 1A<sup>1</sup> [State Construction Bond Act of 1962] in November 1962. Again, this State Construction Bond Act is critical to the university being able to move on with its capital projects. And various regents again were involved in the Citizen's Committee. I know from John Canaday's interview that he was the treasurer of that committee and supported the initiative. Again, do you have any recollection about being involved in that committee?

FORBES: I probably was involved, but not in a principal way. John Canaday was very familiar with

---

1. Proposition 1A (November 1962).

Sacramento, and handling such matters. He was, as you know, vice president in charge of public relations for Lockheed [Corporation]. And this was his field. He would be quite familiar with what to do and how to do it.

TRELEVEN: In situations like this, whether it's Prop. 1A, or the earlier prop, or later props, would the Alumni Association be quite involved in this, like the past presidents?

FORBES: Yes. They would be asked to help and participate. Yes.

TRELEVEN: And that, presumably, would involve alerting loyal members of the association?

FORBES: Correct. Friends, yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Well, that measure passed. You might remember that in November, despite some rather vocal opposition.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: And, in terms of the University of California, opponents made several key points. I wonder if you would respond to each of these. The opponents said they were opposed to the bond because, "Construction at the university is unnecessarily elaborate."

FORBES: My response to that type of a criticism would be that perhaps those who are critical may not be aware of the needs for expanding physical facilities, as a whole process of education advances into more and more technical ways requiring new facilities, better facilities, geared to advances of science.

TRELEVEN: So this would be countered with something like the Citizen's Committee getting out the word on why it's important for these additional facilities to be built. Is that correct?

FORBES: That is right. That is right. That's right. One has to recall the great advances in. . . . Well, I'm thinking of a specific example in the School of Business Administration, when in the early days, we had IBM punch cards to be sent through. In later years that would be laughably simplistic. There have been so many advances in the accelerations of methods to gain information. Facilities simply have to be provided to keep pace with the advancement of science, progress. That's true in science, that's true in medicine, etc., etc.

TRELEVEN: I can relate a little to the punch card business

because UCLA has done a fairly long interview with [Robert A.] Bob Rogers, and he spanned that entire period of time.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Trying to get control over the numbers. First with IBM punch cards, and then developing other systems leading up to the current or the early computer systems.

Well, another criticism that the opponents to the proposition had is that, "The university engages in impractical research."

FORBES: Again, the critics may not know whereof they speak. What research is pertinent and what research isn't? You are constantly searching for the truth. It is a neverending, complicated process, and some may not really appreciate the process.

TRELEVEN: Finally, the third criticism, the third major criticism is that, "The University of California is not sufficiently careful in expending state funds."

FORBES: Well, I think the university has a fine record. I'm prejudiced.

TRELEVEN: Of course!

FORBES: Of course. But when I see how carefully the funds are managed by the Investment Committee, by the treasurer's office. I can do nothing but applaud the record, and the record really will speak for itself.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Good. Well, not long after Prop. 1A's victory, the key aides to the governor stated they preferred a multipurpose bonding initiative every year or two. President Kerr, on the other hand, indicated that he preferred a bond issue related specifically to higher education every five or six years. What made the most sense to you?

FORBES: The president's comment.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: We are not a factory. We have needs. When we have those needs, they ought to be understood, but it isn't a matter of cranking out dollars and facilities year by year. It is a matter of reacting to specific needs.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But, in all of this, is there some sense that the regents are better off in wanting a higher education bonding initiative in and of itself rather than a multipurpose kind of bonding

initiative that would cover, presumably, other construction projects amongst state agencies?

FORBES: Yes. I think the university should manage its affairs. It's able to forecast its needs. For example, when we needed new campuses in San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz, this was an unusual situation. It needed many decisions quickly and it is something that doesn't happen year after year after year. But on occasion.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, the viewpoint that you expressed a couple minutes ago, let's have one for higher education every two years, that viewpoint prevailed, because in November of '64, there was another initiative, Prop. 2, called-- appropriately enough--the State Construction Bond Act of 1964.<sup>1</sup> And the electorate passed it. And that was in the midst of heavy construction activity already going on at San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz. Any recollections about that particular initiative campaign?

FORBES: Well, I have many recollections of that time, not specifically related to the bond issue.

---

1. Proposition 2 (November 1964).



TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But it was a time when the enrollment in Santa Barbara, for example, moved up a third in a single year. These were growth years, and we simply had to provide facilities for the growth in response to our mandate of providing a place in higher education for the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates.

TRELEVEN: Right. I've seen one source that indicates that several regents loaned a healthy sum of money for television spots to support the initiative. Do you recall that?

FORBES: That could be. I don't recall it specifically.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When I was thinking it through, I was wondering, is there a line between what can or cannot be done by a regent or regents to support a ballot initiative on behalf of the universities?

FORBES: I don't think so. I think it is left to his or her best judgment.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: What best serves the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay. It also came to mind because I got a mailing from the UC benefits office just about a

week ago. It indicated that if Prop. 111<sup>1</sup> was not passed, it might have an impact on salary and benefits available to people like me. It has to do with the Gann spending limit,<sup>2</sup> and the initiative is designed to override that to some extent. So I was thinking about-- Well, they weren't exactly telling me how to vote, but they were alerting me to the fact that Prop. 111 could have an impact.

FORBES: It was important. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, and certainly, as 111 indicates, that from '64 on, or since '64 I should say, the ballot initiative has continued to be a very significant means to finance California higher education and the university. Now, land is available for expansion of an existing campus, and planning and construction funds are available. And at this point, I'd really like to draw on your long experience on the Building and Grounds Committee.

FORBES: Grounds and Buildings Committee.

TRELEVEN: Grounds and Buildings Committee. That's what my

---

1. Proposition 111 (June 1990).

2. Proposition 4 (November 1979).

pad says here. To explain some of the ins and outs. Some of these questions may be naive, but I think they are going to be helpful for researchers in the future to understand some of these things. Of course, it will help me immediately understand them. Looking at a new campus development, an architect has been or is hired to develop an overall concept, like a master campus plan?

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It was the policy of the board to have an architect, not an employee but an outside architect, as the chief architect for a given campus. Whether it's Welton Becket.

TRELEVEN: At UCLA.

FORBES: At UCLA. And when Irvine came along, we probed the field for the best person that we could get and selected William [L.] Pereira [and Associates].

TRELEVEN: Pereira. Okay.

FORBES: Then he drew up his concept of what should be on that acreage and brought it back to the board through channels, the campus architect and the

administrative channels, for approval. In the case of Pereira, he explained how the land in the Irvine area had what he called a high sky. A very bright high sky. Very similar to areas that he had studied in Spain. And he was therefore recommending a certain type of structure and layout and windows that would take care of proper treatment of rooms in an area with a high sky.

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned. That's interesting. I guess at Santa Barbara, I guess, originally it was Pereira & Luckman, and then I think [Charles] Luckman [and Associates] . . .

FORBES: It was really Charles Luckman who was really the Santa Barbara . . .

TRELEVEN: Later on. And just to get the nomenclature right, now, that architect on each of the campuses is called the consulting architect?

FORBES: Don't hold me to that title. He was the chief advisory arch person. And we simply knew that for overall discussions of a campus in its entirety, we would consult with and look to one person for general advice. Other architects could be assigned specific building projects, but there was the campus architect.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: The title escapes me.

TRELEVEN: I've gotten some sense that there is a consulting architect who the regents choose, like Welton Becket at UCLA now, and then the designer of a particular structure is called executive architect. Now that's what I have been able to make of the nomenclature. Which may be right or wrong. Something more to check up on.

FORBES: Yeah. That word "executive" doesn't strike me or signal anything.

TRELEVEN: How competitive was it among architectural firms to become a campus architect?

FORBES: Oh, I would say quite competitive. It would be a feather in one's cap to be named head man, call him campus architect at a UCLA or a new project such as Irvine or Santa Cruz. Yeah. It was an appointment to be revered.

TRELEVEN: And back at that time, we are talking about the early sixties, was there an understanding that it would be an in-state architectural firm?

FORBES: No. I don't recall that that came up specifically. From a standpoint of practical workaday relationships, it would be useful to

have someone on the ground, or nearby.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. So it might be economically unfeasible or unworkable for an out-of-state firm to be interested in a large project.

FORBES: Might be impractical. There might be some overriding reasons to have one outside the state. You have to keep an open view.

TRELEVEN: Right. And by the same token, would it make more sense if you are building a campus in the south to have a Southern California architectural firm? And vice versa, say, for the north?

FORBES: All things considered, I'd say yes. I think when you think of a Santa Cruz, you think in terms of someone who has offices in San Francisco, or the Bay Area generally. Because it is nearer.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And how, ultimately, is that--what we will call the consulting architect--selected? A Pereira for Irvine, an [Robert E.] Alexander, initially, for San Diego. And I can't remember the architectural firm at Santa Cruz [John Carl Warnecke]. But . . .

FORBES: The only recollection I have is that he was from San Francisco. And if you were to mention his name, I think I would say, "That's right." But I

don't recall it specifically.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But, in any case, how would you and other regents select who that chief architect should be?

FORBES: How did we come upon the appointment?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. How did you make the decision?

FORBES: Through the president's office and through the president's staff architect. And people such as an Elmo [R.] Morgan [vice president--business, UC] or a [Robert] Bob Evans, who would give thoughts to the president. Also, the regents were completely free to make suggestions to the president for consideration of various people. Don't forget, there was a Music Center [of Los Angeles County] being developed in Los Angeles.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And Regent Chandler was intimately involved. She had great knowledge and capacity for evaluating architecture. So it was a combination of sources. Then finally there would be a recommendation to the board for the appointment of a certain person.

TRELEVEN: And I take it that architects would come before the board and give presentations?

FORBES: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Slide shows, things like that.

FORBES: That's right. And they would do it thoroughly and impressively. With a staff of perhaps three or four, with Bill Pereira there, but there would be. . . . He would have two or three very capable assistants, and they would present their reasons for a recommendation, make the recommendation, and then withdraw and let the regents make a decision.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So if I get this progression straight, through the president's office a call is put out for architects who are interested in making initial sketches or whatever and making presentations to the regents, and . . .

FORBES: Are we talking about a specific building on a campus? Or are we talking about a campus plan?

TRELEVEN: No. I think at this point a campus plan.

FORBES: I would only be able to comment this way on things that happened while I was a member of the board. Welton Becket, at UCLA, was already there when I came aboard.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But with the new campuses, Alexander, Pereira,



Santa Cruz with the unknown person there.

TRELEVEN: Which I'll find out. Yes.

FORBES: How they. . . . Whether they said, "President Kerr, I'd like to be considered," what that was I wouldn't know. But I just know that it finally came to the board through the president's office. And after his people had evaluated it and caused the president to make his recommendation to the board.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you get somebody hired, and then on a day-to-day basis the consulting architect within the university would work with one of the president's staff. You said the president had a staff architect and that would . . .

FORBES: Well, we. . . . I'd have to look it up in the old books, but Bob Evans was an employee of the University of California, and an architect. And then Elmo Morgan--I'd have to look up his title--but these people were involved day to day on campus planning. Including architecture. They would not work with a Pereira in developing his concept for Irvine. Pereira and his staff would develop a plan and he would present it through channels to the university.

TRELEVEN: Right. That's what I was trying to get at.

Okay. And that channel would include, when it comes to the regents, first of all the Grounds and Buildings Committee. Is that right?

FORBES: It would come to the. . . . Routinely, the construction of a new building would come through a committee such as Grounds and Buildings and get its approval. And the chairman of the Grounds and Buildings Committee would recommend it to the full board.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Now, on the matter of a new campus and a new consulting architect--we will use that term--such as Irvine/Pereira.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: That might go beyond a committee of the regents. It might go directly to the board. It could go by way of the Grounds and Buildings Committee perfunctorily, and say, this is-- We are going to-- The president is going to say, "Let's have a combined meeting of Grounds and Buildings and the board." Because that's an overall matter for discussion.

TRELEVEN: Sure. And I think you indicated at a previous

session that at least in the early stages this would be the kind of discussion that would be held in executive session because of the sensitivity, sometimes, of competing architects and so on. Is that correct? Am I remembering accurately?

FORBES: I think. . . . Now, again, are we talking about a new campus?

TRELEVEN: New campus at this point.

FORBES: Oh! That matter, that matter would end up in executive session.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I think that's what you indicated last time. Now, to divert slightly, a consulting architect has to work with a specific site or I guess we might call it the grounds portion of the Grounds and Buildings Committee responsibility. And, looking at the three new campuses, La Jolla, Irvine, and Santa Cruz, were all of these sites selected by the time you joined the regents in 1959?

FORBES: No. No. None of the three had been decided upon.

TRELEVEN: In '59?

FORBES: The decisions were all made when I was on the board.

TRELEVEN: When you were on the board?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Okay. At this point I think I am going to start in the south and move north. And I'd like to look at La Jolla in more detail.

FORBES: Let's call it San Diego.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It's in La Jolla, but we know it as the San Diego campus. It's contiguous to the Scripps Institution of Oceanography at La Jolla.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. And going way back, I am calling it La Jolla because of the Scripps Institution, which was about a three-acre, quote "campus" unquote of the university at that time. Now, and that is the background, at least in part, of the development of that campus. Of Scripps operated by the regents.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And then, as I understand it, the city of San Diego donated 650 acres of former rancho lands for at least the corpus of that campus. Now,

that didn't fulfill the regents' goal of 1,000 acres.

FORBES: Correct.

TRELEVEN: What can you tell me about the regents' efforts to acquire more property?

FORBES: Well, my recollection is that the federal government had some land contiguous to the acreage that you just mentioned.

TRELEVEN: Okay, now is this the navy property where Camp Matthews and Camp Elliott were located? Is that the . . . ?

FORBES: I would think that's logical, but I wouldn't want to say yes. I know that. . . . I'm rather sure that it was federal land that might be available.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And we were insistent on the 1,000-acre minimum. The land did become available, and whether it's 1,150 acres or what I don't know precisely. But I know that it was above 1,000 acres.

TRELEVEN: Right. There was something called the Black property, too.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I think that had 450 acres. And according to my

notes, that was an acquisition completed in July of '63. I think there were actually several Black acquisitions. Tell me more! [Laughter]

FORBES: Well, there were. . . . I can just tell you that along the shore there was Black property with a huge, lovely mansion. A lovely home there. And I cannot tell you too much about the acquisition of that property, except that we visited it, and it was logical to have it as part of the university property.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And then there was something called La Jolla Farms that was purchased. I am a little confused from the regents' minutes whether this is part of the Black-owned property or a section that was called La Jolla Farms. Do you recall?

FORBES: I could not tell you that.

TRELEVEN: Then there was the navy property. Again, it is a little confusing from the record whether Camp Elliott and Camp Matthews comprised the entire federal government package that the regents ultimately got, or whether these were the same chunk of property or separate chunks of property. But it was something over 500 acres, whatever, in terms of the federal land.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Now, is that land that faces essentially east that is kept in . . .

FORBES: The federal land, as I recall, was to the east.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It had some wooden barracks. These became temporary housing and even teaching facilities, as I recall, on the campus. The Black property, and other property, was to the west, toward the water.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Now, I might just parenthetically suggest that if you need specifics on this, it would be all in the treasurer's office. [Owsley B.] Bob Hammond, the treasurer of those days, could. . . . It has to be there.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And another source is an Elmo Morgan, if he is around, or a Bob Evans.

TRELEVEN: Sure. Well, I'm trying to get at what you remember and what you don't remember as a member of the Grounds and Buildings Committee, in particular.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Ultimately, the San Diego campus I think right now is something in the neighborhood of. . . . Well, it's just over 2,000 acres, I think, as a result of the original donation by the city, and then the . . .

FORBES: Other acquisitions.

TRELEVEN: . . . other acquisitions. I know at one point that the General Services Administration [GSA] of the federal government threatened to sell Camp Elliott, and there was a big flourish amongst the regents. And I think someone appealed to [United States Senator Thomas H.] Tom Kuchel.

FORBES: Could be.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall that at all?

FORBES: Just about that much. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Anyway, it got worked out. But you weren't involved in getting GSA to change its mind?

FORBES: I personally was not. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, you need 1,000 and you end up with over 2,000. Why do you need so much property at San Diego?

FORBES: Well, the 1,000-acre minimum that the regents set was basically because at that time we realized how the 400 plus acres at UCLA and Berkeley were



inadequate for the 27,500 student population.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And we said we wanted enough land. Then, as time went on, not too long after that. . . . This was not part of the master plan, I don't believe, but it was a recommendation from the president's office that these new campuses all would have a maximum limitation of 27,500. Now, that's rather shocking in light of the problems we have today, in 1990, at Santa Cruz, for example. Where the town, the city of Santa Cruz doesn't want that big of a university. But at the time it was established there the community very much wanted the university to come to Santa Cruz.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: So there is some give and take.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think we will pause for a minute and turn the tape over.

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

TRELEVEN: I guess what I am getting at is, say, above and beyond the 1,000 needed that San Diego needed for buildings and access roads, etc., etc., was there an idea to own some lands to kind of create a

buffer? A buffer area to protect the campus from encroachments, say, by private developers?

Especially like in . . .

FORBES: No. I don't think I would use the word buffer. But I. . . . The Irvine campus is an example of where we got the 1,000 acres, and then we had another 500 acres, and we called it. . . . I'm searching for that word. But what it was, it was for uses . . .

TRELEVEN: Inclusion area.

FORBES: Inclusion areas for faculty housing, for other close entities not part of the university but close to. . . . Part of university activity.

TRELEVEN: Oh. Okay.

FORBES: But we didn't use the word buffer.

TRELEVEN: Right. Inclusion area is a phrase that was used officially at Irvine.

FORBES: Quite a bit at Irvine. And the 500 acres are being used today for such purposes.

TRELEVEN: Is it possible that some of the acreage at San Diego was being held to be sold later and as an investment by the regents?

FORBES: Not that I recall.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I was wondering because at some point the

. . . . Again, it has to do with the Black property or a later acquisition from the Black estate. I think there were something like thirty-three subdivided lots, and the neighbors raised hell because they thought the university was going to do something. But I think the university did end up selling those lots later.

FORBES: It quite possibly could have. And if it didn't serve our purposes to keep the property, we would sell it. But I don't think we acquired land contiguous or part of the campus for investment purposes at all.

TRELEVEN: Consciously to invest.

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You alluded to something a few minutes ago, so I am going to. . . . Looking at 1961 there was a very basic issue on that campus which caused a bit of heat, and that was the naming of the campus. Why was the very naming of the campus so controversial at the time?

FORBES: Are we talking about San Diego?

TRELEVEN: San Diego.

FORBES: Well, my recollection isn't perfect on this. The Scripps Institution of Oceanography was at La

Jolla, and there were probably those who felt that with the campus contiguous to Scripps Institution, that it should be La Jolla. I think that another body of thought was that the area was San Diego, and it would be better. . . . The campus would be better identified as the University of California, San Diego. But while there might have been controversy, I don't think it was bitter. It might have seemed to be bitter, but I don't think it was.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think. . . . Was it Copely or Copley newspapers?

FORBES: Copley.

TRELEVEN: Copley newspapers were adamantly against it being named San Diego.

FORBES: All right. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Possibly because of the confusion in existing institutions.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: So, ultimately, the compromise was that it would be the University of California, San Diego with a La Jolla mailing address. [Laughter]

FORBES: All right. All right.

TRELEVEN: I guess you were in favor of that.

FORBES: Sure. That's all right. That's where it was.

TRELEVEN: The only other thing I wanted to ask you is if you recall when the city of San Diego donated the 650 acres, and in 1960 took twenty-seven of those--it was reserved for research area for the university--and gave it to the Salk Institute [for Biological Studies]. Do you recall that?

FORBES: I do not recall any negotiations concerning Salk. I knew that Salk was to the north of us, but my information stops about there.

TRELEVEN: How involved in all of this would a San Diego area state legislator get?

FORBES: A state legislator . . .

TRELEVEN: A state legislator, based on your . . .

FORBES: How . . . ? Restate that.

TRELEVEN: Well, as these issues come up . . .

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . where there is some sort of pro and con, there is controversy, there is a lot of discussion about such things as property acquisition and. . . . I remember the flight pattern at Miramar was a problem for a while. And the GSA business in terms of the Camp Elliott property. In other words, this is

swirling about, and the regents are having to weigh certain evidence and make certain decisions. The question is, in situations like this, would San Diego state legislators get involved?

FORBES: I'm sure they would get involved because they are working for their constituents. And the university had staff people in Sacramento whom they could contact. They could contact regents. They could do that and did. I recall no instance when I was approached by a legislator, so there was another route that he or she would take. Maybe, as I say, through the Sacramento. . . . Contacted the university, the president's office, chairman of the board. But we talked about flight patterns. I can remember about that. And whether or not we should have a campus there, and whether it was too close.

TRELEVEN: Well, tell me a little more about that.

FORBES: Well, if you have a flight pattern with planes going over your campus at frequent intervals, it would be disruptive. We considered that matter regarding San Diego, and I think we did, we checked that out at Irvine, too. Because of the

Santa Ana airport.

TRELEVEN: Right. The El Toro [Marine Corps Air Station].

FORBES: So it was a subject for discussion. That's about all.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But at that time then, was the more or less normal flight pattern into Miramar right over the campus area?

FORBES: I do not think so, and I can not tell you. I don't recall quite what it was.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But it was discussed.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, turning back to the La Jolla campus site plan in general, I guess this was developed in a larger context of a university community master plan. Is that right? I've seen reference to a university community master plan in San Diego.

FORBES: That might have been. That might have been a way in which the university could get and receive input from the community on the university, about a proposed university.

TRELEVEN: I see. Okay. And, as we've discussed a little earlier, architects are then solicited to prepare sketches for a master campus plan from which a

consulting architect or a chief architect--  
whatever the proper terminology--from which that  
person would be selected.

FORBES: Yes. I don't recall that the appointment process  
would consist of having a number of architects  
develop plans.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I think you would select a person for his  
performance in the past, assuming that he would  
come up with a favorable plan.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, at UCLA we have done, within the last  
five years, an extensive oral history with Bob  
Alexander and we have preserved his memory of  
what he did to prepare for his regents'  
presentation.

FORBES: Good. Good.

TRELEVEN: But from your standpoint as a regent, what  
impressed you about Alexander's concept for the  
campus?

FORBES: Well, the most impressive part of the campus, in  
my view, was the library. And I can't tell you  
whether Bob Alexander was the architect.

TRELEVEN: Pereira did that.

FORBES: Pereira did that?



TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: I thought it was a unique plan and different . . .

TRELEVEN: I think we will pause for a minute.

[Interruption]

You were talking about the plan.

FORBES: About the library. I don't know whether you're aware of the structure. Are you aware of the library itself?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: The diamond type? I was quite intrigued with it. I think I noticed just recently that it is being renovated in some way. This is 1990, and I am curious to know what they are going to do about that. But the thing I liked about the plan itself was that with the diamond structure, wherein some 70 percent of the floor space was centered in three floors in the center of the diamond. It would be possible for a student to-- by going up one flight of stairs or going down one flight of stairs--he, being on the center floor there, would have access to a high percentage of the total space of the library easily and quickly, instead of being in an ordinary building of five or six stories with an

elevator up and down and around.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And I recall checking out the cost per square foot of this design and finding that it was quite competitive to a regular form of building structure. And, as you were asking me about what comes to mind about the campus, I think that is the most exciting part of it. In my view.

TRELEVEN: That particular structure. Yeah, I think Pereira did that.

FORBES: Pereira did that?

TRELEVEN: After the initial buildings were built, I think a dining facility and some dormitories were the earliest structures, which I will want to get back to. I wonder though whether I can. . . . So Bob Alexander is the initial consulting architect on the La Jolla campus, and I wonder if we can use that as an example to, again, get back to describing the steps and the process, maybe, for any of the three new campuses. Because the chief or consulting architect, he completes the drawings for a campus plan, and who all is involved in the approval mechanism? Or how does

that work? You've got the plan for the campus, and then it goes to the president's office. Then to the full board through the Grounds and Buildings Committee?

FORBES: It goes to the board by way of Grounds and Buildings.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It's discussed in Grounds and Buildings with an architect present to describe what his concept consists of. Then if the Grounds and Buildings Committee approves it, it goes from Grounds and Buildings to the regents in their subsequent meeting.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And then going the other direction, I take it there are something like planners on each individual campus.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: The campus planning committee.

FORBES: That's right. That's right. A campus architect. Staff people.

TRELEVEN: Right. Okay.

FORBES: And they will have been briefed on this recommendation before it ever goes to the Grounds and Buildings Committee.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: You have to keep in mind constantly that the board recommends. . . . Sets policy but does not administer.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So presumably, by the time it gets to the board, there is consensus and concurrence amongst campus . . .

FORBES: The staff people and the president's office. Indeed.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, as this takes place, what's the relationship between the University of California and state of California officials in terms of these plans? I take it. . . . In other words, who in Sacramento takes a look at what time during this process? Because I assume there are costs attached . . .

FORBES: Are we talking about a building?

TRELEVEN: A general campus plan at this point. Since I presume there are costs attached to it.

FORBES: Yes. The president's staff had its contacts with Sacramento.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And would discuss situations as indicated to whatever extent the president's office felt it

was proper. But it wasn't by way of the regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess what I am trying to get at here is for a campus plan that's going to cost money, does this all have to be approved by the governor's office, by the legislature, legislative analyst or something like that? Or are the regents . . ? Is the president's office free to sort of go ahead on its own and take the plan, submit it to the regents . . ?

FORBES: We are talking about a new campus?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: The president's office would be sure to discuss with the director of finance, office of the governor, with the legislative analyst, with people in Sacramento so that the rug wouldn't be pulled out from under him.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Sure. There is a liaison there. And that would be all done prior to its route to the regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I'm trying to get at this issue of the independence of the regents. In a situation like that, the director of finance or the legislature would not have veto power over, say, a proposed

campus concept.

FORBES: No. It would be. . . . The plan would be developed and cleared, let's say, and discussed with the director of finance and with Sacramento so that by the time it gets to the board for action, no one in Sacramento would say, "Well, I didn't know anything about this." You have to communicate.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So part of the president's job is to make sure that there are no surprises for the governor, no surprises for the legislature.

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: In terms of the development of these plans.

FORBES: Yeah. We may have mentioned in a previous discussion how there was quite a heated discussion between the president and the director of finance.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Hale Champion.

FORBES: Hale Champion. And it got to a situation where they weren't mad at each other, they simply had different concepts of this problem. Finally the governor heard about it or was informed about it and said, "Well, let's get together." And we went to Sacramento and worked it out. No

surprises.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So there is a comprehensive campus plan, and one thing we often forget about is that before the first structure is going to be built, there is the matter of earth moving, and sewers, and water lines, and roads. Who takes care of all of that?

FORBES: Well, [Laughter] I wasn't down there to watch that.

TRELEVEN: Not which regent takes care of it, but is that done through, what, a bidding process and a contractor?

FORBES: Of course. Sure. Yeah. Work starts, grading, all the initial stages of a plan, of a campus. You just start by letting contracts, one by one. The first building at Irvine, for example, was a ready-made metal structure that was to be ultimately used to house machinery. But it was [Daniel C.] Dan Aldrich [Jr.]'s first office. It was a metal structure. I forget the name of this national company that makes these metal structures. You just screw them together and bolt them together and pretty soon you've got a building. That was the first building on the

Irvine campus. And when I stopped by there one day to say hello to Dan, it was lunchtime and there he was out in the back pitching horseshoes with three of his associates. [Laughter] And we'll add that I said, "Pretty good?" He said, "Well, I'm about 60 percent." And I had never heard the term used before, but that meant that 60 percent of the horseshoes that he pitched were ringers. He was pretty good. And they were all pretty good. But they just had their lunch break and they were out there. So this was the first building on the campus. And I think the cows were still grazing. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: But turning back to our San Diego example, and this would be true at other campuses, and I want to look at Irvine in detail probably next time.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: So we will get back to that. We are not going to forget it. I take it there is some sort of negotiation, discussion, agreement that has to go on with the municipality concerned in San Diego in terms of if you build a sewer, it hooks into the San Diego sewer line, or the municipal sewage district. Or whatever it's called.



FORBES: Yes. All sorts of mechanics.

TRELEVEN: And those mechanics are really handled out of the president's office? Is that the way that works?

FORBES: Well, not out of the president's office. But he is the chief administrator of the university. And I've mentioned it would be done by contract. I forget his title, and I could look it up, but Elmo . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I think it was vice president--business affairs or some such.

FORBES: Sure. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And I can look it up easily.

FORBES: Right. Okay. All right.

TRELEVEN: So . . .

FORBES: But the university itself didn't start working on the sewer lines. It would be people who were sharp in those areas who would be delegated, commissioned to do the job.

TRELEVEN: Right. Okay. And is all of this done under the aegis of the chief architect? In other words, does the chief architect then hire an engineer who hires a contractor? How does all that work, if you remember?

FORBES: The chief architect's office would be aware of

this, and he might approve it. And it might be a university function to let the contract or the architect might let the architect. I can't tell you specifically how that worked mechanically.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But if something goes wrong, with a road, with a sewer, who has the day-to-day responsibility? Is it the chief architect? Is it the vice president?

FORBES: I would say it is a combination. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And if something really goes wrong, then you would hear about it as a member of Grounds and Buildings.

FORBES: Yes, eventually. Eventually. But bear in mind not administratively. We did not get into operations.

TRELEVEN: I know.

FORBES: We had to stay out of operations.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Good.

FORBES: Very important. And a policy-making board who tries to administer or tries to get into operations makes mistakes. It's just wrong to do it. It's not good policy.

TRELEVEN: So what you are saying is you delegate it, and once you delegate it, it stays delegated.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: At least that's your viewpoint in terms of a regent's responsibility in terms of a new campus, a new building, or whatever.

FORBES: That's right. Yep. Yep.

TRELEVEN: Good. Now, Bob Alexander, in his interview, indicated that it was kind of a tradition amongst the regents to award to the chief or consulting architect contracts for the initial structures on the campus. Is that your recollection?

FORBES: He would be. . . . That architect would be probably inclined to get the initial work.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Just because he has had the contact, he's laid out the concept of the campus for the board. It's logical. It's logical.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And in his case that involved the first residence halls and the first dining hall facility, which included a general services building. Now, for that first structure and the succeeding structures on the campus, as many are built through the rest of the sixties, must each of those buildings, individual structures, the plans for those structures go through the same

approval process that we just discussed for, say, a campus master plan?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: It's the same routine?

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Any structures, any plan, that has to go through the Grounds and Buildings Committee into the board for final approval. Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And then, here I am probably going to oversimplify this, but I take it that money is provided at different stages. Different stages like site planning, initial drawings, final plans, site preparation, construction start-up, or some such. Is money . . ? I guess what I am asking is whether money is allocated in a chunk for the whole project, or does money get funnelled into the project at these various stages--to support these various stages?

FORBES: I would simply think that. . . . Now you are getting into the financing, and that item might not only go for a new structure. We are not talking about a new campus but a new structure on a campus.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: It would go to two committees. It would go to Grounds and Buildings for the approval of the physical being. It would go to the Finance Committee for the approval of funds. Now, whether or not--to get back to your question--whether or not the whole thing is approved, the whole cost of the structure is approved at one time or not, I can't tell you. It would probably be in two or three steps. As work progresses you approve funds. But the totality of the structure, the financial totality would be approved before there was a start on it.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: You would know what it cost.

TRELEVEN: Right. Which kinds of brings us full circle back to one of those bonding initiatives that's passed.

FORBES: That's right. We would know.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. And when we get to bidding from contractors, I guess what you are telling me is that's all handled out of the president's office.

FORBES: That's right. Let's say it's handled by the administration, and he designates what office.

If it's Elmo Morgan, and . . .

TRELEVEN: But, officially, the regents have to approve all these contracts.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. What requirements, in your recollection, were there at that time--again, we are talking about the early sixties--that firms must not practice, say, discriminatory hiring practices? Were there . . . ?

FORBES: Those were quiet days as far as that's concerned.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: In those days you're three or four years before . . . . In the early sixties there wasn't much of that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Mario Savio came along in '64.

TRELEVEN: Right. But what you are saying is later, a few years later, the regents did have to pay attention to . . .

FORBES: Discrimination? Yeah.

TRELEVEN: As a result of federal and state legislatures.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. That all came about.

TRELEVEN: And later, also, I think came environmental impact requirements.

FORBES: That's right. Very important.

TRELEVEN: There's some form of conventional understanding among the public, and I see this in articles in the Daily Bruin and in the L.A. Times, that the regents are exempt from any environmental impact requirements.

FORBES: Not true.

TRELEVEN: What's the accuracy of that?

FORBES: Well, the accuracy. . . . I can't speak for today. We had to pay very strict attention to environment impact studies. We were required . . . . A project required them. It wasn't a matter of regental approval or disapproval. But if a project needed an environmental study, it got it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I don't know the basis of that kind of allegation that continues that the regents are exempt from certain kinds of environmental impact.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Maybe some of this stems out of the pot boiler going on at Santa Cruz that you alluded to earlier today. A rather vocal part of the population opposing further . . .

FORBES: It could be. People can be inaccurate.

TRELEVEN: Okay. In any case you got the site, the utilities work is done, construction begins. During the actual building process, how is quality assurance maintained by the regents so that the people of California get what they are paying for?

FORBES: It isn't maintained by the regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It's maintained and checked by the proper administrative people of the university. But, again, the regents do not get into operations.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: We hear about it if there is a problem.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: Later.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But we can't possibly be involved in any way in operations. Mustn't be.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You set the policy, and procedures are set up relating that policy in terms of the managers handling all of that.

FORBES: We set the policy.

TRELEVEN: But I'm sure you've had cases where there have



been minor deficiencies or even major flaws in some structures.

FORBES: Oh, yes!

TRELEVEN: What options do you have in a case . . ? What options do the regents have in a case like that?

FORBES: The president's office will report a malfunction or a problem to the board and probably recommend solutions or open it for discussion.

TRELEVEN: How do you try to work out a solution to one of those, say, a major problem in a structure?

FORBES: Well, we are being very hypothetical.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: It would depend on the individual circumstances of any problem. You just have to look it in the eye and try to determine if the recommendation of the president's office seems satisfactory. Or whether we would send it back for another go-around.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Is there any particular situation that you would want to allude to as an illustration of a major problem?

FORBES: No, no. I can think of some, but I don't want to allude to any of them.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I. . . . They are in the public

record.

FORBES: Oh. Okay. If they are in the public record and if you have a question to ask, ask it.

[Laughter]

TRELEVEN: No, but if you choose not to bring up a specific instance, that's entirely up to you. Again, though, and maybe along the same lines without mentioning any names unless you want to, were there cases of, say, contractors or even architects whose work was so consistently substandard that the regents would discreetly decide that they would no longer contract with one or another firm?

FORBES: I don't recall that. I don't recall that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When we get into landscaping, who pays for landscaping? Is that part of . . . ?

FORBES: That's part of . . .

TRELEVEN: Is that part of the construction funds?

FORBES: Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: Okay. All right. So at the time the cost estimates are submitted, the landscaping is taken into account.

FORBES: Yes. Or it might come later. That could come later.

TRELEVEN: Again, this is something that's handled out of the president's office, the landscaping aspect of . . .

FORBES: Well . . .

TRELEVEN: No?

FORBES: I'm thinking of the [Murphy] Sculpture Garden [at UCLA], the north sculpture garden at UCLA. That as an item probably came before the board through the Grounds and Buildings Committee. With the appointment of an architect, a landscape architect, to develop the plans for what is now the Franklin Murphy Sculpture Garden. That isn't just done. That has to have approval.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So do you remember if that means that a landscape architect would work for the overall chief architect, or do the regents independently select a consulting landscape architect?

FORBES: I think that would depend on the individual project.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Okay. I wanted to ask a little about construction costs again. As a campus is being built, or as a building is being built, what power does the governor's office or the legislature have in terms of being watchdogs over

these projects?

FORBES: Well, I think there has to be a cooperative attitude maintained at all times between the university administration and Sacramento. Be it the legislature or the administration. The governor's office. I mentioned before the director of finance, the legislative analyst. They are not as much watchdogs as much as important parts of the state of California, because all the people of the state are involved. There is one governor, and a legislature.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: They all need to be tuned in and a part of it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I want to get back to that, but I think my tape is nearing the end.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: So is it time to put on a new tape, or . . . ?

FORBES: All right. Fine. Sure. Let's. . . . Do you want to carry on a while?

TRELEVEN: Sure.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Before we turned over the tape we were talking

about the relationship between the regents, governor's office, and the legislature, when it comes to structures being built. And I raised this for two reasons. There is one general context and then there is a specific instance. I wanted to ask you about these. First, in general, from time to time, either a director of finance or a legislative analyst would protest that the per square foot cost for UC buildings exceeded those of comparable structures built at state college campuses. What was your position as a regent to such complaints?

FORBES: Well, I would take them seriously and discuss them with an Elmo Morgan, for example, and get his comments. Actually, in the case of the library in San Diego, I checked the cost per square foot or cubic foot of the library compared with a state college cost and found that they were quite comparable. And the university library result, or the construction itself, was, in my view, superior to the other. But you take comments from the director of finance or the legislative analyst--not that they would come directly to the board--but any comments that they

would make, you would take them seriously.

TRELEVEN: You bring up the library, again, at San Diego. Was that an instance where there was some criticism that it was opulent?

FORBES: No. No. No. I anticipated that type of charge. And I was curious to know the facts. Look, this is lovely, but is it going to cost too much on a comparative basis? I just took it upon myself to find out what a comparable building and usual design did cost. And I think it was something on a state college at that time, not a state university campus there. But I checked it out because I. . . . You know, if you are prepared in advance of a possible criticism, sometimes you can lick it before it's off the ground. But in that case it was very, very favorable.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, then there was a more specific instance. This, again, relates to Bob Alexander's interview. There was a legislative demand that the height of the dining facility ceiling at San Diego either be modified or a private donor must be found to pay the extra \$10,000. And I might add that the donor was

found and the \$10,000 contributed. But do you happen to remember that incident?

FORBES: No, I don't.

TRELEVEN: Well, I guess my question is what is the legislature doing meddling in a ceiling height kind of situation that involves a sum of money but not a great deal of money?

FORBES: I can not say why. I could guess, but I don't know. A legislator might consider it a form of not caring about cost, or unnecessary expenditure. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Well, what I am getting at in all of this is that there is Article IX, Section 9, of the California State Constitution.

FORBES: You bet.

TRELEVEN: You know that probably by heart. What I am trying to define here, when it comes to developing campuses and structures, individual structures, is the ongoing relationship, responsibility, or power, as it were, between the regents and the legislature and the governor's office.

FORBES: Well, I simply would say that Article IX, Section 9 gives us broad scope. But the attitude of the

board when I was a member was to take that responsibility to heart and to realize it is a responsibility given by the people of California, and not to be handled lightly. Because we have the power we must not abuse it. That was the general attitude of the board, of a Don McLaughlin, of a Jesse Steinhart, of an Ellie Heller.

TRELEVEN: And you.

FORBES: Yeah!

TRELEVEN: Okay. If you wouldn't mind, I'd like to turn back specifically to Bob Alexander. After that I want to move on to Irvine, and it looks like that will be next time. But I wanted to ask you a few more questions about Alexander as San Diego's first consulting architect, because he has provided his recollections.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And I think talking to you there is a chance to expand on the knowledge that we have of the architectural business at San Diego from your vantage point. So, I guess, generally what is your overall opinion of Alexander's original campus plan?



FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: Secondly, how did you look upon the several structures that he designed?

FORBES: Favorably. I do not have specific recollections about them as I did about the library.

TRELEVEN: The library.

FORBES: But satisfactory.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And I think it ought to be added that the first structures on the campus--well, let's just say concurrent structures--were the improvement of the housing, these shacks, these wooden structures that we inherited from the army or the marines or the navy, or whoever, that became very popular as residence halls. As residence sites. And I think some instruction. We were having to work fast and prepare ourselves quickly for a whole lot of students.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And that comes to mind as an exciting part. And the fact that where we thought these things would be lightly regarded, they were popular. I thought I would just throw that in.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's interesting.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I think it was late '63, '64. . . . It was after . . . . Let me rephrase that. Late '63-64, the residence halls and the dining facility that Alexander did apparently was impressive enough so that he was selected by the regents to do a couple of additional buildings: science and medicine. The first science and the first medicine building. And then he resigned not long after that. What do you remember about the circumstances?

FORBES: I don't recall the circumstances.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Alexander said he was "thrown to the wolves." Any idea who the wolves were?

FORBES: No. No, as I recall Bob Alexander's relations with the board were satisfactory and pleasant. A nice, nice person.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. That's his general viewpoint as well, in terms of his relationships with regents.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: He mentions you, specifically, as one of the great regents to work with. But it is also clear from his interview that he found Kerr an obstacle. Bob indicates, for instance, that Kerr

was so little impressed with his ability to design a medical facility that he, Kerr, brought in a co-consulting architect from the Twin Cities [Minneapolis-St. Paul]. Do you remember anything about that?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Then he mentioned that you were one of the regents he approached about his strong desire to do the medical facility. He specifically remembers coming to the music company and talking to you and your encouraging him to talk to Kerr if he was really interested. So he went to talk to Kerr, and then he was criticized later by then Chancellor [Herbert F.] York for going over York's head. Now, I don't want to get into kind of gossipy trivia here, but I am really trying to find out what you remember about the interplay that was going on among architect and regents and administrators over the medical facility and the science building at San Diego. Do you have any recollection at all?

FORBES: No, I haven't. And I can't be very helpful on this. If I suggested he go to Kerr rather than to Herb York, it might have been because he had

said that he had discussed this with Herb York previously. I don't know. But logically, you talk to the chancellor on the campus first. But if, when he came to me, he was still unhappy, I probably simply said, "Go see the president." The regents must stay out of administration and stay to policy. And I've tried to adhere to that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. What was your reaction when you heard that Alexander was going to leave the San Diego project?

FORBES: I can't recall.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Did you make any attempt to ask him to change his mind or anything?

FORBES: No, I can't recall about it. I just can't.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Anything else you'd like to add? Anything that you'd like to say for the record about what I'd call the Alexander situation at the university at San Diego?

FORBES: No. There are comings and goings and a whole lot of people involved and a whole lot of projects. One wins some and loses some. I can't really say more that is useful about it. It's just part of the process.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Then came Emmons and Jones [A. Quincy Jones and Frederick E. Emmons], I think, after that.

FORBES: Okay. [Laughter] We had a lot of them, you see, and it was quite a while ago.

TRELEVEN: And Emmons and Jones come. You've alluded to the beautiful library designed by Pereira, and then there are other structures as we go on in time. If it's okay with you, at this juncture I'd like to leave San Diego and come back to it later in other contexts.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: In the contexts of medical education and curriculum development and so on.

FORBES: There was a whole lot that went on in medical education and medical problems in San Diego.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Yes.

FORBES: That's true. They might be addressed.

TRELEVEN: Right. And the way I thought I'd handle medical education is to handle it on a systemwide basis.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: And cut across all the campuses at a later point.

FORBES: Good. That's fine.

TRELEVEN: This would be in accordance with the regents'

Master Plan for Medical Education that was approved, I think, in December 1960. And we will cut across old campuses, new campuses, because it was quite a phenomenon in and of itself. I'd like to swing north to look at what was called at one time the "campus without a city": Irvine. The first question is what is the background of that site being selected?

FORBES: Well, one was the availability of land because of our relations with the--our relations!--the Irvine Company [Inc.] and Ed Carter was involved with the Irvine . . .

TRELEVEN: I think he was a director of the Irvine Land Company.

FORBES: Right. And here was a huge, undeveloped 80,000 plus or minus acres, agricultural land with an absolutely gorgeous site and climate. And apparently available under right conditions. A handsome site, and there was not much question but that it would be a superior place to put a campus. In a growing area.

TRELEVEN: Right. Was there any other site, as far as you remember, that was in serious contention as a location for a university campus in this

Southeastern Los Angeles/Orange County area?

FORBES: Nothing comes to mind.

TRELEVEN: Nothing. Yeah. Nothing that I have seen either.

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: This, I guess we should add, is in the context, too, of William Pereira and Associates having developed in 1960 something called "A University-Community Development in Orange County," a development plan which he presented to the regents in 1960. Now, when he did that plan in 1960, was he working for the Irvine Land Company, or was he working for the regents?

FORBES: Well, what was the project? Was the project a plan for the university?

TRELEVEN: No, it was called "A University-Community Development in Orange County."

FORBES: Well, I can't be sure of the chicken and the egg and which came first.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, which is what I was trying to get at.

FORBES: I know that he had his office down in an old barn on the road down toward the water. I don't know whether you visited that site, but he had an office. A sub-office. He had his main office on Wilshire Boulevard, and then he had this

attractive barn beyond where the campus is now. It is still there. I remember going down there for some type of meeting. But whether it relates to this community business or not, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, what I was trying to get at is whether this plan. . . . Did he develop this plan before or after the Irvine Land Companies offered to donate the 1,000 acres to the regents?

FORBES: I don't know. I don't know. The community plan might have been something that he did in conjunction with Irvine and the university. I don't know. But I do know, I remember distinctly his presentation to the board about the campus. I do remember that Regent Chandler, Buff Chandler, was not present at one of the meetings, and she wanted to see the 1,000 acres that had been proposed. The site was staked off with red flags, and I joined her in a Goodyear blimp, and we went over the site to see that.

TRELEVEN: Really!

FORBES: She was very, very careful about her judgments. She wanted to see how it was relating to Newport Beach, and the ocean, and so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so did I, so we looked. I can't tell you



whether that was before or after his presentation, but I rather think it was before.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Then it's a little confusing, too, because he did the first. . . . He did the plan that I am referring to and then he did a second phase plan, and that was presented. That was in '61. So it is a little bit difficult to unsnarl this. But let me do some more digging before I get back here next time.

FORBES: Yes. The important meeting with Pereira was when he described to the board the physical plan that he had in a circle, which was adopted, and it related to the "high sky" and what he felt the area should have. That's the important part.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And that was strictly the campus layout.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I hope you can help me explain some ins and outs in a situation that seems very simple and straightforward, but I get the idea it's a little more complex than that. Because I guess it wasn't just a matter of the Irvine Company simply deeding over 1,000 acres. That the 1,000 acres were offered as part of a package, and that's the word that was used. What does that mean, "part

of a package"? I think maybe this does get into  
. . .

FORBES: The inclusion areas?

TRELEVEN: . . . the inclusion areas.

FORBES: And it might get involved with what was across the street to the north, which was a tiny, early community. It was not part of the university. But when you suggest the word "package," the only thing I think of is that we had the campus, and we had the inclusion area 500 acres to the east, as I recall. And then there was some discussion about some marshland down to the west where water came in, and I'm not sure but maybe Mildred [E.] Mathias was interested in that area.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And then this small community across the street to the north of the campus that had an Irvine flavor. Now, "package" beyond that, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Well, in the minutes I find such phrases as "deed negotiations" going on between the regents and the Irvine Company.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: What does that refer to?

FORBES: Well, I would think that would relate to the acquisition of the land by the university from the Irvine Company. Deeding the land, I guess.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But I take it it wasn't just a straight deeding. There were some contingencies involved which had to do with the inclusion areas which were not donated. Is that right? I mean, these were . . .

FORBES: Did we buy it? I can't recall now whether we bought that 500 acres or how it was obtained. But we felt it extremely useful to have.

TRELEVEN: Well, I get a sense that there were negotiations going on, and they sort of dragged on.

FORBES: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Nineteen-sixty, and 1961. I know that for about eight months, of course, you were not on the regents, and probably . . .

FORBES: Could have been at that time.

TRELEVEN: . . . were missing at least for part of '61 and early '62. Then, according to my notes, it was during your eight-month absence that Pereira presented before the regents a second phase report for "A University-Community Development in Orange County." That was October, '61. And

that's during that eight-month period that you were not on the regents.

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

TRELEVEN: That report tied into the so-called inclusion areas that were adjacent to the campus. What I can't get clear is whether, even at that point, Pereira is employed by the Irvine Land Company or employed by the university. Maybe I need to dig into the minutes again and clear that up. I know that. . . . I get some sense that there was some haggling going on over the price per acre of the inclusion areas.

FORBES: Might have been.

TRELEVEN: You don't recall?

FORBES: No. No. I don't.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And I also get the idea that there were a few regents that were extremely impatient, Norton Simon being one of them.

FORBES: Okay. That's likely.

TRELEVEN: Are you aware that he was impatient? [Laughter]

FORBES: Oh, Norton was impatient many times. Sometimes with my blessing and sometimes not.

TRELEVEN: I think that's where I'd like to leave it for today and pick it up next time.

FORBES: All right. All right.

TRELEVEN: I would be very interested in learning why. . . .  
It's so clear from the minutes that Simon is  
impatient with the way things are going at  
Irvine. It's not clear why he is impatient. And  
if we could pick it up there next time we'll  
continue with Irvine.

FORBES: Fine. Fine.

TRELEVEN: Move on to Santa Cruz, the site there, and the  
early development.

FORBES: Fine.

TRELEVEN: Good. Thank you very much.

[End Tape 5, Side A]

[Session 4, May 2, 1990]

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's May 2, back together with William Forbes in Pasadena.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: Just a couple corrections, clarifications from last time. The new consulting architect at San Diego was Jones and Emmons. I had it the other way around.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: You will recall we left San Diego where construction was moving ahead and continued through the sixties and early seventies with first [Revelle College], second [John Muir College], and Third College being built. And we had just begun to discuss UC Irvine, what would become UC Irvine. According to my notes, William Pereira's "A University-Community Development in Orange County" was presented to the board of regents at its May 20, 1960, meeting. The

regents, in September '61, agreed preliminarily to name Pereira as consulting architect for the Irvine campus and then finalized that in December '62. This is in the context of what we were trying to determine last time, who Pereira was employed by and which time period. So I think I've got that pretty well clarified. During much of that period, of course, you were absent from the board. In fact, much of the haggling between the regents and the Irvine Company over the price of the inclusion area took place during your eight-month absence. But during those eight months you were gone, in terms of Irvine, were you in close enough contact with other regents, say, Simon, Canaday, Pauley, and so on, to have been aware of the regents-Irvine Company negotiations?

FORBES: Well, probably not. I would not be attending meetings, and I would see some of the people socially. But I would say that I was out of touch for those eight months. If you are not in committee meetings, and you are not in regents' meetings, you are away.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When you returned to the board in March of

'62, all the matters clearly still hadn't been resolved, in particular the purchase price for and the plan for development of the inclusion areas. First, the purchase price of the land based on appraisals, then reappraisals by both regents and the Irvine Company. What do you recall about that business?

FORBES: I don't recall specific figures on the price of the land. I recall many discussions about the importance of the 500 acres, I think it was, of the inclusion area. Extremely important, and as time has proved it out, it's extremely valuable, the inclusion areas, as a part of university affairs. That we have the inclusion areas. I think it was a very good judgment that we insisted on that.

TRELEVEN: Well, you have a good memory. Originally, the negotiation was over 660 acres. And, ultimately, the regents bought 510. [Laughter]

FORBES: Okay. Well, I missed by ten.

TRELEVEN: But I get the idea that it wasn't just a matter of price, that there were components of a package, sort of, that were being negotiated. For instance, in September of '62, Regent Simon



complained that the company wanted more and more concessions from the board of regents. What concessions did the Irvine Company want the regents to make?

FORBES: I cannot tell you. And I don't know that Norton was specific beyond what the minutes might say. As I recall, he was quite suspicious of negotiations with Irvine. I would have nothing to back that up. I know that was the general attitude. But I don't know the specifics of negotiations.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Later, I get the idea that you joined him in being suspicious, if I read the minutes correctly.

FORBES: Can you be specific on the minutes? On any particular items that I was doubtful about?

TRELEVEN: Well, ultimately, I will lead into this by indicating that in December of '63, President Kerr announced that negotiations had been concluded. So it did take a long time. With the regents receiving clear title to 1,000 acres for the campus proper, 510 acres in the inclusion area. And then 150 acres to be developed by the Irvine Company, quote, "in a manner compatible to

university development," unquote. And it was at that time that Regent Simon expressed suspicion still over the arrangement. And you, at that time, seemed to agree with Simon. The question in all this is what lay behind those suspicions?

FORBES: I might have asked for clarification. If Norton raised some questions about the negotiations, I might have asked for clarification. But I don't recall specifically the nature of my suspicion.

TRELEVEN: Well, I'm just trying to sort my way through things, trying to get some things clarified.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And I know that during the period of negotiations, the regents had granted several extensions of time to the Irvine Company for Pereira to finalize what was called "An Inclusion Area Development Plan." There seems to be a connection between concluding the negotiations, in terms of purchasing the inclusion areas, and finalizing that inclusion area plan. Does that ring a bell at all?

FORBES: No. We wanted the 1,000 acres for the campus. We decided that that would be the minimum on new campus sites. There was no great debate about

the desire for the inclusion area. No. What went on specifically in negotiations between Irvine and the university, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Another thing I wanted to ask you about is in the midst of these negotiations, the Irvine Company offered to build a chancellor's house at Newport Beach. At cost. Now, was this sort of a sweetener?

FORBES: No. No. I don't recall that. I do recall the chancellor's house and the fact that there was a committee of three, I believe, to work with Dan Aldrich about it. I was one of the three, and Buff Chandler was another. I can't recall the third. I remember we went out on a limb. Well, not out on a limb, really, but we really moved the costs of the house up beyond what other similar structures had been and settled on a price of about \$126,000, I think. And we thought that was very expensive. A choice lot, a wonderful view, and I have no notion how much that's worth now. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Probably a couple million.

FORBES: Probably.

TRELEVEN: I mean, no joke, it probably is, given that area

in Newport Beach.

FORBES: Yeah. Yeah. But we hesitated. Mrs. Chandler and I and the other member wondered if we weren't getting it up pretty high. But that's what it was.

TRELEVEN: And that, obviously, was agreeable to other individuals on the board.

FORBES: It was approved by the board, yes, through Grounds and Buildings.

TRELEVEN: Catch any flak for that in the press or anything that you remember? Given the cost.

FORBES: No. I don't recall any.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I don't remember seeing any either. Just as we were concluding last time, we had begun to discuss Norton Simon. Especially, it's in the context of Irvine where he seemed to be really the most uncomfortable person and the most impatient regent during these negotiations with the Irvine Company. Can you shed any more light on the reasons for Simon's complaints during that process?

FORBES: Could we turn the tape off for a minute?

TRELEVEN: Sure.

[Interruption]

Before we paused I was asking you if you could shed any more light on the reasons for Simon's complaints about the rather protracted Irvine negotiations.

FORBES: Well, I think I'd rather go into that later.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were there other regents that also seemed to be impatient with the slowness in which things seemed to be unfolding at Irvine, that come to mind?

FORBES: No, not that I recollect.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I might add that we were. . . . The board was involved with getting three new campuses started, virtually at the same time, San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We were impatient as a board about a whole lot of things. We had to get on with the big job. And as I look back, President Kerr and his associates did a wonderful job of moving the university forward. Geographically, numerically, it was a good effort.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, that's an interesting comment because we have the luxury, during an interview

like this, to sort of break things into components and it's easy to forget, as you suggest, that all of this business was going on simultaneously.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And in that way the structure of the interview is a little bit artificial in view of what's going on at San Diego and Irvine and Santa Cruz, let alone all of the expansion that we'll be turning to.

FORBES: That's right. There was a whole lot of business going on.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. I know early on at the Irvine site there, there was also great anxiety by the school district there about the future of the university's impact. Okay. So there is land and a campus plan developed by Pereira. And then there are improvements, such as necessities as water. Where to get it. I guess the choices were Orange County Metropolitan Water District or the Irvine Ranch Water District. Again, this came up, and Simon really seemed to demonstrate some impatience again. I got the idea that, oh, my gosh, here's yet another problem with the

Irvine site. I doubt if you remember the water

. . .

FORBES: I can't. I can't add anything on that.

TRELEVEN: . . . specifically. I guess for the record, though, the regents ultimately contracted with the Irvine Ranch Water District.

FORBES: Fine. Fine.

TRELEVEN: And the Orange County Sanitation District [Number 14] to take care of the sewage part of that.

So, now construction got started in earnest, and the first students were anticipated in the fall of 1965. What other wrinkles came about at Irvine during that early design and development period? Let's say from '60-'64. Any come to mind that we should include as part of the record right now?

FORBES: I don't recall any wrinkles so to speak. I think that Pereira came up with an excellent master plan. He did considerable research. I think I've mentioned before how the climate with the high sky was comparable to parts of Spain.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: And he had studied the importance of that high sky and the sun and the light in the type of

construction of the buildings on the campus. I think he did a good job.

TRELEVEN: So once construction actually got under way, your recollection is that it stayed more or less on schedule?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. We had little items such as residence halls. A group of us had previously studied residence halls in the United States on other campuses, such as [Pennsylvania] Penn State [University], [University of] Michigan, Michigan State [University], Indiana [University], and had gone abroad and studied campuses: [University of] Oxford, [University of] Cambridge, [University of] Nottingham, [University of] Sussex, [University of] Reading. We developed thoughts and ideas about single rooms, double rooms, cluster groups for residence halls, and we tried some new things on the Irvine campus. Those are specific things that were done.

TRELEVEN: Well, I swear there has been telepathy operating, because later. . . . In fact, I worked a bit this week on developing some questions about the whole housing thing. And I think since you've brought it up, maybe it would be a good time to divert.



I'd like to know more about how you came to take a special interest in. . . . Let's take dormitories first. There are other types of housing, of course, on each campus. But how did you come to take an interest in dormitories to begin with?

FORBES: I don't know why or how it came about. And I might mention that we used the words residence halls.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Instead of dormitories.

FORBES: Instead of dormitories. But we began, for example, on the UCLA campus with Sproul Hall [residence hall, UCLA].

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: And then Rieber [Hall, residence hall, UCLA], and others.

TRELEVEN: Dykstra [Hall, residence hall, UCLA].

FORBES: And Dykstra. And about that time the university determined a policy of having campus housing for about 25 percent of the enrollment.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: So with that as a fact the board, particularly those on Grounds and Buildings Committee, were interested to know the best way to proceed. By

that I mean, should we have double rooms? Should we have single rooms? What are other institutions doing? So some of us were interested enough to take the time to investigate. And we investigated both in the United States and in Britain.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So to try and get a time on this, of course, Dykstra, Sproul, Rieber, and I think Hedrick [Hall, residence hall, UCLA] was the fourth. But at least three of those were completed by the time you became a gubernatorial appointee to the regents. So that would take us up to March of '62. Thinking about how the plans for Irvine were developing, really not until the end of '63, does this mean you were taking this trip, roughly, what, '60 . . . ?

FORBES: Well, we would have to go back and take a look at the calendar and figure out when precisely the regents were involved in studying campus housing.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: To be sure Sproul might have then been in existence. We probably looked at it in this fashion. We had more campuses, we had a policy of adding to residence halls in numbers. And we

wanted to make sure we did it right. The same . . . . This involved new residence halls at Berkeley, and, of course, Santa Cruz. We had this interesting experiment on the Davis campus that I could tell you about if you are interested in it. Santa Barbara. And basically, should we favor double rooms? Or should we favor single rooms? Or should we have clusters? The clusters, as I recall, one of the places that it started was on the Irvine campus.

TRELEVEN: So the interest in this didn't necessarily come from the fact that you necessarily found, say, deficiencies in Dykstra or Sproul that had been competed earlier at UCLA, but it was part of . . .

FORBES: We wanted to move forward in the proper fashion.

TRELEVEN: And move forward, as you indicated, first in terms of visiting domestic campuses. You wanted to see how other . . .

FORBES: We wanted to move forward on any of our campuses in the most intelligent manner possible.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Administrative staff people such as Elmo Morgan were involved. And it was suggested that some of us go take a look, talk to people, and see for

ourselves. And we did. I could go into more detail if you want on what we saw and what we found. Would you like it?

TRELEVEN: Those are some of the questions that I actually had written out for today. So I know we are diverting a little bit from Irvine, but it's connected to Irvine.

FORBES: It's connected with Irvine.

TRELEVEN: Because of what you found.

FORBES: Yeah. It's a part of the whole university.

TRELEVEN: So, when you say we, first of all, it was you, it was Elinor Heller.

FORBES: Elinor Heller and I.

TRELEVEN: John Canaday.

FORBES: John Canaday was on the trip to [Great] Britain. I can't recall whether he went to the U.S. campuses or not. But I know that Ellie Heller and I did.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And the record would show who it was.

TRELEVEN: Who else, if there was anyone else. Well, what did you find?

FORBES: Well, we found. . . . We went to Indiana, Penn State, Michigan, Michigan State. We found,

generally, that a double occupancy was the vogue. There was a difference at the University of Michigan in that there had been a grant by someone for some housing, and they had rather expensive single occupancy facilities. But Michigan State had double occupancy. As I recall both Indiana and Penn State did. Now, in contrast, just to proceed, when we got to Britain we found that there was much more of a tendency toward single occupancy. You can argue it one way or the other. One should be alone and not bothered by a roommate, or you can say, "University life is part of society and you learn to get along with others. Man is by nature, as Aristotle said, a social animal. And it would be a good idea to have double rooms." But Britain, essentially single rooms. The United States, essentially double. Now, at Santa Barbara, for example, when we built some residence halls, about 90 percent, 95 percent was double occupancy, with some single occupancy. After they were built and available the campus reported, Chancellor [Vernon I.] Cheadle, that there was a great demand for the single rooms.

They were the first to go, and there was a standing line for single facilities. But it brought up a financial problem in that you can house two students at less expense in one room than having two rooms.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Now, at Nottingham, in Britain, they jolly well wanted single rooms. And they went down to 110 square feet for a single room. Now, that's pretty small.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But it gave the individual his own cubicle. And they liked it and the students liked it, and it was a happy campus. But you can house two students with about, as I recall, this is some time back now, but 140, 145 square feet. And now, I might say in 1990, parenthetically, at UCLA, most of the double rooms, or some of the double rooms, house three students. And it's pretty tight. But the campus is crowded. And that's the way it is. Now, do you have any more questions about . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Sure.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: So if I hear what you are saying correctly, the economics have a lot to do with it as well.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Basic. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Obviously, to make the economics work with only single rooms, single occupancy rooms, you would have to up the cost, the lodging cost in effect.

FORBES: That's right. And reduce the size of the room to make it all make sense. We decided to go double rooms, essentially.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You mentioned 25 percent. I believe the policy of the regents was 25 percent of all students at the larger campuses and 50 percent at the smaller campuses would be housed in university housing.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Why does the university have to get involved in housing at all?

FORBES: Well, ideally, campus housing permits the student to spend more time studying, getting acquainted with other aspects of the campus, its culture, its activities. And it reduces travel time. It keeps the focus of the individual on education. I think it is logical to be near your work. A student's work is on the campus. If he is housed

there, so much the better.

TRELEVEN: And there was no chance that the gap would be filled by the private sector building housing contiguous to the campus?

FORBES: Oh, well, private housing, that's private enterprise. That can go on individually as it would. On the UCLA campus, for example, land costs made it extremely difficult to provide any kind of housing near the campus. In later years, when some housing that was private became available to the university south of the campus, we bought it. The regents bought the property for the university and, I presume, still operates it.

TRELEVEN: Well, we are talking about, so far, a space where students can sleep, study, clean up, or whatever. But then there are what one might call amenities. But that's probably not the right word because they are necessities. And that is eating. Food. What was your experience in how that was handled? Or was that part of what you looked into on other campuses? Whether food facilities were provided, say, in the residence halls, or whether there would be a number of



residence halls and there was a commons for students to eat? That kind of thing.

FORBES: We didn't go into that, the food facilities matter, too seriously, although some recollections come to mind. We found that an open area with a whole lot of tables was less desirable than breaking that space up into smaller areas by dividers, by plants, by devices to make eating more pleasurable and to reduce the problem of sound.

TRELEVEN: To what extent were you interested in how more meaningful academic life might be integrated into residence halls? Did you see models like that on other campuses here or in Europe? I suppose by that I mean more social functions, more academically related functions, programs, perhaps speakers, in and of themselves in the dormitory-- or, excuse me, residence hall areas.

FORBES: No, I don't think so. I just think that it was a given that those who lived in residence halls would have academic programs and other types of student activity close at hand and be more a part of the scene than those students who lived away from the campus.

TRELEVEN: I suppose what I am getting at here is a question something like to what extent were you concerned about the quality of student life as that quality related to residence halls?

FORBES: Well, to be sure we were basically deeply concerned with the individual student and student life. And we would provide facilities on campus. One comes to mind on the UCLA campus: the recreation area on the northwest corner of the campus.

TRELEVEN: Sunset Canyon Recreation Center.

FORBES: Right. Yeah. And I guess that's been reworked a little in recent times.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But it was a wonderful facility. So we were deeply interested in student life.

TRELEVEN: Now, you learned various things and you carried them back to the president's office and the full board in the form of a report?

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: So, it's a written report which should be part of the record. Would it be fair to say you also reported verbally at Grounds and Buildings and also to the full board?

FORBES: Yes, we reported to Grounds and Buildings Committee. And I'm sure that Elmo Morgan turned in a report to the president's office.

TRELEVEN: So, as a result of having personally eyeballed residence halls elsewhere, does this mean that you and Mrs. Heller and John Canaday, that you had closer interface, then, with architects who were designing residence halls on both the newer and older campuses?

FORBES: We had developed a point of view, individually, that would help us in approving or not approving architectural plans for residence halls on the various campuses. We were in a better position to know what the university probably should have. And if we were in looking at it without having seen what others had found through the years to be satisfactory.

TRELEVEN: No, and I understand what you are saying. But what this meant, also, is that when you contract with an architect to build a residence hall, after you come back, you didn't necessarily then sit down with the architect, or Morgan's office sit down with the architect, and say, "Look, here are some findings that we have that we would like

incorporated into your design for a residence hall"?

FORBES: Precisely how Elmo Morgan handled his operation I wouldn't know.

TRELEVEN: How about . . ?

FORBES: We did not sit down with architects, so to speak. But when architects would present their plans to the board, to the committee, Grounds and Buildings Committee, we could ask, "On these specific plans of yours, what's the square footage you have on this particular unit?" What about various types of facilities? Different campuses approached residence halls in different ways. I'm thinking of Santa Cruz. Again, that was, as I recall, cluster group.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But I don't know if there is anything more to add.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I just wanted to clarify that. It was more a matter of those of you who had familiarized yourself with residence halls elsewhere being able to look at the plans and ask much more perceptive questions.

FORBES: That's well said. We were not. . . . We did not

come back from our meetings to dictate to anyone how to do it. That's the architect's job. But we came back with an understanding of what seemed to be working so that we could ask intelligent questions, so that we could approve or disapprove facilities that we didn't think made sense.

TRELEVEN: So what existed on various UC campuses in terms of residence halls really had nothing to do with prompting the trip. In other words, that things were not working as well as they should . . .

FORBES: Correct. That was not the basis of it. It was the basis that we, the university, was getting more and more involved with building residence halls. And we wanted to do it right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Are there some ideas that come to mind that were incorporated into the residence halls as a result of your having made those excursions?

FORBES: No, I think the record would simply have to speak for itself.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And I take it a major policy decision was to have rooms by and large for two occupants rather than one.

FORBES: Yes. And I must say that as an individual I went to that concept with some reluctance. Because if

the dollar bill was not involved, I leaned toward the individual room. But it wasn't affordable.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So there had to be a compromise.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: We're nearly at the end of this side, so we will pause for a minute.

FORBES: Okay.

[End Tape 6, Side A]

[Begin Tape 6, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Well, specifically then, getting back to Irvine, and I'm glad we took that little detour, because I honestly was prepared to ask you about some housing related matters today. And we will get back to housing in several other contexts later, but getting back to Irvine, then, what ideas were incorporated into residence hall construction at Irvine?

FORBES: I can't be more specific than to say that at Irvine we accepted the recommendation to build residence housing that would be in, let's call it, cluster form with four to six to maybe eight-- and I can't be too specific on this--students in a group with some cooking facilities for the group. And showers, baths, whatever, in

clusters. That was probably an innovation at that time.

TRELEVEN: And at Santa Cruz, also.

FORBES: Right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Which turned to the cluster approach, also being used.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. And the cluster approach was used in Britain--I didn't mention that--in some areas. And the Santa Cruz campus developed in the image of Dean McHenry, who wanted to find a place for seminars and tutorial instruction. The cluster group concept was basic. Well, not basic, but used a great deal in Britain, along with the single rooms.

TRELEVEN: So it seems more along the lines of creating a more--if I can use the word--homey atmosphere.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Within the confines of a large institution. Less institutionalized, more homey in various ways. At Irvine, in terms of building design, I recall reading an article in the L.A. Times within the last year or two about the mundane design of some of the early architecture. I thought back and I remembered having read that Mrs. Chandler, I

think, twenty years earlier had complained that the initial buildings at Irvine had characteristics of--here's the quote--"they had institutionalized monumental and dated characteristics." Was her critique at that time unique, or was that shared by other regents? I'm talking about the design in general of the early buildings.

FORBES: I don't recall her being critical of the design in the early years. I don't recall it.

TRELEVEN: Oh. Okay. Your personal impressions of the design of the early buildings at Irvine?

FORBES: I approved the designs and liked them. When the early buildings were erected and finished, I visited them and liked what I saw. I think I was favorably impressed.

TRELEVEN: Okay. To get back to something I think we talked about a little last time, and that is having to watch the dollar, to what extent do you think that financial constraints can inhibit an architect's creativity when designing university buildings?

FORBES: Oh! Money, costs, are basic, are a basic restriction on architecture. My classic example of that is Pauley Pavilion. Do you want me to



get into that?

TRELEVEN: Sure. You are going to use it as an example so I'd like to hear what comes next.

FORBES: Yes. We had a difficult time finding a way to play basketball and to have convocations in large numbers. There wasn't a big budget for this, and the need was apparent. Pauley Pavilion came about because we asked the state to help develop an all-purpose facility that could be used for large gatherings and for basketball--for sports we said. As I recall the numbers, we asked the state for \$2 million. We asked the regents. The regents were willing to put up \$2 million, and the UCLA Alumni Association was prepared to try to raise \$1 million. We. . . . It doesn't quite add up, but when we got ready to really negotiate on a facility, we had in hand by grants and by loans \$6 million. Welton Becket designed Pauley Pavilion and came up with a project that would cost \$7 million. Now, this is getting to your point on financial constraints.

TRELEVEN: Right. On design, yeah.

FORBES: On design. And we, the board, heard Becket's presentation and we liked what we saw and heard,

but we didn't like the price of \$7 million. So after Welton Becket left the room, we talked about it a bit. Then they asked me to step out and talk to Welton and see if he could do something for \$6 million. So I went out and saw Welton. And we walked down south of the Murphy Hall to where the steps were and stopped there. I told him that we liked the idea, his ideas very much, but we really only had \$6 million. And what could he do about it. In fact, I said, "Could you build it for \$6 million?" And he said, "Yes, I can. But, Regent Forbes, you are going to have to understand that it won't be what you could get if you spent \$7 million. We will take out the escalators. We will do some changing on the steps going down. But we can do it for \$6 million." So today we don't have escalators at Pauley Pavilion, and if you go down the steps you will notice that they are not even. One level is a little longer, and then there is a short one, and then there is a long one, and then a short one. But Welton Becket cut some costs, still provided a good facility at less money. And I think it is a perfect example

of financial restraints on architectural structure, entity. We were happy. We got a facility. It wasn't quite what we wanted, but it has worked very well. But you can do it.

TRELEVEN: And there was no chance of getting an extra \$1 million because you had had the fund-raising. Ed Pauley had committed his . . .

FORBES: Well, it worked out the Alumni Association. . . . I was. . . . That was the time when I was an ex officio member of the board and president of the Alumni Association. I remember the chairman saying to me when I said we were going to put on a fund-raising drive for \$1 million turning to me and saying, "Well, can you raise \$1 million?" And I said, "We never have. But I think we can and we'd like to try." Now, it turned out that we raised \$2.234 million I think because Regent Pauley said that he would match anything up to \$1 million that we raised. So we came out very well. We got the \$6 million for the structure. That's the way it worked out.

TRELEVEN: Right. So there are compromises that have to be made in the architect's creativity.

FORBES: That's right. Yes. You've got to leave. . . .

Regent McLaughlin loved red tile. We joked about that a bit, but we couldn't always afford red tile. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Well, last time we had a rather detailed discussion about the process and procedures and design and construction for a new campus or for new individual structures. And I take it that generally those were pretty much the same for Irvine as they were for San Diego. Once construction got under way at Irvine, were there any particular or peculiar circumstances or situation that you recall having come up during that early construction process?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: It went along pretty well. And would you say, or would you care to say, that Regent Simon became mellower as the Irvine campus began to take shape?

FORBES: I doubt if Regent Simon was ever very mellow.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Okay.

FORBES: And I say that as a very good friend of his.

TRELEVEN: Right. I understand. And I think we should say for the transcript record that one should listen to the tape to hear the way you said that to get

the proper inflection.

Well, as with San Diego, I'd like to return to Irvine at some point later again in the context of curriculum and especially medical education. But I'd like to take a look northward again, this time to the South Central Coast. Back when you were an ex officio regent there was a regents' Special Committee on New Campus Sites consisting of Boyd, Carter, Canaday, Chandler, Steinhart, and McLaughlin. But what do you recall personally about various prospective sites for a South Central Coast campus?

FORBES: Well, I simply. . . . I remember that the. . . . Was it the Cowell family that offered . . . ?

TRELEVEN: It was the S. H. Cowell Foundation.

FORBES: Right. The Cowell Foundation offered, as I recall, 2,000 acres at Santa Cruz. So that was one site that was under consideration. But there were other areas that we looked at. One, in particular, east of Santa Cruz, and don't hold me to this name, but I think it was in the Almaden Valley. But it was east of Santa Cruz and somewhat, somewhat adjacent to San Jose. The regents were taken on a bus on an inspection tour

of this area, and later discussed it. Now, that's the only other specific site that I visited. There might have been others that were considered.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But ultimately the number of seriously considered sites was down to two. I don't know whether this anecdote has come from you in informal conversation or whether it's from another interview. Possibly Canaday's.<sup>1</sup> But there is an anecdote about the regents visiting both sites on the same day or both sites on consecutive days and going to the first, which was not Santa Cruz. And it was extremely hot and humid. Then came Santa Cruz with ocean breezes and so on, and that had something to do with turning the corner. Do you recall . . . ?

FORBES: Well, I recall two things about that. One is I recall that when we were on that bus and in that valley area, that it was quite warm. And that was a group. Now, then I remember that I believe it was a Saturday afternoon, and the only two

---

1. Canaday, John E. "Alumni Officer and University Regent." Interviewed 1974 by John B. Jackson, Oral History Program, UCLA.

members of the board who were present, and this was not anything but just our own interest in the Santa Cruz campus. Phil Boyd and I climbed over a barbed wire fence to get into the Santa Cruz area in a light drizzle. A very heavy mist or a light rain. We were getting a little wet, but we were interested. And we climbed this barbed wire fence and walked up north toward the quarry and around just to see the site. And we were both favorably impressed. There is no question but what it's an outstanding site for a campus. The choice, in my view, just individually, was easy to make.

TRELEVEN: But what did you like best about it? About that site?

FORBES: About the site? It's attractive. Attractive from the standpoint of land and growth. Adjacent to the ocean, which suggests a moderate climate. And the fact that it had 2,000 acres.

TRELEVEN: As the result of the proposed donation by the  
. . .

FORBES: By the Cowell.

TRELEVEN: By the Cowell Foundation. Well, today, in 1990, as you've read I'm sure, there are some pretty

loud rumblings against campus expansion among various people in the Santa Cruz area. What was the residents' attitude about a major campus when you were considering it in the early sixties?

FORBES: I had no contact with the administration of Santa Cruz. We were, the regents, certainly were assured by Santa Cruz that the university would be welcomed. We never would have gone to the Cowell Ranch if we had not had the tacit approval of the community. Now, I just say that knowing the university administration. That if there were any crosscurrents, any problems there, they would have come to the board. I don't recall any. Now, it should be said that later--and this is a matter of educational policy--when it was established, we said that there would be a maximum enrollment of 27,500 students on all of the campuses. Riverside, San Diego, Irvine, so and so.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And, now, in 1990, as you've referred to it, we have constraints on that because of the community. They don't want it to get that big. This is another subject and you might not want my



comments on this, but developing a new campus is an extremely costly undertaking. And while we will need new sites as the population of California grows, we ought to develop our present campuses in a reasonable way, to the maximum compatible with all involved. I think of Riverside, with well over 2,000 acres. I think of Irvine, I think of Santa Cruz, I think of San Diego. They should be developed in a compatible way with the environment as we add numbers to the university rolls. And, coincidentally, with new campuses. The heart of a university is its library, and a library is extremely costly to develop.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: When Franklin Murphy, relatively early in his tenure, said one day to the board of regents that he wanted. . . . He was aiming for UCLA's library to be equal to Berkeley's, there was a long silence. But Franklin Murphy persevered. And today, not in specific numbers, but UCLA has a comparable library.

TRELEVEN: Right. I think what you are saying, if I am paraphrasing this correctly, is that there was a

master plan established. The master plan called for campus development at various sites. The number was 27,500. And here in 1990, let's stick to the master plan essentially as it was worked out in '60 and subsequent years. So, in the case of Santa Cruz, I also think what you are saying is that having 2,000 acres and having the master plan, I suspect, well known to people across the state by then, including residents of Santa Cruz, there could have been no misunderstanding at the time that the University of California intended to build a campus for 27,500 students at Santa Cruz. Is that accurate?

FORBES: That's perhaps not precisely accurate. Because in fairness to the people of Santa Cruz, I'm not sure that the figure of 27,500 was laid before them specifically. The 27,500 as an educational policy number might have come somewhat later.

TRELEVEN: Somewhat later. Okay.

FORBES: That might be. And I know, presently, in 1990 that President Gardner has his negotiations or discussions with Santa Cruz, and that something compatible with the university and the community should be developed. Should be worked out. But

the background should also be stated.

TRELEVEN: Right. And when you got into Dr. Murphy and the library, that was presented as an illustration, I think, to point out that to build an entirely new campus, and just a library in a brand new campus, is extremely costly, as compared to developing the remainder of an existing campus.

FORBES: That is right. That is right. I read about some new plans for Riverside expansion. And to me, that is great. That is exactly the way we ought to do it.

TRELEVEN: Now, I didn't get the sense at Santa Cruz that there was, as at Irvine, a university-community development plan. Was the campus by design to be a self-contained community without, pretty much, commercial businesses? Do you recall?

FORBES: Without commercial services?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Without commercial. . . . Well, a nearby business district as it were.

FORBES: A nearby business district, as I think back, was never discussed. Bear in mind that this campus developed in the image of Dean McHenry. And he wanted. . . . He was thinking of the personal student and the environment close to the faculty,

hopefully with seminars and tutorial aspects.  
Keeping the university ratio between student and  
faculty on an even keel with other campuses.  
But, yet, getting a personal environment.  
Example of that: Dean came to a regents' meeting  
once and said, "We'd like to have a running  
track." And he said, "Nothing fancy, nothing  
fancy, but just a place where the students can  
run a little." And he said the cost of it would  
maybe be \$1,000. Now that's how modest and  
personal and small McHenry was thinking. I just  
say this not for any other reason than just for  
your information. After the meeting I said to  
Dean that I would give him \$500 if he could get  
the other \$500. And I think he did.

TRELEVEN: So we are talking about a running track. Nothing  
. . .

FORBES: A running track for \$1,000. Now, this is  
inconceivable today.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: But that's what was said. It's interesting.

TRELEVEN: Now, we are talking about Santa Cruz in the  
context of a rather, I guess what I'd call  
unorthodox, university setup. McHenry's idea for

this I assume was fully supported by the president. But given the fact this was so unorthodox, was this . . ? What were the pros and cons of trying something like this from the standpoint of a regent?

FORBES: I think that the regents accepted innovation, accepted the quality of the peer institutions that Dean McHenry would think in terms of. The university had broad educational policy. I refer to the ratio between students and faculty that would have to be adhered to.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

FORBES: But within those limitations, let it be. Let's just try it.

TRELEVEN: I'm trying to recall, and I can't . . .

FORBES: I can't imagine anyone saying, "No, Santa Cruz, you've got to be like Berkeley." Or, "You've got to be like something else." No. If it's good academically and sound academically, perhaps try it. President Kerr recommended Dean McHenry to the board as chancellor. We approved him. Good man. "Let's have him have a try" was the approach.

TRELEVEN: Right. I was trying to remember when the

literature began to develop and the word "multiversity" became part of the parlance. It may well have been in the fifties, late fifties, which led to lots of thought about how to build a university environment that was somewhat different from the traditional model.

FORBES: Different.

TRELEVEN: But I can't do that. Oh, yes. A major find! Ernest J. Kemp was the consulting architect for the Santa Cruz campus.

FORBES: Ernest J. Kemp.

TRELEVEN: Kemp. In 1963. You told me last time that if I came up with a name it probably wouldn't mean a thing to you.

FORBES: As a matter of fact I have to say that I don't have instant recognition of that name. I can think of some other. . . . I can vaguely recall other architectural names involved with Santa Cruz, but that wasn't one of them.

TRELEVEN: Well, this. . . . Beginning in '63 and extending, well, at least into the early seventies.

FORBES: Ernest J. Kemp.

TRELEVEN: Well, you've mentioned Dean McHenry, and my information is that he has done an extensive oral

history interview at Santa Cruz.

FORBES: He's what?

TRELEVEN: He's done an extensive interview at Santa Cruz.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: But it's sealed during his lifetime. Someday, researchers will certainly have, I would suspect, a goldmine of information about planning and development of the Santa Cruz campus. But from your standpoint, as construction proceeded to meet the goals of the first classes in '65 and have facilities readily ready for occupancy fully in the spring of '66, were there any particular obstacles that you recall that became problematic at Santa Cruz?

FORBES: Obstacles? No, I don't think of obstacles, I just think of the different type of structures that were put up in getting the different colleges. And the sites in and around the redwoods. And access. But I don't recall obstacles. Do you have any obstacles in mind?

TRELEVEN: No, I have no obstacles. I was just asking that as a . . .

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Mentioning access, of course, brings to mind that

the regents decided to name the major access roads after deceased regents: Steinhart, Hager

. . .

FORBES: Well, and I think there is Heller, and that might have been for Ed Heller.

TRELEVEN: That was for Ed Heller.

FORBES: And McLaughlin is. . . . Well, I don't know. He was still alive. But Steinhart. Great! Good.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. The first three, Heller, Hager, Steinhart, the first three roads.

FORBES: Jerry Hager. Three outstanding people.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. So there was certainly unanimity on that. But then in '65 came the idea of naming the latest built college Adlai Stevenson College, and some regents seemed to be a little bothered by that. [Laughter] What was your position on that? On the naming of that college after Adlai [E.] Stevenson?

FORBES: I know the record might show how I voted, but I would think that I approved it. There would be no problem about Adlai Stevenson.

TRELEVEN: Well . . .

FORBES: But there would be, perhaps. He might have been, at that time, considered by some a controversial



person, figure. But I hope I voted for him. I think I did.

TRELEVEN: I can't tell you. I don't know.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I just wondered if you remembered the incident.

FORBES: Just very vaguely, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. That reminds me of something else, though. As I look through the regents' minutes, there is almost a continuum of discussion and debate over who to name buildings after. What should a person have contributed to the university to have something named after him, and I should say, or her?

FORBES: I don't think we discussed that too much.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: I don't think so.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's just an impression that I had. Back to McHenry for a minute. Had you and McHenry remained in contact over the years?

FORBES: Have we?

TRELEVEN: Had you up to, say, 1960? Perhaps because of the Alumni Association?

FORBES: Oh, up to 1960. No. No, we hadn't been in touch. When I became involved with the

university and I renewed acquaintance with Dean McHenry, it was all new really. I hadn't seen him.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so this would be . . .

FORBES: And he, actually, was a little after my time at UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Right. So you really got to know him much better, or you got to know him, I should say, when he was on Kerr's staff as the dean of academic planning.

FORBES: Right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And founding chancellor of Santa Cruz, and you had become a regent.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: I see. How closely did you work together then from that point on? Or are you, as a regent, in the development of Santa Cruz, somewhat removed from the day-to-day development of the campus? Is it more something out of the president's office?

FORBES: Well, the development, the construction, the planning is totally an operational matter out of the president's office and the chancellor's office, locally on a given campus. I was

involved only as a member of the board.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Anything more to. . . . I want to get back to Santa Cruz again in another context a little later, but anything more come to mind at this point about the construction?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: How plans unfolded in terms of building the various colleges?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, in our little verbal cruise around the state I guess in terms of existing expanding campuses in the sixties, I think I'd like to turn first to Santa Barbara, which, by the time you became a regent, had been substantially relocated to the Goleta campus.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Yeah. It was just history that it was other than out there in Goleta.

TRELEVEN: As nearly as you can recall, at the time you joined the board, what was needed at UC Santa Barbara in terms of planning, in terms of development?

FORBES: What was needed? Things that subsequently were built. A student union, so to speak. A student gathering place was needed. A facility such as

[Lily Bess] Campbell Hall [at UCLA] was needed.  
Student housing was needed.

TRELEVEN: I think you told me in a previous session that  
the enrollment was exploding at Santa Barbara.

FORBES: Well, I think I said that in one year it  
increased by a third, which put tremendous  
pressure on the campus to recruit faculty, to  
provide facilities for this incoming number of  
students.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We are nearing the end of this tape.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: So I am going to pause.

[End Tape 6, Side B]

[Session 5, May 8, 1990]

[Begin Tape 7, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, I guess it's May 8, if I'm not mistaken.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Back with William Forbes.

FORBES: Sunny afternoon.

TRELEVEN: Sunny, beautiful day here in Pasadena. Just to prove to you I've done my homework, it was 1964 you went to Europe to look at the housing facilities. I've determined that since the last time we met. We left off last week just having begun to discuss the Santa Barbara campus expansion. That, in turn, was in a further context of having diverted into a long discussion about residence hall planning at both the existing and the newly built UC campuses. I'd like to get back to Santa Barbara, but there are a few follow-up questions I have about student housing. First, you alluded to an interesting residence hall experiment that took place at

Davis. Could you tell me more about that?

FORBES: Well, yes. Now, do you happen to know a little about this?

TRELEVEN: No.

FORBES: You don't?

TRELEVEN: I haven't done any research on this.

FORBES: Well, I'll try to be brief, and it's rather personal, but the chancellor, [James H. Meyer] Jim . . .

TRELEVEN: The chancellor at Davis?

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: We'll pick up the name later.

FORBES: Okay. The chancellor came to a regents' meeting one time, and he knew that I was particularly interested in housing. So he talked to me about an idea that he had. They had practically no budget for additional student housing. They did have plenty of space on the campus. And someone had contrived some experimental structure designs. Let's say they would look something like small domes. Fabricated over some kind of a net and then plastered or cemented in to make one or two room structures. Not very big. And he would like to have about ten of these on the

campus. The cost was, compared with other housing costs, minimal. I liked the idea, and he brought it to the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, and we went forward with it. They were built and instantly became extremely popular. And they were used from that day until, let's say, three or four years ago when I visited the Davis campus at the time of the chancellor's retirement. And he said that they were finally going to remove them because they needed the land for high-rise structures. But it was a novel experience. One of the campuses. It worked out extremely well. And housing was provided at a very low cost.

TRELEVEN: So these were sort of . . .

FORBES: Dome-like structures. Single story. They were white fellas. And they didn't look like much except what they were. But they caught on with the students, and the students loved them. There would be quite a story there if you really dug into it.

TRELEVEN: Have you any idea why the students liked them so much?

FORBES: No. I could guess. Extremely informal, laid

back, and novel. And they just caught on. But let's remember and recall that the old barracks buildings on the San Diego campus, when we got that land from some part of the military services, proved to be very popular. You don't have to be very dressy, you know.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Something like a little bit of status in living in a structure that was dressed down a little bit.

FORBES: That's right. That's a good way to put it.

TRELEVEN: Another follow-up question I had was in terms of the places that you and Mrs. Heller visited. You mentioned Indiana, Michigan, Michigan State, Penn State. Why were those campuses selected?

FORBES: I think they were the suggestion of Elmo Morgan. I would guess that. But well-known and well-regarded universities. And perhaps a cross section of what we'd like to aim for.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now at the time you were making these residence hall investigations, was it a bit too early to consider males and females living under one roof, even if separated by floors or wings, of the same building?

FORBES: No, that wasn't an important item for discussion



at that time. I don't recall much ado about that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. This is something that . . .

FORBES: I think that the manner of handling the sexes on some of the campuses, maybe Berkeley, UCLA, but men and women were on alternate floors of high-rise structures. Now, of course that's all changed now.

TRELEVEN: Right. And at one point, or at some point, what we might call clamoring did begin for single student coed housing facilities. What was your opinion about that as a regent?

FORBES: Say that again. Single student, single room?

TRELEVEN: Well, where you would have a structure and you would have within that structure housing for males and females, both. When that clamoring got under way, how did you feel about that? What was your opinion about housing members of the opposite sex in the same building?

FORBES: Oh, I have no specific recollections. Back to Aristotle again. "Man is by nature a social animal." It's obvious that the university would require proper standards, let's say. But we . . . . I gave it no particular thought.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Another question came to mind as I thought more about where students live on campus. I thought about fraternity and sorority houses providing living quarters, which they do. That, in turn, takes a little bit of pressure off the regents in terms of providing housing facilities. Sororities and fraternities, though they are not organically part of the university campus, but they are subject to some regents' official regulations. But, briefly, what is the relationship between a fraternity or sorority house and the regents?

FORBES: I don't recall any specific item regarding fraternities and sororities. You're right. There is a relationship there. And since they're an entity involved totally with the university, there is a responsibility there for operations, but I don't have any specific things that I think about. I'd be glad to answer any specific question.

TRELEVEN: Well, let's say in 1960 the regents emphasized to every campus organization that it was the regents' policy to be nondiscriminatory on the basis of color, on the basis of race, and so

on. And I think this came about. . . . I should say that was '59, because the regents adopted that policy soon after the Unruh Civil Rights Act<sup>1</sup> was passed in the state of California.

FORBES: Did that go forward to sororities and fraternities?

TRELEVEN: Well, that's what I was going to ask you. As organizations that are recognized by the regents on individual campuses, but not technically part of the University of California, what's the extent to which the regents could force--I guess is the word--fraternities and sororities to comply?

FORBES: I don't recall any instances where we were up against that type of challenge. As time went on, and this is at a time when Joel Wachs and Rafer Johnson were students, I think of one specific incident that was pleasant. I was sitting at a football banquet dinner with Joel and Rafer, and I learned that they were fraternity brothers. This amazed me a bit because in the dark ages when I was on the campus, I think his fraternity,

---

1. A.B. 594, 1959 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1866.

Zeta Beta Tau, was totally Jewish. I just was amazed and interested that they were now fraternity brothers. They were fraternity brothers at that time. But I don't recall any regental actions. I don't recall any that we had.

TRELEVEN: Well, it seems to me that there was some conflict in some cases. Since fraternities and sororities somewhat come out of the South, that national-- and I'm asking you this because you are a member of a fraternity--that some of the nationals had regulations, I guess, that banned any but whites being in the organization. I think in a few cases that was the justification for the fraternity and sorority complying. In other words they had to be in accordance with the national. But at the same time it put them in a position that was not consistent with the way the university was trying to go in terms of, say, the nondiscrimination policy that was developed in '59.

FORBES: Well, we have to remember that a whole lot of time has passed in the life of fraternities. Now, my fraternity, my national fraternity, Beta

Theta Pi, was founded in Oxford, Ohio, in 1839. Now, consider the state of the union at that time.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I know of no regulations of the fraternity that would be troubled by what was in vogue then or through the years. And that national fraternity came on the UCLA campus in 1926. There have been social adjustments and developments and, let's say, improvements through the years.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Another residence hall question. A few years after your exploration to determine how residence halls should be constructed and furnished, I get the idea that growing numbers of students were rebelling against being required to lodge in residence halls. Women, in particular, at Berkeley seemed to be opting for private housing. Did you and Mrs. Heller, and perhaps John Canaday, as this began to happen, did you talk to students to try to determine why they were vacating residence halls? Why they were rebelling against the residence halls?

FORBES: I don't recall any specific instances of talking to students in that connection. We talked to a

good many students on all manner of subjects. Now, private housing at Berkeley, for example, is desirable. The housing was popular. I had a daughter [Allison Forbes] who had a little, private spot that she rented in the basement of a private home six or eight blocks from the campus, and she liked it. It probably wasn't as comfortable, all things considered, as a residence hall, but she chose it. She was by herself, with a family there.

TRELEVEN: Why did she find that more desirable than living, say, in residence hall?

FORBES: I don't know. I really don't know. It was just her wish. She found a spot she liked. But I don't know. She might have enjoyed life in a residence hall, too. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Well, I was wondering whether this is a piece of the whole challenge raised by students against what we might call in loco parentis, that traditional role played by the university, by colleges and universities all over the country. Whether this was a little piece of that breaking away from the . . .

FORBES: Perhaps it might have. As I think back, my

daughter Allison for her first two years was on the Santa Barbara campus and in campus housing. She transferred to Berkeley and she found a spot in a private home. Now, maybe something can be drawn into that, but I don't know.

TRELEVEN: No, I wasn't making a generalization on the basis of what she did, but, again, I get the idea that there was an apparent migration of students out of residence halls. Kind of rebelling against the idea that if you are a freshman and a sophomore that the thing to do is to live in a residence hall.

FORBES: Yeah. I don't think. . . . I don't see much in that as an important part of discussion in those days. Through the years the resident housing has become very popular and desirable.

TRELEVEN: Right. I would guess that if what I am raising was a serious problem, the residence halls would have been underoccupied and therefore financially threatening in some way. But you don't remember that happening.

FORBES: No. And now, as you bring that along, it seems to me that we did require life in residence halls for undergraduates to make sure that we did have

100 percent occupancy. Although I don't think that was ever a big problem.

TRELEVEN: Right. The student population was growing so rapidly that filling the places in the residence halls was not a problem.

FORBES: Not a big problem.

TRELEVEN: If somebody migrated, there were probably three other people there to take their place. Which occurred to me again, doing the research, again, part of when we are discussing things on a piecemeal basis, we forget that in this decade we are talking about the student population doubled.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: On the various campuses. Which I had to remind myself of. Not a static situation.

Another follow-up question that occurred to me was pertaining to the site selection, South Central Coastal region. Were you lobbied at all as a regent, by one interest or another, to pick one site or another?

FORBES: I think there was some lobbying, a slight amount of lobbying, for people who were interested in the site that I mentioned the other day. Almaden



area, if that's the correct name. But it was nothing, no heavy lobbying at all. Some people would like to have us choose that site for their own reason.

TRELEVEN: So these might be what? Chamber of commerce people? Or . . .

FORBES: Yes. Let's just say citizens of the area. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: How about county board supervisors or mayors or city council people?

FORBES: Might have been.

TRELEVEN: Might have been. But you don't know?

FORBES: And they might have been identified at that time as such, but I don't recall.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Mostly people interested in the area.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were you at all pressured by any state legislators whose districts would be in one site or another?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: Hands off?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And when it came to Governor Pat Brown, Governor Brown's attitude toward which site you selected was . . . ?

FORBES: He left those matters up to the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay. This seems to be consistent with what you told me before.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Then there is a related question. As you narrowed the field of potential sites, and ultimately to two, did the press bother you at all for sort of an inside scoop on the way you were thinking or the way the regents were thinking?

FORBES: At times. At times reporters would approach us, would approach me. Was there any specific thing about this item or that item? But only because they were inquisitive reporters trying to do their job.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: That was all.

TRELEVEN: How would you respond? Or was there a mechanism within the regents that if a reporter wanted to get some information, he had to go see the appropriate person rather than talk to a regent individually?

FORBES: I don't think it went beyond the fact that I, as

a regent, would simply say, "There isn't anything that I can say regarding this. I don't have anything for you."

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And leave it to him to go where he wishes to go.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Then a couple more follow-up questions from last week's session about. . . . These are concerning the student activity center at UCLA, the structure that became known as Pauley Pavilion.

FORBES: Call it the. . . . Was it the all-purpose?

TRELEVEN: Well, I. . . . Go ahead.

FORBES: It wasn't a student center, it was a facility that could be used for many activities.

TRELEVEN: Right. I've seen it referred to in the minutes, and I was hoping to get this clarified with you, called a student memorial activity center. Then I saw a reference to--this is early, before the drive got under way to get the funding package together--something about the Edith H. Norton Fund for a university activities memorial center. And is that the center that became Pauley? Does the Edith Norton Fund ring a bell at all?

FORBES: Just barely. But not a loud enough chime to be helpful. You might look up the genesis of that Edith Norton Fund, but I can't be helpful there.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Do you recall at all being present at the Claremont Hotel after a regents' meeting with Canaday and Pauley and Dr. Murphy and discussing funds for this proposed activity center with Ed Pauley?

FORBES: Yes, I do.

TRELEVEN: What do you remember about that conversation?

FORBES: Well, I remember that we wanted to get Ed Pauley to commit himself for a gift. We got, after a regents' meeting or a committee meeting had adjourned, we made a date to meet in the lobby of the Claremont for a little discussion. And Ed was agreeable. I remember that the four of us surrounded a very small table. Because of the size of Ed Pauley and then the three of us, it made the table very small, indeed.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: We talked about it, and Ed indicated that he would make a gift. And I'm sure that I said, "Ed, I don't know how much you plan to give, but I hope that it's going to be enough so that we

can. . . . It will be named the Pauley Pavilion."

TRELEVEN: You said that?

FORBES: I said that. And it worked out. He was far more generous than I dreamed he would be. Of course, his pledge was that he would give up to \$1 million, dollar for dollar, for everything that the UCLA Alumni Association raised. And as I recall we ended up with his money and the money we raised. I think we ended up with something like \$2,234,000, something like that.

TRELEVEN: Who, of that group, took the lead in sort of bringing this up and popping the question?

FORBES: Well, I don't know if there was a leader, but it could have been John Canaday, it could have been Franklin [Murphy], it probably was not.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I take it the others of you had met beforehand and sort of talked about approaching Ed Pauley.

FORBES: Sure. Yeah. We wanted to move in on him.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Okay. As I understand it the state funding for construction, state funding, was allowed only for that portion of the cost for physical education. That was, as you indicated last time, about \$2 million.

FORBES: It was about \$2 million, and it was an amount of money consistent with what the state had given some other higher education entities for certain facilities. They could see their way clear to give us \$2 million.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you . . .

FORBES: But we had to lobby a bit for that. Because Phil and Tom Davis and I went to Sacramento and made the rounds to work on that a bit.

TRELEVEN: So you did need to lobby various legislators to make sure that that item, what, remained in the capital budget?

FORBES: That's right. Just stayed there and was firm.

TRELEVEN: What legislators in a situation like that could you depend on? Those people who were for higher education, maybe whose special interest was UCLA? Do you recall?

FORBES: No names quickly come to mind. If you raised some names, I could say yes or no. But I don't recall any specific people.

TRELEVEN: Well, let me throw one out. [Thomas M.] Tom Rees. He was in the assembly in the Beverly Hills area.

FORBES: Right. He might have been a friend of John

Canaday's. I'm not sure. I'm vague on that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah. But no names pop out.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: I'm afraid I'm not going to be able to mention anymore right now. So, as you did this lobbying, you could make the argument that \$2 million had been provided to another institution, and it was only fair that UCLA . . .

FORBES: Yes. We didn't talk in those terms, as much as simply to let them know that we were from UCLA and that we were badly in need of a facility to get people together. If someone asked about basketball, we could all relate to how we played our games in the girls' or women's gym[nasium] and on the floor of the Shrine Auditorium and at Olympic Stadium [Auditorium], I guess it is. The little spot on Eighteenth [Street] and Grand Avenue.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We went from pillar to post. I think we were down in Santa Monica for a while. But we were growing and in need of facilities. But we didn't call it a basketball pavilion as such, because it was used for other purposes.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I think of the magnificent occasion when Prince Philip [of Great Britain] addressed people at UCLA. It was a nice event. And it was appropriate that we had such a facility for such an occasion.

TRELEVEN: Right. At the same time it didn't hurt to have John Wooden and a few winning seasons under his belt. [Laughter]

FORBES: No. No. He helped a lot. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: So would you call this a regent lobbying effort or one that stemmed mainly from the Alumni Association?

FORBES: Alumni Association, I'd say.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So it was you, Tom, Phil . . .

FORBES: Others.

TRELEVEN: Others. Canaday.

FORBES: But they had an airplane, and that's why the three of us went up. And. . . . No, that's not quite fair. Phil and Tom were deeply interested in UCLA. But they did have a plane, and it was convenient for the three of us to go up.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, back to Santa Barbara for a bit, and then I'll get back to UCLA. I'll want to look at



another form of student housing. But first, Santa Barbara. You may recall we had begun discussing the need for residence halls on all of the UC campuses in the context of a growing enrollment, including the campus at Santa Barbara. That's how we sort of got tracked off into the residence hall discussion, which was great. But in terms of future campus development there at Santa Barbara, more land was also needed. And in 1960, which was the last year of Regent [Thomas M.] Storke's term on the board, he offered to sell a healthy piece of property contiguous to the university. What do you recall about that?

FORBES: Well, I'm not sure that we are talking about the same piece of land and whether it was Tom Storke's or not, but there was a piece of land west of the campus and north of Isla Vista. It was close to the campus and, in my view, highly desirable. We had some discussions about that, and there was pros and cons. I recall that I pushed as hard as I could for the purchase of that land, and it was purchased. I think it has worked out satisfactorily.

TRELEVEN: Well, there were actually, I think, two Storke offerings. I think there was one that the regents agreed to purchase in April of '61. Then about two years later, the Storke trustees offered another parcel of about eighty-nine acres, if my notes are correct, which again the regents agreed to.

FORBES: I don't know that the land that I was thinking about was as big as that. I don't think it was. As I picture it in my mind, it was long and somewhat narrow, but definitely north of Isla Vista. I could walk through it now.

TRELEVEN: Well, it may have been another parcel. So now I'll do a little . . .

FORBES: You have to remember that we had great growth in campus numbers. We had housing discussed, campus housing, we had Isla Vista as an area where there was a whole lot of student housing, and, of course, unfortunately, some riots and incidents there, of course.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: But it was a broad growth era.

TRELEVEN: Here again, was the idea to meet the goal of assembling 1,000 acres? In other words, the goal

on the various campuses was, except where the constraints were such, as at UCLA, were . . .

FORBES: The goal of 1,000 acres, I can't tell you whether it was the chicken or the egg. But it seems to me that the 1,000-acres policy developed a little after the Santa Barbara crush for added housing.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And taking care of the third more students that came in a single year.

TRELEVEN: That sounds right, because the Santa Barbara campus was expanding before the master plan in 1960 was agreed on.

FORBES: That's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: How well did you get to know Regent Storke when you were an ex officio member?

FORBES: I don't know. I hope I. . . . Well, I'll start over again. He was just a splendid, outstanding person, and it was easy to get to know him. I liked him very much, and I hope he liked me. I don't know. But he was vigorous and farsighted and a real star. One of the things that I remember about Tom was that the regents had an invitation to go north to Berkeley for a luncheon with Frol [R.] Kozlov of Russia. He was supposed

to be the number three man in Russia at that time. And John Canaday, with Lockheed, said that he had a plane, Lockheed had a plane that was pretty fast and that he'd like to have some of us fly up in this Lockheed plane. I don't know, I don't think Tom Storke was aboard on the way up. We, I think, took off from Burbank and got up there in forty-two minutes.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Which is pretty fast. But Storke was at the meeting in Berkeley, and we had an interesting luncheon. I could go more into that if you ever wanted. But after lunch it was determined that the plane would drop Tom Storke in Santa Barbara on the way back. Tom called ahead to his newspaper, [Santa Barbara] News-Press, and had camerapeople out there. I have pictures of the arrival. But it was the first jet plane ever to land in Santa Barbara. But it was Tom Storke, and, you know, he was quite a guy. So I remember that about Tom.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: And many other things.

TRELEVEN: Right. He wasn't on the board very long when you

were a member. I think he left the board in 1960.

FORBES: I think that's right. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And somewhat liberally inclined if I am not mistaken. Or am I mistaken?

FORBES: Oh, I would have called him a liberal moderate. He would look any question in the eye and take a good look at it and vote his conscience. If you've ever. . . . I don't know if you've read his book,<sup>1</sup> but it's a great story about Tom Storke.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I am aware that in the middle of his offering of property to the regents that the News-Press did a very controversial expose of the John Birch Society and got a few people upset.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: But in a situation like that, that kind of fact didn't have any impact on, say, the property negotiations?

FORBES: I don't think so.

TRELEVEN: No ultra-right-wingers knocking at your door

---

1. Storke, Thomas M. I Write for Freedom. Fresno: McNally and Loftin, 1962.

saying, "Don't buy that property from Storke"?  
That kind of thing?

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: Maybe I'll pause and turn the tape over. We are  
near the end.

[End Tape 7, Side A]

[Begin Tape 7, Side B]

TRELEVEN: We were talking about the Santa Barbara campus  
and the Santa Barbara property and the property  
offered by the Storke. How well did you get to  
know Regent Storke when you served as an ex  
officio regent?

FORBES: I felt that I got to know him quite well for the  
short time span that we were together. He was  
easy to know and a lovely person. Just a great  
individual. Massive in many ways. Life in Santa  
Barbara, service to the state and to the  
country. I could tell about the incident when  
some of us were invited north to have a luncheon  
with Frol Kozlov, who was supposedly the number  
three man in the Russian hierarchy. John  
Canaday, vice president of Lockheed, called to  
say that he had the use of a plane, a very fast  
jet plane that could be used to take any regents

north who might want to go. And I did. And pretty fast in that it took forty-two minutes to get from Burbank to wherever we landed in San Francisco area. We had an interesting luncheon, and Tom Storke was there and said that he would like to fly down with us and could we land at Santa Barbara? John called the pilots and found that they could and would. So Storke called ahead and asked his newspaper, the News-Press, to have the photographers and reporters at the field. And pictures were taken on our arrival in Santa Barbara. At that time we found out that that was the first jet plane that had ever landed in Santa Barbara. Quite a bit was made of that. Tom devoted his energies very well for the university and was a great member of the board.

TRELEVEN: Well, given this stereotype of Santa Barbara, I wonder how many citizens called the police after that jet came screaming into the airport. Great story about that airport, too, about how it became the Santa Barbara airport. It's really in Goleta.

FORBES: Goleta, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. We've done an interview with Stanley [T.]

Tomlinson, who is a former assemblyman, and then went on to become city attorney. Through a very interesting maneuver, Goleta airport became contiguous to Santa Barbara by means of water. It took a special act of the legislature, and it's a fascinating story. But that's the airport where you landed in that jet plane.

FORBES: Good for them.

TRELEVEN: I think I wanted to ask you--everything is relative, of course--but I guess in the context of Storke's. . . . We'll pause.

[Interruption]

In the context of Storke's newspaper, the News-Press, there was a rather upsetting series of articles exposing, I guess you might say, the John Birch Society. Does this mean that Storke was somewhat liberally inclined? Or was he a liberal next to, say, members of the John Birch Society? Or how would you characterize his politics on the basis of your association?

FORBES: I think from my memory of Tom Storke I would consider him a moderate, thoughtful, forward-looking person.

TRELEVEN: Center of the road? Middle of the road?



FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Middle of the road something.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now I'm curious about this Russian delegation. This takes place, must have been about the late fifties or 1960 if Storke was still on the board, because he left the board in 1960.

FORBES: All right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: So it must have been right in that during the [Nikita S.] Khrushchev years. How did that come about?

FORBES: Well, I think, as I recall, the Russians were invited to visit the Lawrence laboratory at Berkeley.

TRELEVEN: Right. The Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory.

FORBES: The radiation laboratory. So members of the Kozlov group were taken on a tour. I'm sure that it was circumspect. But this was something that was handled by the administration and, I'm sure, by Glenn Seaborg. And other people who had friends among Russian scientists were there and carefully showed them through the laboratory. Then after that there was a luncheon and Kozlov

spoke. And I was attracted to the fact that two people were taking down his remarks in shorthand. And there was an interpreter. I was seated with a chap by the name of Orsikonakov who. . . . I asked him what his field was and he said that he was an economist. But I couldn't get much in the way of discussion of the economy. Or really any subject. He was very tight-lipped. That's about all I remember of the luncheon.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So this was a luncheon to which . . .

FORBES: All regents were invited.

TRELEVEN: . . . all regents had been invited.

FORBES: Right. Yeah. And it was at University House. There were probably thirty or thirty-five people in all there.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall any regents who were so opposed to these representatives of the Soviet Union being on campus that they protested the fact?

FORBES: No. I don't recall anyone.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess that is after Khrushchev had gone to Disneyland. Is that right? Yes.  
Chronologically?

FORBES: Can't be sure.

TRELEVEN: I can't remember either. One thing that occurs to me is that the regents since '47 had had a policy against permitting communists to speak on campus. Yet here's an official university inspection and luncheon, the one that you attended, and it seems to be a bit of a contradiction.

FORBES: Well, just saying that's the policy, it seemed to me that it would not be consistent with it. But I can't go beyond that. I'm rather sure that President Kerr would have thought the matter out and cleared the matter with the chairman of the board before going ahead. It might not have been really a speech or a talk. It might have been a luncheon in his honor to which regents were invited. It could have been that. And he had some informal remarks to make.

TRELEVEN: Now, I think when Dave Gist interviewed you for student leaders, at the end of your interview he asked a general question: when you joined the regents, was there any residue left from the loyalty oath period? And I think you answered no.

FORBES: If any, very little. I had read about it and

knew about it, but there wasn't anything of substance.

TRELEVEN: Right. As I remember it there were some settlements made along the way. In some cases some monetary settlements dragged along through the fifties. Where things became somewhat better after Regent [Edward A.] Dickson passed away, and then the regent, whose name I am not going to remember [Regent John F. Neylan].

FORBES: Yeah. I have no recollection of that.

TRELEVEN: But in any event, despite the fact that the issue of the loyalty oath had demised, it was still the regents' policy that communists could not speak on campus.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: And, indeed, that known members of the party would not teach in the university. But I know when we were talking a few minutes ago, as it turned out off tape, you. . . . What we think was probably after the Angela [Y.] Davis case, as it's called, began to become public at UCLA, that you had had a lunch that involved Angela Davis and several other regents. I wonder if you could relate that to me.

FORBES: Yes. It was quite informal. To repeat, I think that I'm the only one who had luncheon with Ronald Reagan one day and Angela Davis the next. And it came about in this curious fashion. We had a regents' meeting and the governor attended, and I happened to be seated with two others and the governor at a small table wherever we were having the meeting. I think maybe Santa Barbara, but I'm not sure. The next day I had a phone call from either [Frederick G.] Fred Dutton or Norton Simon asking if I'd like to go to lunch with Angela Davis. And I said, "Sure." He said, "Well, we are going to be meeting at twelve-thirty or whatever at this building, northeast corner, Wilshire [Boulevard] and Westwood [Boulevard]. See you there." So Norton and Fred and Angela and I had a luncheon. And the one thing that I remember about the luncheon is that Norton took great delight in pursuing a probe of Angela, saying that he didn't really think she was indeed a communist. And in a nice, light manner, but as serious as Norton can get at times. But that's what I remember about the luncheon. And I

remember her as a rather soft-spoken person.

TRELEVEN: So she did not respond to Simon's probes, I guess you might call them?

FORBES: Not in any heavy way. No.

TRELEVEN: She didn't return things by saying, "Well, Mr. Simon, I don't think you are a capitalist."

FORBES: No. No. I would have remembered that.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: And these were the days of Eldridge Cleaver and Soul on Ice, the book.<sup>1</sup> Dan Aldrich had made arrangements for him to speak on the Irvine campus, and my wife and daughters and I attended, sat with the chancellor and heard him out. And to a packed audience of maybe 2,500 students in that facility that they had at that time.

TRELEVEN: Right. Very small enrollment. Were there any particular regents at that time that would get upset because someone like Cleaver was speaking at Irvine?

FORBES: Who would get upset?

TRELEVEN: Other regents. Regents other than yourself.

---

1. Cleaver, Eldridge. Soul on Ice. New York: Dell Publishing Company, 1968.

FORBES: Oh, yeah. I think that there were some who didn't look kindly on this. Now was it Eldridge Cleaver who wrote Soul on Ice?

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

FORBES: All right. We had a meeting on the UCLA campus, a regents' meeting. And it was a committee meeting, because I stayed overnight in Westwood because there would be another committee meeting early the next morning. At that time one member of the board said that he or she did not think that Cleaver had written the book. And after the committee meeting was adjourned, a student came to me and said, "I know he wrote the book because my father is vice president of the publishing company who published that book." He said, "I know it was his book." And I said, "Would you be good enough to talk to your father and have him send you a wire overnight saying that?" He said he would. And, as I recall, he came to me the next morning with a telegram saying that. Now, that's my recollection of that.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Yes. So there was a difference of opinion about different people who wanted to speak and express

their opinions.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think the record will show that there were some regents who were I guess what one would call stridently against certain kinds of speakers, including those on the far left. How did you feel about that? How did you personally feel about it?

FORBES: I personally felt that people should be heard. There is no substitute for free speech. We mustn't, we mustn't stifle speech.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Back to Santa Barbara, and our tape recorder has been good to us the last few minutes.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] We left Santa Barbara so many minutes ago I have to remember. . . . Yes, we were in the process of planning and development of the grounds and structures there. I take it that that followed the routine quite similar to the routine on a brand new campus in terms of development of new structures?

FORBES: Other campuses? Yes. The general routine was to bring matters before the Committee on Grounds and Buildings and have a presentation by the



architect involved. Santa Barbara's chief architect was Charles Luckman.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Extremely capable with a good staff, and he made good presentations.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I think the record shows that he was the consulting or chief architect at Santa Barbara from. . . . Well, roughly thirteen years. 'Fifty-six through '69. Which, I guess, adds up to the regents considering him a very desirable individual to work with.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Plus the fact he was quite involved with the state college system, was he not?

FORBES: I think he became involved with the state colleges a little after that time, although I'm not positive about that.

TRELEVEN: I think you're right. I think you're right. It was after the State College Board [of Trustees] was reconstructed. And I think, after Glenn Dumke was selected to the. . . .

Well, same question I've asked about some other campuses. In terms of building design and in the case of Santa Barbara, I know there were

several regents, not you but several others, who were critical of Luckman's quote "unimaginative" design. What was your opinion of the buildings he designed?

FORBES: I think he did good work, and I think the Santa Barbara campus reflects it. Different people have different ideas about architecture. I've mentioned that Don McLaughlin loved red tile roof.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: While we, as a board, approved what later became Bunche Hall on the UCLA campus, Regent [William M.] Bill Roth thought the design lacked a good many things and was critical of it. But different people have different ideas.

TRELEVEN: I think last week we discussed how architects can be severely impacted by money.

FORBES: By money. That's right.

TRELEVEN: Unless you have the money, you can't build something elaborate. In fact, that's how we got into Pauley Pavilion.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: You gave me that example.

FORBES: That's right. We told that story.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well . . .

FORBES: And Pauley Pavilion today isn't quite what it would have been if there wasn't a restraint of about \$1 million in the budget.

TRELEVEN: Right. Anything else about Santa Barbara, at least in terms of that sort of rapid construction, development period in the sixties that comes to mind that is important to be part of the record?

FORBES: No. No. I don't know if you will get back to Santa Barbara in any other . . .

TRELEVEN: I will.

FORBES: You will. Okay. All right.

TRELEVEN: Right. So, in terms of physical expansion . . .

FORBES: No. The one thing that I remember, and I don't know how it's worn through the years, is [William W.] Campbell Hall [at UC Santa Barbara], the circular building, auditorium. I don't know what the reaction is today about Campbell Hall, but I remember it as something that I liked and was developed through those years.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. One thing I remember is that the university bought, I believe it's called the salt marsh in that area. And it was part of the

environmental impulse or impact.

FORBES: Impact. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Or mission or whatever of the Santa Barbara campus. Land that is preserved today in . . .

FORBES: West of the chancellor's home, what was the chancellor's home. Yes. Because it was contiguous to areas that needed to be watched carefully.

TRELEVEN: Okay. If we could I'd like to come south to UCLA. I guess I'd like to begin by saying that it seems to me there is a conventional wisdom that not much was happening at UCLA before Dr. Murphy's arrival. Clearly he raised the energy level at the Los Angeles campus. And he irrefutably guided UCLA to new frontiers of academic excellence during his tenure. But the expansion of the physical plan had been well under way for some time before Murphy got there. Look at the minutes for, say, the two years that you were an ex officio regent and there were many projects that were under way or in planning stages on the campus. Would you say that's fairly accurate?

FORBES: Well, I'd say that the record will speak for

itself on buildings under construction and growth prior to Franklin Murphy. But, vividly, the campus was in need of leadership and all that leadership implies. And this, now, if I may just take a minute.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Please do.

FORBES: This is something that I was in the middle of because the past presidents of the Alumni Association of UCLA constituted a powerful and useful entity in turning the corner, let's call it, in 1960, the time Franklin Murphy came. The past presidents asked Clark Kerr for a meeting. At that meeting a dozen of us discussed the importance of the chancellorship and said that we wanted him to come up with a strong person. Later, President Kerr came back to us with a list of about three or four, which we discussed, not affirmatively, and told the president that. President Kerr accepted the comments in good grace and said he'd be back. He was back specifically when he called me, and I was president of the Alumni Association at the time and an ex officio member of the board, saying that Franklin Murphy had agreed to come out for a

visit and could I meet him at twelve-thirty in the morning, LAX [Los Angeles International Airport].

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And make arrangements for a hotel, which we did. I could go into more detail on that if you want. I think this has been covered, maybe.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. You went into that a bit way back.

FORBES: Before.

TRELEVEN: That shows you how long we have been taping. But you agree that there was construction under way and that gradually the old beanfields of the twenties were disappearing as the construction took place. But that the level of energy, in terms of not only what was being constructed, but what needed to be done beyond that was so much involved with Murphy's energy. His initial energy after he came to UCLA.

FORBES: There were some very good things done before his arrival. For instance, the medical school. Phil Davis should get high marks for working diligently, along with others, for the medical school. Other things were done. But to raise UCLA from a good university to a great one

required tremendous leadership, and we were looking for that. We badly needed it. And in Murphy we got it.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right. Now, looking just at the physical space, we've talked before about how the space at Los Angeles is very limited--411 or 413 acres, something like that. By the late fifties, early sixties, was it already apparent that there were going to be space problems in view of what needed to be done at UCLA?

FORBES: I'm sure. I'm sure. Yes. Berkeley and UCLA have about the same acreage, give or take a few acres.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: We did acquire that west campus beyond Gayley [Avenue], and that added a little, but not materially. But we knew we were lacking space. That was one of the problems. But I think that what I alluded to, as far as leadership was concerned, was more academic quality and aiming for higher goals. Bigger libraries. The heart of the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So a constraint is the smallness of the plot, if you will, the space available.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: A constraint is a lack of leadership.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: A constraint is . . .

FORBES: Budget.

TRELEVEN: . . . money that is needed to build new  
buildings.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Any other constraints beyond that?

FORBES: No. The leadership would include a quality of  
academic environment depicted later by the Murphy  
cultural garden. What do you call it?

TRELEVEN: Sculpture Garden.

FORBES: Sculpture Garden. Right. Just a breadth of  
qualities that we later embraced. And we didn't  
have them before that time.

TRELEVEN: Now, I think it was Welton Becket at UCLA who was  
the consulting architect.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: So that firm is responsible for the general  
campus plan.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I want to stay away, at least for right now, from  
the expansion of the health sciences facilities



in general. We will get back to medical and health sciences education. But I do have a general question about medicine and health, since it took up a fairly good chunk of the campus, and that is why did it seem sensible to you to expand the medical school complex on such a small acreage rather than developing a medical school someplace else?

FORBES: Someplace else? To my recollection we never discussed any other site. We knew that we had a limited amount of space and we had to go high rise. And we had to be extremely adroit at every step in adding such things as the Jules Stein Eye Institute.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And other facilities.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. At the time you came to the board I think Unit 1 had been completed of the health sciences complex.

FORBES: Yeah. Right.

TRELEVEN: That's going way back to the late forties, early fifties. Then came the need for funds to expand.

FORBES: To add on. Right.

TRELEVEN: To add on in terms of both high rise and, in the

case of Stein, a rather low-rise structure.

FORBES: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: And in all of this development that needed to be done, health sciences as well as the other professional schools, other types of facilities, you and other regents assumed that the existing acreage would have to support these structures. I take it, unless you disagree, you were satisfied with Welton Becket?

FORBES: Yes!

TRELEVEN: The job they did on the campus.

FORBES: Yes. And there was a compatibility with Welton Becket. Recall that the first structure in Century City was a structure that was Welton Becket's office, his architectural office and Pauley Petroleum [Company]. They were the tenants of this building. So there was a warm association with Welton Becket.

TRELEVEN: What would you say about the landscaping at UCLA up to the time that Franklin Murphy came?

FORBES: I would say it was adequate.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And then improved.

TRELEVEN: Right. I'll come up with a name for you there,

Ralph [D.] Cornell, who the regents contracted with as consulting landscape architect about '62.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: There was another problem at UCLA--perhaps not only at UCLA but probably at other campuses, but we will use UCLA as an example--and that is parking. The parking of automobiles.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: I'm struck by the fact that by the . . . I'm struck that by the sixties at UCLA virtually no new structure was considered without taking parking into account, automobile parking. What's the background of UCLA's "parking problem"?

FORBES: A couple of things. One is that Los Angeles as a city has horrible transportation, which causes automobiles to be almost a necessity. That's one constraint. The other situation was that UCLA had an excellent environment with Bel Air on its north. And we had to be good neighbors. In regard to parking I vividly recall when the parking structure at Hilgard and Sunset was proposed. I think we aimed for four stories of parking, and we, the regents, were extremely concerned about the impact on our neighbors to

the north. Only by very capable design of the structure and planting with trees and all did that parking facility become a success. I think it's worked out very well. But that illustrates the parking problems. And the fact that parking costs, structures in those days, it was plus or minus \$8,000 per car. What it is today I have no notion. But that's what we were thinking about. At that level would it pay out? Could we afford it?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Somewhat like the housing system, I guess.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Sort of what they called the Group A Parking System.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And I guess it was a systemwide bonding kind of setup.

FORBES: It was a financial structure that would cause us to be able to build parking and then pay for it through ultimate use.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Continuing use.

TRELEVEN: Right. Through user fees.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Which the faculty and staff are complaining about to this day. As someone said the other day, "Back in '57 we could park for a dollar a day."

FORBES: Well, now it's. . . . I forget what it is every twenty minutes in downtown Los Angeles, but the maximum is \$16.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Or Century City.

FORBES: Is that what it is in Century City?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: It's a miserable situation, but it's a fact of the transportation situation.

TRELEVEN: Now, you indicated that when this parking structure, say, at Hilgard and Sunset was being planned, you had to be attentive to the structure being attractive. Is that something you thought of, or did the neighbors get nervous in the early planning stages about a structure being built, in essence, right across from Bel Air?

FORBES: I can't be sure of all this, but I will say that I know that Franklin Murphy, as chancellor, had conversations with people in Bel Air. Not only about that matter but about on the northwest corner, where we had the recreational center.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And we deliberately did a low-key, attractive facility there to be courteous and neighborly to the people across Sunset Boulevard.

TRELEVEN: Now, I think it was in the mid-sixties. . . . Well, it could have been early to mid-sixties, it was in that period that the Catholic order thought they might sell the Marymount [High School] property, and UCLA became very interested.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Of course, Marymount held onto it, which means the order changed its mind.

FORBES: Is your tape all right?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Okay. But . . .

TRELEVEN: I would guess there is a little more to the story than just that, because I know that the regents . . . . I know Regent Carter was extremely interested in raising the money necessary, finding the money necessary to buy the property for UCLA expansion. What do you remember about that?

FORBES: I remember about that much.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

- FORBES: About that much. That we had considerable discussion about the property, and could we get it, and should we have it, and what should we do? Back and forth. I remember how one member of the board said, "This is the way Sunset Boulevard will look one day." And he drew a line right straight through. Straightened out that loop down to the south and back. "But," he said, "when this will happen, I have no idea." But this was just a . . . It would have been a great idea to be able to get more land contiguous to UCLA. And if Sunset Boulevard had been straightened out and that body of land made part of the campus, then great. It'd be fine today.
- TRELEVEN: Well, when that idea was kicked about, in other words when the property was up for sale, do you recall resistance by Bel Air people who thought that UCLA was encroaching . . . ?
- FORBES: I don't recall it specifically. I can guess that it was. Yeah.
- TRELEVEN: I can't remember whether we've talked about the proposed major football stadium idea that was floated?
- FORBES: We haven't talked about that.

TRELEVEN: Back in the sixties, at all. But that caused a great storm of protest.

FORBES: Right. That's right.

TRELEVEN: What were your feelings about that?

FORBES: Well, now when did the proposal . . ?

TRELEVEN: That was about '62-'63. Right in that area.

FORBES: Okay. Well, we. . . . The one I remember more than the football--not as a controversy with the neighbors, but whether we could have it--was a baseball field. They were trying to get a baseball field. Was there room for a baseball field? And we talked about the short leftfield wall in Boston, Fenway Park. We talked about a whole lot of things. And that was quite controversial for a while. I do remember about the football, too, to some extent. But not that much.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: We're almost to the end of the tape, so let us turn it off.

FORBES: Okay. All right.

[End Tape 7, Side B]

[Begin Tape 8, Side A]



TRELEVEN: Okay. We're back on. I'd like to return to another aspect of housing at UCLA. We talked about the residence halls. At this time I'd like to talk about married student housing. In '62 you were appointed to a special regents committee to investigate the problem of housing for married students.

FORBES: What did we do?

TRELEVEN: I wanted to know what your recollection was of what the problem was in terms of married student housing.

FORBES: Well, the obvious problem was how to develop facilities that would be adequate and affordable.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I get some sense there were some old units. Now, see, I haven't been at UCLA that long, but some . . .

FORBES: Well, there . . .

TRELEVEN: Some units that were going to be condemned, I guess.

FORBES: Well, there some units down on the southeast corner, and I can't name the specific structures, but do the minutes show that we turned those into married student housing? Or did we . . . ?

TRELEVEN: No. They were going to have to be torn down.

FORBES: Going to be torn down?

TRELEVEN: And that apparently was part of the problem.

FORBES: You can see that I can't be too lucid on this one.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. But why should the regents have to deal with married student housing anyway, to begin with?

FORBES: Well . . .

TRELEVEN: Why should . . ? Students should not get married till they're through with school. [Laughter]

FORBES: Well, that doesn't always work out. There was an obvious need or it wouldn't have come to us.

TRELEVEN: Surely, this got under way. . . . Well, I guess in the GI Bill days, after World War II, and then, of course, the GI Bill continued through the fifties and onto the sixties.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: So I suppose that is part of the reason married student housing ever was dealt with, anyway, by the university. Well, there were some options, I guess, and certainly one option was Veterans Administration [VA] property.

FORBES: Oh, yeah.

TRELEVEN: In fact, one piece of property is where the federal [office] building [on Wilshire Boulevard] is located right now.

FORBES: Yes, we tried very hard to get that.

TRELEVEN: Yes, you did.

FORBES: Failed.

TRELEVEN: Right. In fact, something in my notes about one idea was to use VA property to be the center of the space science program, one idea. Certainly another option would have been to construct married student housing substantially on the campus.

FORBES: But we lacked room.

TRELEVEN: You didn't have the room.

FORBES: We just didn't have the room for that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. The other option that came up was that you acquired some existing structures, namely the Park View Apartments and the Sepulveda Park Apartments.

FORBES: Right. Down south.

TRELEVEN: Down south. If you could tell me, if you could remember, what made those structures so desirable?

FORBES: Well, they were apparently available. They were

reasonably close to the university. And they were affordable at a price, as I recall, that we could come out on them. But they were available and near the university, reasonably near the university. That's why they were desirable. And it answered a need. It answered a then present need.

TRELEVEN: In terms of Park View, I guess from what I am able to gather, the purchase was made in customary way of appraisal by each side. Offer, counteroffer, and you decide on the price. But in terms of the Sepulveda Park Apartments, a hitch developed because, well, the tenants didn't want to move out, and raised Cain. Do you remember that?

FORBES: No. Maybe we had problems. I don't remember.

TRELEVEN: Well, so there is a disagreement and a dispute. Do you remember the regents kicking around whether to exercise the right of eminent domain or not?

FORBES: We might have, but I don't recall.

TRELEVEN: Well, you did.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Remember getting sued? [Laughter]

FORBES: We got sued? Did we win or lose?

TRELEVEN: A standoff. There was . . .

FORBES: Push?

TRELEVEN: Well, the married students are living there yet today.

FORBES: That's fine. That's good. That's what we wanted.

TRELEVEN: So that's what you wanted. But the issue also became political. Mayor [Samuel W.] Yorty got involved. It had something to do with tenants who were not paying an awful lot of money. But, also, I guess the structures had been built originally and subsidized by the federal government. It wasn't public housing, but it was an FHA [Federal Housing Administration] project or something like that.

FORBES: Okay. Right.

TRELEVEN: And here was the university exercising eminent domain. And Mayor Yorty was . . .

FORBES: Didn't like it.

TRELEVEN: Didn't like it.

FORBES: Okay. I can't tell you. I never met the mayor.

TRELEVEN: You don't remember that swirl of controversy,

though?

FORBES: No. And, again, the regents might not have been in that swirl of controversy. That was an operational matter. Whether it was the president's office or the chancellor's office working with Yorty and all that, we wouldn't get into that. If there's a problem, okay. Try to clarify it.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I thought you might remember it because it was a rather unusual situation for the regents to exercise the right of eminent domain.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: It's unusual, in fact. That's why I thought you might remember it. For that reason, and also because you were on the special committee to try and get a handle on married student housing at UCLA.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: But I'm not ringing any bells.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: The only thing that Mayor Yorty ever got excited about, right? [Laughter]

FORBES: No, he got excited about a few other things.

TRELEVEN: Do you have anymore thoughts in this whole matter of housing, why, in general, the private sector is not often willing or able to do more than it seems to do? In easing the . . .

FORBES: All right, we are talking about UCLA, now, aren't we?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Let's use UCLA.

FORBES: Okay. The private sector has had and has a basic problem in the high cost of land in the area.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It is just an almost impossible task for private people to develop something that would make sense for a state university, a public university, in dollars.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Think of the high rise on Wilshire Boulevard.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Think of Ashdale Place near the university. And \$1 million, \$2 million for a private residence. Three million dollars.

TRELEVEN: What you are saying is that an entrepreneur, given the price of land, can not go in, build a structure, and charge rates that most students could afford, and therefore could not get the

kind of return on the investment . . .

FORBES: That's right. That's right. That's correct. And that's why I think the university has underwritten--if that's the word--housing for faculty.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, which I . . .

FORBES: That's different. And yet even that's difficult.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, let me get back to that in a minute, the faculty housing. But one thing I wanted to ask you. . . . And thank you for that explanation, because my thoughts were, gee, there's a market demand. And what you are saying, yeah, there's a market demand . . .

FORBES: Market demand. The demand is there, but you can't deliver.

TRELEVEN: Right. In the mid-sixties, I was wondering if you remember when Tishman did propose kind of a mixed-use development in Westwood. I get some sense it was like he was proposing a joint venture. I don't know if the regents can do a joint venture, legally.

FORBES: I don't know either.

TRELEVEN: That there would be student housing as well as



commercial space as well as office space. Does that ring a bell with you at all?

FORBES: Not. . . . It really doesn't.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It could very well have happened, but I don't recall it. We didn't get very serious about it.

TRELEVEN: You seemed not to have. It came up and it was discussed.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: It seemed to have fallen by the wayside. Now, you just mentioned faculty housing. I guess the basic question is, if you can remember, how early you remember that becoming an issue. That--and we are talking about UCLA, specifically, at this point--that the regents must get involved in some way in not providing but in some way subsidizing faculty housing.

FORBES: I wish I could be helpful on the UCLA situation. I think of it more in terms with Irvine, for example.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, let's use Irvine as an example.

FORBES: Okay. All right. Now, that's why. . . . That's one of the reasons why we had an inclusion area that we wanted to have, that 500 extra acres.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: For such things as faculty housing. Now how that was implemented as time went on I don't know for sure.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But that would be a use for that land. And if UCLA had had land anyplace, that would have been a great use. I know that I've just read in recent years how we've been able. . . . We've needed to help faculty with housing because you have to recruit good people.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And they are not going to move into an impossible living situation. So you have to do something. So the regents have done that. But I can't be too helpful on the UCLA campus.

TRELEVEN: By and large, are these housing-related problems that were developing, that we're discussing in terms of UCLA, by and large are they the same issues you have to deal with at Berkeley? I'm talking just about housing.

FORBES: Housing?

TRELEVEN: Right. For students, married students, faculty.

FORBES: I would think it would apply on all campuses.

Now, no matter which campus you look at, faculty housing is an item for consideration. And it is broad consideration. Because this goes right to the heart of a university. You must recruit good, good people. With California as a desirable place to live, and we have our campuses in desirable locations within California, it's an obvious problem.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I mentioned Berkeley specifically because of its campus size. I'm not including the San Francisco [University of California, San Francisco] medical campus.

FORBES: No. No.

TRELEVEN: But just Berkeley being roughly the same size, and also impacted by a largely . . .

FORBES: But you mentioned the San Francisco campus. I recall going up somewhat behind the medical center, the medical center at San Francisco, and seeing some housing. I believe it was faculty housing on the hills back of the campus and up a ways.

TRELEVEN: You're right. Some neighbors raised hell, too.

FORBES: I'll bet.

TRELEVEN: They were not very pleased over university

plans. It was for the continued construction of the San Francisco campus, as well as some other plans the regents had for development of that campus. Sounds familiar, huh?

FORBES: Yep. You bet.

TRELEVEN: And that got negotiated. Another potential expansion site for UCLA, to get back to UCLA, was something called Lantain Park in the Santa Monica Mountains.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And I hope I am pronouncing that correctly. Lantain. It was offered to and accepted by the regents in 1963 from something called the Lantain Corporation.

FORBES: And then something happened?

TRELEVEN: Something. . . . Yes. The regents set up an auxiliary organization, if that's the right phrase, to operate the Mountain Park Research Center.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: There was some speculation about how UCLA would use this property. There was an idea floated that it would become a nuclear research center, and there would be a nuclear reactor placed in

the mountains. Any recollection of . . ?

FORBES: Not enough to be helpful.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Now, Franklin Murphy would probably be able to give chapter and verse of that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And I think Chancellor [Charles E.] Young, because he certainly was . . .

FORBES: Oh, yes. And Chuck Young. Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: . . . an assistant. Well, in any case, it didn't develop. It's obviously the other side of the freeway. But it's still administered, it's still property owned by UCLA.

FORBES: How many acres?

TRELEVEN: I knew you'd ask that. The acreage isn't listed because it's still--in terms of fee title--it's still listed as proposed in the office--my god--office of the vice president, agriculture and natural resources. Reserve acreage by type of ownership. Something I got from Mr. [J. Roger] Samuelson up at Berkeley. So Lantain does not . . .

FORBES: I can't be helpful on that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. But that, in turn, made me want to take another little detour, here, and just discuss

briefly, the regents' Natural Land and Water Reserve System, which is rather hidden from the general public. Not conspiratorially, understand, but we never think about the board of regents owning fifty. . . . What is it now? It's about 94,000 acres in the Land and Water Reserve System.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: And about more than half of which are Santa Cruz Island, which is run by Santa Barbara. But 94,000 acres at twenty-five sites throughout the state of California. When you were a regent--I do have a question here--when you were a regent did you become acquainted with these various sites as well?

FORBES: Well, yes. You had to get. . . . If you were interested, you had to get involved with a good many things. Now, I strike out on some of these things you ask me, but when I think of [Boyd] Deep Canyon [Research Center].

TRELEVEN: Yes. I wanted to ask . . .

FORBES: And Phil Boyd in Palm Springs. A magnificent gift on his part of rare research land. I've tramped a good many miles of it and remember

meeting scientists from Australia studying bats.

TRELEVEN: Really? [Laughter]

FORBES: So you get involved with a lot of things. Now, you mentioned. . . . Do we own part of Santa Cruz Island?

TRELEVEN: Right. Fifty . . .

FORBES: I flew over there one day with [University of California, Santa Barbara] Chancellor Cheadle.

TRELEVEN: Sorry. That's a lease-use agreement.

FORBES: Yes. I didn't think that we owned it.

TRELEVEN: Sorry.

FORBES: But we've done some. . . . We had some research people over there. That's probably the lease agreement. But I didn't think we ever owned it.

TRELEVEN: No, you're right.

FORBES: But we flew over there and had an extremely interesting day on that island.

TRELEVEN: So as a member of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, these are grounds you would pay some attention to?

FORBES: Yes. And just on a personal, because I was interested in the thing. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: For the record, we should indicate that the Boyd property, it's called Boyd Deep Canyon Desert

Research Center. It's in Riverside County.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: By dint of being there it is attached to UC Riverside.

FORBES: Good.

TRELEVEN: Administratively.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Phil Boyd gave the gift originally of 1,500 acres, and then the Boyd. . . . A later gift by Boyd, and then the Boyd Foundation . . .

FORBES: Gave a whole lot more.

TRELEVEN: . . . added property to that.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: So it now consists of nearly 11,000 acres.

FORBES: Right. Yeah. And it's, I think, extremely valuable research property. A real asset.

TRELEVEN: Now, if you don't want to discuss this now, tell me and we won't. But I take it that you and Boyd were quite close.

FORBES: We were good friends, right, and good working members of the board. We had some differences, but they were reasonable differences.

TRELEVEN: Well, gosh, he had been the mayor of Palm Springs, and he had been an assemblyman, I think,



back. . . . And a developer. I guess that was  
. . . .

FORBES: A developer. But a devoted member of the  
board. Phil Boyd and Ellie Heller and I would--  
and I think I've told you this--we would meet, go  
a day early to a board meeting.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right.

FORBES: So that we could have dinner together and spend  
the evening visiting on matters that were coming  
up to committee meetings the next day. And then  
the board the following day. So I'd go up on  
Wednesday to San Francisco and spend an extra  
night up there to go over items on the agenda  
with Ellie and Phil. Another one was [Dwight A.]  
"Dutch" Higgs.

TRELEVEN: Higgs. Right.

FORBES: From San Diego.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: He would occasionally do this. We were all  
interested, deeply interested, in the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: About Boyd, have you got other things to ask?

TRELEVEN: Well, I didn't know whether today you wanted to  
get into specific areas where you disagree or not

agree. I don't know how we want to time that in terms of what we tape. We will be getting back, in future sessions, to specific issues that become rather hot and heavy. I don't know what your feeling is about that.

FORBES: There is only one area of disagreement that was at all difficult between Phil Boyd and me, and that was when, after the Mario Savio fall, in December the regents decided to study the basic problems. And Ed Carter as chairman made me chairman of a Special [Forbes] Committee.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: From that day forward until May of the next year, I didn't do much except work on that committee. And it was extremely difficult. I think that I give credit--we had a committee of seven--but I think that the three people--the two people who helped me pull the thing through were Buff Chandler and Norton Simon. They were. . . . Phil, and maybe I will talk about this later, had some problems in going along with everything.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. On my part the hesitancy to talk about it now is I need to do a little more research on that before I talk to you. I'd rather . . .

FORBES: Well, I'll tell you. . . . Okay, fine. It was a testy five months.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But I can just tell you this in advance, that after we came out with the report, went public with the report, the Times ran our report verbatim. A long report in the Times. And then two weeks later as an insert in the Times, in a little booklet, printed it again for distribution with the Times. It was quite a document. But there was blood all over it. A whole lot of people on the board were somewhat unhappy because of what we said. Tough.

TRELEVEN: And it was in the context of that committee that you and Boyd had some major disagreements.

FORBES: Yeah. Not difficult ones. And in later years we continued to be very good friends and visited with him. I became a member of his. . . . What is the name of this . . . ? Another great museum [Palm Springs Living Desert Museum]. In Palm Springs.

TRELEVEN: Oh, you mean the Desert Museum?

FORBES: Desert Museum.

TRELEVEN: On the board of that or connected to that?

FORBES: I wasn't on the board, but I became a life member

because of Phil. That's all afterwards.

TRELEVEN: Sure. He was instrumental.

FORBES: No. We were good friends.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, let's. . . . It will be good to get back to that. I think, to end up for today, if, in terms of UCLA campus property and some options, I just wanted to discuss one more area, and that's Extension [at UCLA]. Of course, an extension building was ultimately constructed on campus at Gayley and LeConte. The property, I think, which was owned by. . . . Was it Tom or Phil Davis? One of them.

FORBES: Can't tell you. Don't know.

TRELEVEN: Sorry. Here I had Tom and a question mark.

FORBES: I didn't even know that it was owned by either.

TRELEVEN: Okay. But then, right up to today, there is also a downtown extension.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And we find that today at Eleventh [Street] and Grand Avenue.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Back in the sixties the regents, or at least the southern regents, led by Mrs. Chandler, strongly favored a Bunker Hill site for the downtown

extension building. And that was after the lease was running out on another structure.

FORBES: You mean the lease on Eleventh and Grand?

TRELEVEN: No, the lease at another location, not Eleventh and Grand. But that lease was running out. And then the question became where are we going to put the downtown extension?

FORBES: Oh, yeah. And we looked at something, we talked about something on Temple [Street], I think.

TRELEVEN: That's right. I said Hill [Street], and maybe it was Temple. But I think . . .

FORBES: Well, it might have been Temple and Hill.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. County-owned property. How much were you involved in attempts to get some property up in that area?

FORBES: I wasn't involved at all in the negotiations. But I do remember that we had a number of discussions about property on, I think, on Temple. It could have been Temple and Hill.

TRELEVEN: And for one reason or another it didn't work out.

FORBES: No. And Regent Chandler might have been absolutely right in wanting it. It's a site proximate to other property that she's involved in.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: Pavilion. And Times Mirror [Company]. She knew that territory. Probably right.

TRELEVEN: I think she had a grand design of extension being part of the entire cultural milieu that was being established.

FORBES: Could have been. Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: You know, with the music center, and so on and so forth.

FORBES: Yeah. Could have been good.

TRELEVEN: Well, maybe that's a good place to call it quits for today.

FORBES: Fine.

TRELEVEN: I guess we can't totally ignore Riverside or Davis.

FORBES: No!

TRELEVEN: I'd like to talk about the two agricultural campuses a little bit next time. And then. . . . What's my plan after that? Then I guess I would like to get into this question of medical and health sciences education. So, for today though, thank you very much.

FORBES: Okay, fine. Cheerio.

[End Tape 8, Side A]

[Session 6, May 24, 1990]

[Begin Tape 9, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's May 24, back with William Forbes.

FORBES: Good afternoon.

TRELEVEN: Good to see you again. We've been figuratively traveling around the state looking at grounds and buildings on various campuses. Today I wanted to begin by discussing at least briefly Riverside and Davis, two campuses that the regents in 1959 decided to develop as general campuses. First, Riverside. I have a sense that UCR was kind of a poor sister in terms of campus development. How accurate is that?

FORBES: Well, I don't quite know how you mean poor sister. My quick thoughts about Riverside are these: the campus itself has adequate space. It has somewhat over 2,000 acres, as I recall. It has a distinguished record academically in some of the sciences having to do with agriculture.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: A fine reputation.

TRELEVEN: And in the fifties was a nationally recognized, small undergraduate institution.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: Rated very well. Very high marks.

FORBES: But, now, Los Angeles County floats a good deal of smog eastward.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Being inland, Riverside has warmer temperatures than Los Angeles or Irvine, for example, nearer the ocean. So, from a standpoint of climate, not as agreeable. But basically, the campus has a fine reputation, as I said, academically, but hasn't been as popular as the other campuses.

TRELEVEN: Well, one of our favorite chancellors, I think, was the first student body president at Riverside.

FORBES: Charles E. Young.

TRELEVEN: That's right. [Laughter]

FORBES: Speaking of chancellors at Riverside, and I'm struggling just momentarily . . .

TRELEVEN: Ivan [H.] Hinderaker?

FORBES: No, well, before Ivan.

TRELEVEN: Oh, before Ivan.



FORBES: The first chancellor came from UCLA and was a professor of mine. Now, we got. . . . And I have a road named for him out there at the chancellor's residence, Gordon Watkins.

TRELEVEN: Oh, of course, Gordon S. Watkins. Right.

FORBES: A tremendous person who came from his home in Wales to the United States, working his way on a cattle boat. And in the late twenties was teaching labor economics at UCLA. That's where I had the good fortune of being his student. And where he could tell me that unemployment, this being of course in labor, unemployment ran from a 1.5 million in good times, to 4.5 million in bad times in the United States. Now, those are statistics in the twenties.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Now, they don't mean much today, but that's what Gordon talked about, the first chancellor of Riverside. It's a long way.

TRELEVEN: That's right. That's right. Well, in the context though of all of the new construction and the construction going on on the larger campuses, UCLA, Berkeley, was Riverside sort of--not forgotten about necessarily--but did less funding

come . . ?

FORBES: Well, there was less demand for construction at Riverside because there was less demand for enrollment.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: It didn't grow as fast. So there wasn't as much construction. I'd put it that way.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And then it needed support. The best example of outstanding support was Phil Boyd. Regent Boyd, who anonymously made available the clock tower.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And I don't know whether that's been . . . He ever released that for public view, but it was his donation. He made it possible. And he watched its development carefully. I happened to be on a committee of three who were involved with appointing the architect and watching closely the development. The Riverside campus needed that kind of personal devotion, really, to give it some extra spirit.

TRELEVEN: Once in a while it seemed to have come up that there was not terribly good community-university relations in Riverside, that the campus was off

here, and the professors were a bit standoffish from community. Not a good town-and-gown situation. Did that ever . . ?

FORBES: That would be contrary to my impression.

TRELEVEN: Your impression.

FORBES: I spoke at one town-and-gown dinner in downtown Riverside. I can't pick out the exact reason for the meeting, but it was well attended. And I found an excellent spirit between the community and the university. So I don't know about any possible friction or standoffishness.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Your personal experience was contrary to that.

FORBES: My personal experience is contrary to that, right.

TRELEVEN: When did it become . . ? Well, let me start again. In one of our past discussions you indicated very strongly that now, in 1990, given the cost of building new campuses, clearly the university should develop Riverside so it could take more undergraduate students. That that campus should be developed because it is a heck of a lot cheaper to develop an existing campus than build a new one from scratch. You made that

point quite forcefully. When did you begin to think that? Was it in the seventies? Or is this something that has come up since you've been off the board? When was there a realization by you and other regents that more resources should be put into Riverside to attract more undergraduates? To attract those individuals that perhaps would like to go to UCLA or would like to go to Irvine, but there is not room.

FORBES: Well, that attitude of mine isn't something that was newly developed. From the time that the board set up and started three new campuses, San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz, and shortly thereafter President Kerr came to the board with a policy on setting these campuses, as far as enrollment was concerned, to a maximum of 27,500.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: I've been aware that we should keep those figures in mind, particularly because of the cost of developing a library.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And other facilities that are basic to a university. That it would be a terrible waste of present resources if we didn't develop a Davis or

a Riverside. Or any of the campuses, really, to the full extent that they could handle it numerically and geographically. Nothing new.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Just basically sound to do that.

TRELEVEN: And I guess as one looks at updates of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, that's pretty well spelled out. It was anticipated.

FORBES: Yes. And we had discussed the fact that Santa Cruz will not grow to that number, apparently, because of discussions between the present university administration and the community. Some compromise is understandable. But those numbers are ones to be kept, to be considered seriously.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, about a minute ago you mentioned Davis. Of course, Davis by the sixties was a nationally and I think internationally reknowned agricultural research center.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: What were the factors that led the regents to targeting Davis for engineering, law, and medicine?

FORBES: Well, the regents, I think, targeted Davis to

become a general campus.

TRELEVEN: Yes. That's correct.

FORBES: Rather than one emphasizing agriculture.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Because of numbers, because of numbers of applicants. Because of the needs throughout the state of California for another general campus. And Davis has adequate acreage in which to build.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. About thirty-six hundred, I think, is the figure that's used now.

FORBES: They use that in many interesting ways. A lot of it is agricultural and livestock. And it's an interesting . . .

TRELEVEN: Monkeys.

FORBES: Monkeys.

TRELEVEN: Primate center.

FORBES: It's an interesting campus to visit. But along came law school to Davis, and along came the association with the. . . . I believe it's the county hospital [Sacramento County Hospital]. We got into medicine.

TRELEVEN: Right. Right.

FORBES: And really in the side door. It was a very difficult situation that the university faced.

But Davis now is a full-blown university.

TRELEVEN: Well, the engineering certainly ties into the historic agricultural engineering.

FORBES: Yes. Right.

TRELEVEN: Law: you always need lawyers near Sacramento.  
[Laughter] And medicine.

FORBES: The county hospital was in a fix.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah. Which actually I'll get back to I hope today. Well, at a previous session you told me about the innovative cluster housing that was developed at Davis.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: What else comes to mind when thinking back about what was needed by the sixties and seventies to develop Davis into a general campus?

FORBES: I don't think of anything out of the ordinary. We needed residence halls, we needed construction for the general growth of the campus, but I don't have particular things that come to mind.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were there any, leaving Sacramento County Hospital and Bakke<sup>1</sup> aside, were there any other

---

1. Regents of University of California v. Bakke, 438 U.S. 98 S.Ct. 2733, 57 L.Ed.2d 750.

particular problems in that developmental period?

FORBES: I think not. No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We'll get back to the others a little later. Well, this brings us to the mother campus, Berkeley, which today is listed as having 1,232 acres.

FORBES: I wonder where they are.

TRELEVEN: Well, I've seen a map, and they are really quite scattered. But what . . .

FORBES: I challenge that a little. Up beyond, up in the hills, beyond the science laboratories, there is some acreage up there, but are you counting that as part of the campus?

TRELEVEN: Well, that's not clear, because systemwide [administration] has the UC Press facility at Richmond, for instance. I don't know if it includes that. My benefits office is located in Oakland. I don't know if it includes that. So perhaps they are throwing in what we would call systemwide acreage as well. I just don't know.

FORBES: They might be. I think on the campus, the center campus let's call it.

TRELEVEN: Right.



FORBES: Berkeley, proper, I think you will find that the numbers are someplace in the 400, 415 to 450 acres.

TRELEVEN: Yes. You've alluded in the past that UCLA and Berkeley are about the same size campuses.

FORBES: About the same. But I go back a way, and maybe something has happened where other acreage has been added, so to speak, to the Berkeley campus. Is there something in Oakland? And up on the hill beyond the Lawrence laboratory of science, there is some space where we fiddled around one morning in the snow getting to a meeting. [Laughter] But that's another thing.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, what I was leading up to with the question, and that makes it even more pertinent, because you're. . . . I think what you are telling me is that you remember it being a lot smaller than 1,232. What are the most serious physical limitations as Berkeley as you head on into the sixties?

FORBES: I think. . . . Wait a minute. Dated as the sixties? We are talking about the 1960s now?

TRELEVEN: Right. Heading into the sixties.

FORBES: Heading into the sixties. Well, heading into the sixties, that's a little before my time because I came on in '59 and so I can't really comment. But I can tell you that in the sixties we needed, because of our policy on residence halls and the community itself, we needed space for residence halls.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: We needed a cultural center, an art center. We reworked some buildings, but Berkeley generally needed facilities to take care of the growth and development in various disciplines of education.

TRELEVEN: Well, you're right. I think there were three residence halls constructed just late fifties, early sixties. It looks like the building pattern was a bit similar to UCLA, except there was a lot more going on at Berkeley, constructionwise, than at UCLA in the late fifties. What I am trying to say is it seems that the level of activity predated the same level of activity at UCLA. Incidentally, I found that the residence halls were designed by John

Carl Warnecke, and I think that's the name we were looking for.

FORBES: In Santa Cruz.

TRELEVEN: Santa Cruz. Warnecke.

FORBES: That is right. That is the name, I couldn't pull it out.

TRELEVEN: Well, I came up with another name, and that firm was the consulting architect, but Warnecke drew up the master plan.

FORBES: Right. At Santa Cruz.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: But a great amount of building, there were instructional facilities, and laboratories, and a new undergraduate library got under way at Berkeley. You mentioned the student center, which included an auditorium and a performing arts center. I also get the idea, though, that there was, even with all that, there was a lot of temporary classrooms, office structures, a lot of leasing going on of structures that were fairly near the campus. Does that square with your . . . ?

FORBES: Yes, it does. It does. I'm sure that

academically Berkeley, at that time, was in dire need of facilities to develop academically. They just needed space for various disciplines.

TRELEVEN: Now, early on in his administration President Kerr pressed for the president's office to be moved from the Berkeley campus to another location in the Bay Area, and there was some looking into it. At the time, and this was about the early sixties, what was your opinion of that suggestion?

FORBES: Are you talking about the statewide university administration?

TRELEVEN: Yes. Statewide administration. What we now call statewide administration.

FORBES: I can't give you the date that the statewide administration building was developed at Berkeley, but. . . . And where the regents held their meetings when in the north. It's across the street, really, from the campus itself. But there were some discussions about the location of statewide university facilities. There was a change in the president's residence from the Berkeley campus to off-campus.

TRELEVEN: And the house stood idle for a while.

[Interruption]

Okay. We are back on. You were mentioning something about the president's house.

FORBES: The president's house, yes, was moved from on campus where it had been traditionally, I think, to. . . . I can't pick the name. Is it Blake House?

TRELEVEN: Oh, you're going to catch me on that one. I'm not going to know.

FORBES: Okay. All right. But we went off campus and developed a very comfortable, nice residence for the president. I'd say that was in the sixties.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, that sounds right.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: But Kerr's office stayed on campus.

FORBES: Kerr's office was in University Hall, which is, I guess you'd call it on campus. It's across the street. It's on the west side of the street.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Yes. His office was there. And his residence was off campus.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I was going to ask . . .

FORBES: And the legal counsel, Cunningham, and the treasurer's office, and secretary's office were

all in that university building. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think the argument that Kerr made at the time was that were systemwide to vacate, that it would make available space that was badly needed for the Berkeley campus.

FORBES: For the campus.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: And . . .

FORBES: But that was, as I recall, that wasn't advocated at that time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I know it had come up. I was going to ask, and I don't want to get ahead of the story, but with 20/20 hindsight in 1990, might it have been better if Kerr's office had been somewhat removed from the Berkeley campus?

FORBES: Yes. Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: We'll get back to that. In addition to the laboratories and teaching facilities and so on at Berkeley, there are also several facilities that are heavily supported by the federal government, one of which is on the campus and supported, specifically supported by the AEC [Atomic Energy Commission], or what we knew as the AEC. The

Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, and then the Livermore lab.

FORBES: Well, now just to make sure that it's clear that Livermore is east of the campus.

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

FORBES: Forty-five minutes, or maybe forty-five miles east of Oakland.

TRELEVEN: Right. So you have Lawrence Berkeley on campus, Lawrence Livermore outside of town, and then farther away, of course, Los Alamos, which is administratively attached to UCLA.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: At least that's the way it. . . . When you became . . .

FORBES: Now, that is new to me, that Los Alamos is attached administratively to UCLA.

TRELEVEN: For certain kinds of paperwork. It's like Mount Hamilton being somewhat attached to Santa Cruz.

FORBES: Well, it is geographically.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And at the time this was set up, Los Alamos was closer to UCLA than any other campus. Is that right?

FORBES: Well, it depends on when it was set up.

TRELEVEN: Oh, god, this was years ago.

FORBES: Well, how many years ago? We have Irvine. And Irvine . . .

TRELEVEN: No, no, way back in the forties.

FORBES: Oh.

TRELEVEN: I think I'm talking about . . .

FORBES: Well, as far as the laboratories are concerned, Los Alamos and Livermore were not really considered a part of any campus. These are special operations.

TRELEVEN: No, I understand that.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And they are not what we call traditional research education service facilities.

FORBES: Institutions.

TRELEVEN: Like most other departments.

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: When you first joined the regents, how did you become acquainted with these facilities?

FORBES: By being invited to visit them, and to have rather thorough inspections of them, and have meetings there. So that the regents who really nominally negotiate contracts with Washington [D.C.] for the operation of the laboratories would know about the facilities.



TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: By intense visits to those areas.

TRELEVEN: Then, in order to visit, did you have to be subjected to security clearances and that sort of thing?

FORBES: Oh, yes. One of the first things that I had to seek was what was known as a "Q clearance." A "Q clearance" is necessary to visit these laboratories and certain parts of, I guess, the Lawrence Laboratories at Berkeley. This means that I was. . . . I filled out a voluminous document and then was checked both by the navy and by--whether the FBI [Federal Bureau of Investigation], or whoever it was--it was governmental Washington, and then I obtained a "Q clearance." Then after the first two years I was off the board for eight months, as you know, and I came back and I had to go through that process again.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: They were very careful.

TRELEVEN: Really?

FORBES: To get a "Q clearance."

TRELEVEN: Make sure you hadn't been a bad boy during those

eight months.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Well, that's the rules, that's the rules.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] In addition to visiting, then, did you witness any of the testing that took place in New Mexico or out in the Pacific?

FORBES: Almost. Almost.

TRELEVEN: Almost.

FORBES: Some of us. . . . We were all invited, but some of us went to Maui and went up on top of the mountain to witness the explosion at Johnston Island, which is, I think, 700 miles west in the Pacific from Honolulu. Or from Maui where we were. And we were up ten thousand feet. It was scheduled to pop at a certain time, and we were up there in a huddle, maybe sixty or seventy people. And some witnesses from really around the world. It got down to a countdown of thirty seconds, and then they counted by the second. And we got down to 29, 28, 27, and we got down to about 22, and the voice said, "Negative. Negative. Negative." And another voice close by said, "Keep on recording, this may be a

mistake. So keep on recording." And they kept on recording. But there was a malfunction in the last seconds. So we did not see it happen. It was rescheduled for two weeks later, and I did not go back for that. But somewhere in my files I have a picture, a front-page picture from the Honolulu Advertiser, the newspaper there, taken at the time of the pop, which is in the middle of the night sometime, and it was as bright as daylight. So it was quite a pop. But that's as close as I got to one.

I visited another. . . . Oh, from there, from there three of us went down to Christmas Island, which is a thousand miles south of Honolulu and about three degrees from the equator, where they had had some nuclear explosions. But we did not witness anything there. We simply saw the facilities that were there for use perhaps in the future at some time. Christmas Island at that time was claimed in ownership by both United Kingdom and United States, and so we were greeted by dual heads of the island, which was rather amazing.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: But everything was all in good fun.

TRELEVEN: You say "three of us." Was it you then and two other regents?

FORBES: Yes. As I recall it was John Canaday and Bob Alshuler. I think those were the ones. Catherine [C.] Hearst was on top of the island at Maui, but for some reason she wasn't permitted to go to Christmas Island.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's interesting. Any speculation why not?

FORBES: No.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, you mentioned Canaday, and he and Ed Pauley seem to be particularly enthusiastic about these facilities.

FORBES: Which facilities?

TRELEVEN: The facilities in New Mexico and . . .

FORBES: Los Alamos and Livermore?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Well, I'd say they were. Yeah. They were intensely interested. But there were a number of other members of the board who were pretty regular in attendance.

TRELEVEN: And you were one of them.

FORBES: Yes. I don't know that I missed on any

invitation.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Let's do something hypothetical. If I were, say, an antimilitary activist in the sixties, or even the fifties, or even today, how would you respond if I asked the question, "What's the University of California doing in the nuclear arsenal business?"? And as you know, that is a question that was . . .

FORBES: Oh, I think that's rather easy to answer. At the heart of military science is research, and universities are research entities. I would say that any intelligent nation needs to use its finest facilities for safety's sake in time of military problems. So I think that it's incumbent upon an educational entity to be of that type of service to the country. [Enrico] Fermi, at Chicago; [Ernest O.] Lawrence, Berkeley; [J. Robert] Oppenheimer. These are minds that were needed when [Albert] Einstein took the formula to [President Franklin D.] Roosevelt.

TRELEVEN: Well, much of the work is top secret. And isn't there, though, a conflict between the university's being a place where there is free

and open inquiry, while there are contracts in the university for this kind of top secret work?

FORBES: I can see why you ask the question. I think in the safety of protection of a country, you need secrecy. We have Secret Service, we have the FBI, we have mechanisms for searching out and watching adversaries, on the one hand, and you have the need, academically, for freedom of inquiry. There's a line to be drawn. But some things have to be operated confidentially. And that's the way it was when scientists from various university campuses went to Los Alamos to work toward the Day of Trinity. When they were there, the families of the university personnel didn't know where they were, actually or theoretically. Their paychecks came to the residence from San Diego. Great secrecy was demanded. And despite these safeguards, the Russians were only ten days behind the actual facts of the explosion, Trinity. At that time, Russian agents were just ten days back. They were pretty close.

TRELEVEN: That's a very controversial period.

FORBES: That's right. Cat and mouse.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah. Well, I'll stop being the anti-military advocate and get back to an administrative question, and that is how, under the conditions of the contracts with the AEC-- which must be pretty darn complex--under the conditions of those contracts, how is it possible for a regent to see that policies and procedures are being carried out at facilities like that?

FORBES: Well . . .

TRELEVEN: I don't have a good understanding about the . . .

FORBES: Well, I doubt if many members of the board could talk intelligently with physicists such as a [Edwin M.] McMillan, or a Seaborg.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: On technical grounds we couldn't. We would have to be. . . . We would have to rely upon the director of the laboratory, such as a Norris Bradbury.

TRELEVEN: At Los Alamos.

FORBES: Los Alamos, for proper word, for proper procedures. You only do the best you can at getting as close as you can to get a feel of what's going on. But we were given the opportunity to have briefings in delicate areas

in rooms marked "Confidential," with scientists working at a blackboard, writing things and then erasing things, writing more and then erasing them, to try to describe to the layman what they in fact were doing scientifically. We got close to it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think I'll run out the rest of this tape.

[End Tape 9, Side A]

[Begin Tape 9, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Now, an important part of the arrangement between the regents and AEC was contract overhead.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Overhead funds that, as I understand it, were segregated by the regents into I think it was called a Nuclear Science Fund.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: So the proper title of that fund would be like a reserve fund or a contingency fund? Or a . . . ?

FORBES: Well, I don't think it was so much a contingency fund as it was a fund that would represent financially the service of the university in relation to the laboratories' operations. Legally, in various aspects, where the university



served the federal government by means of operating the laboratories. I don't know if I've made that clear, but there were certain services by the secretary's office, the treasurer's office, and the general counsel, useful to the laboratories. And it was this service and watchdog relationship in which we participated.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: I don't think it was a contingency fund, I think it was earnings.

TRELEVEN: Earnings for services rendered.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And maybe a simple example--I guess this would be true--would be issuing paychecks. Something like that?

FORBES: I don't know, but maybe.

TRELEVEN: I'm just. . . . What do you . . . ? But, anyway, there was this fund, and what do you recall about the ways in which that fund was used by the regents?

FORBES: I don't think I could be specific on that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: There might have been something that the president would recommend to the board that such

and such be done with funds from that--with monies from that fund. But I can't be more specific.

TRELEVEN: Well, I have an impression, which gets us back to grounds and buildings, that often the regents would agree to allow loans from that fund to purchase property, to assist in the construction of a structure. It wasn't like it was a direct subsidy, but it was like a loan: well, we are going to. . . . It was kind of a bookkeeping kind of thing, I suppose, in a way, but instead of being an outright dipping into and extracting it forever, it would be like a loan that a campus would have to pay back over a period of time.

FORBES: I don't know about . . .

TRELEVEN: You don't recall that?

FORBES: Not the use of the word "loan," no.

TRELEVEN: Well, you are going to catch me on a technicality, here, because that may not be the right word. But to put it. . . . It looked like it was a fund that the regents could turn to if there was something that needed to be built or purchased, and money was not immediately

available, say, from other sources.

FORBES: All right.

TRELEVEN: Private sources. Or state.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Not ringing much of a bell, though.

FORBES: No. No, but I can see where funds might be used temporarily and then repaid to a certain fund on monies coming in from some other source. Yeah, I can see it. But I can't be specific about it.

TRELEVEN: Well--and I'm leading up to this, and you will see how this ties in--once in a while legislative budget analysts and directors of finance, in reviewing the university's budget, they'd argue that greater proportions of grant overhead and a proportion of the contract overhead that the university would get, including Nuclear Science Fund, should go into the coffers of the state of California.

FORBES: If you are asking that in the form of a question, I'd refer it to the legal counsel, see what he would say. I can't be helpful on that. The university had representatives in Sacramento who worked with the legislative analysts and worked with various people there in state government.

But I can't be helpful there.

TRELEVEN: Well, what's going on, I think, at that time, is that some executive office people and some legislative office people would get a budget request from the university, and they'd know a fund like that existed, and then scratch their heads and say, "Well, they don't need all this money, they've got these funds over here." That's oversimplified, but I think that's what was going on. But you don't recall that coming up?

FORBES: No. No, I would think that those matters would have been handled with operations people such as Elmo Morgan in construction.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Jim Corley, our representative in Sacramento.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But I didn't get into that.

TRELEVEN: Well, I don't want to ask you a hypothetical question, but maybe I'll try it anyway. There were times when the regents really did get stuck on the budgetary thing with Sacramento. And, naturally, the president of the university plays a key role at that point. But were there regents

who were likely to have, say, gone to Sacramento and discussed this with a [Pat] Brown, with a Reagan, with a Hale Champion?

FORBES: Sure. Sure. We got into a situation once--I thought maybe we had touched on this before, but maybe we hadn't--we got into a situation in the time of Pat Brown and Hale Champion where Hale Champion, as the director of finance . . .

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: . . . had one approach to some funding. And Clark Kerr, as president of the university, had another approach. They had tried to get together on it and didn't resolve it. And the governor said, "Look, some of you regents come up to Sacramento, and I'll get Hale Champion and some of his people and we will talk it out." Very agreeable to President Kerr and the chairman of the board. I don't know whether it was the members of the finance committee, or whether any regent was invited, but I do know that I went and was probably one of six members of the board who met at the governor's mansion. We had a dinner and a talk. It was not acrimonious. It was very levelly handled. And the matter was resolved.

Now, that's one particular instance that I can tell you about. And that occasion Pat Brown took me and showed me up to the top of the old governor's mansion.

TRELEVEN: Oh, yeah. You did mention that before.

FORBES: Six stories up. We were finally up there, just the two of us, in this little cupola of some kind. But it's up, and that's the sixth floor. But it was a good session and a successful one. Things worked out.

TRELEVEN: I really wonder whether that occasion had to do with this whole grant/contract overhead thing, because that seemed to come up as a sticky point now and then, and I think . . .

FORBES: I don't know.

TRELEVEN: I'm certain it came up once when Champion was director of . . .

FORBES: Hale Champion was a very good man. He was very good. And . . .

TRELEVEN: Good man to work with?

FORBES: Uh-huh. [Affirmative] And very intelligent.

TRELEVEN: A straight shooter?

FORBES: Huh?

TRELEVEN: A straight shooter?

FORBES:     Yep.  As far as I know.

TRELEVEN:   Well, his name popped into the news again during the [Governor Michael S.] Dukakis [1988 presidential] campaign.

FORBES:     I heard his name mentioned in relation, I think, to someplace in the state of Michigan recently.

TRELEVEN:   That I missed.  Well, we've strayed a bit.  We talked about. . . . We got into Nuclear Science Fund because of Los Alamos and Lawrence and AEC.  But do you have any further thoughts or comments about those facilities and their relationship with the university?

FORBES:     No.  Except to say that the University of California's participation with Los Alamos and the development of nuclear energy is an exciting part of university history and one that we should be very proud of.  I think that whoever selected the site at Los Alamos should be congratulated.  It's in a wonderful geographical setting.  I think the laboratory has been of great service.  Great service.  Last time I was down there, there was talk about various experimental work going on.  Seventy percent was not for military function at all but for peacetime use of nuclear

energy. That's worthwhile. And Livermore developed, as you may know, because they didn't want Los Alamos to get any bigger. It was big enough, and we just needed another nuclear campus, so to speak.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And because of its proximity to Berkeley, it was located in Livermore.

TRELEVEN: Well, you mentioned peaceful uses of nuclear energy. It's like you read my research notes before we started today, and of course, you haven't. But I was going to use that as a device to get into health sciences, because one area, of course, is university nuclear science/medical science facilities that relate to radiation and the [Stafford Leak] Warren [Hall] structure over at UCLA, and so on. So with that little transition device I wanted to get into medical education. Here is an area in which the regents and state taxpayers have made really an enormous investment. Education not only in medicine, but also related basic sciences. I guess what existed when you joined the board was a facility at San Francisco, which . . .



FORBES: You mean the medical center?

TRELEVEN: Which became the San Francisco Medical Center.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Here at Los Angeles, we had a health sciences unit number 1. Number 2, was that a building yet, or not? And then the Warren nuclear medicine facility. Now, overall in the early sixties, in this whole area of medicine and health sciences, what was needed and why was it needed?

FORBES: Well, what was needed were both facilities and manpower, the scientists, to keep abreast or forge ahead, let's say, in medical science with things that were developing, being learned about, being discovered. And as you discover new ways to use new knowledge, you need facilities and people to grow. Whether it is San Francisco, or whether it's Los Angeles, UCLA, or whether it's Stanford [University], or [University of] Chicago, as science develops and more things are learned, you need more people to be the pioneers and learn new ways of doing things. Those are the. . . . It ends up in facilities.

TRELEVEN: That's not very understandable to a layperson.

FORBES: No, I don't think it is.

TRELEVEN: What's more understandable to a layperson is, "My town don't have a doctor." Or, "We've got x-thousands of people and we've only got one or two doctors." I take it that that was another rather strong force that was going on at that time?

FORBES: Well, I could quickly say yes, but if I took a little more time and stated it. . . . At the time Franklin Murphy came to UCLA, the situation in rural America was such that there was great need for medical practitioners.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

FORBES: One must recall that Franklin Murphy was dean of KU's [University of Kansas] School of Medicine before he became chancellor at Lawrence, Kansas.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: My recollection is that he--I could be wrong--but I think he was instrumental in fostering more general practitioners in more rural areas of Kansas.

TRELEVEN: I think that's right.

FORBES: And I think that. . . . I can't be, now, specific as to what we did in that, but I don't think we overlooked it.

TRELEVEN: Well, the plan, I think, was that the regents had approved a medical education expansion plan in 1960, and I think that was at least the first blueprint. There were several other plans that came later for the planning of facilities through the next several decades. But I get the sense that there is just a sense of urgent need: that we have got to build medical facilities, we have got to build health facilities, and we have to do this on our existing campuses, and we have to do it at the new campuses, most of them at least. In hindsight that's how I read it, that there is this very urgent concern about medical education and education in the related basic sciences. Did it seem that urgent at the time? Am I misreading it? [Laughter]

FORBES: I think I'll approach that a little on the tangent. The San Francisco Medical School campus and medicine at UCLA speak for themselves. As far as medical facilities in San Diego, in Davis, and at Irvine, there is another part of the jigsaw puzzle. There were county hospitals involved.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now, you are talking about the necessary--

I think the right phrase is--clinical facilities for. . . . Affiliated clinical facilities.

FORBES: Well . . .

TRELEVEN: I think. . . . But, go ahead.

FORBES: This we will want to handle deftly. But it should be said that the county hospitals, San Diego, Davis. . . . Irvine wasn't at Irvine, but it was at Long Beach.

TRELEVEN: Orange County.

FORBES: Orange County.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. It was Orange County there, and at Davis it was Sacramento County.

FORBES: Okay. All right.

TRELEVEN: Those are the boards of supervisors you had to deal with. [Laughter]

FORBES: That's right. Well, we had some situations where those operations--this is my impression--were not doing well financially, operationally. They were troubled. Trouble for the supervisors. Costly. They wanted the university to take them over. And we looked at them and we had some doubts. Then some of the county supervisors said, "Well, we've talked to the state college system. If you don't want it, we'll talk to Sacramento and the

legislature and maybe they should take them and, thus, give advance degrees. And they get into higher education in medicine."

TRELEVEN: Like Sacramento state college [California State University, Sacramento].

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: [California State University] Fullerton, and so on.

FORBES: And we didn't want that. That was the university province.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's part of Article IX [of the California State Constitution], right?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Okay. So those three facilities, as far as their affiliation with the university and our development of those medical facilities, kind of came in the side door.

TRELEVEN: Well, at the same time, my sense is that these are kind of necessary in terms of starting up a medical school, because you have to have clinical facilities.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: In other words, the aspiring young doctors have

got to have bodies and minds to look at.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And where are the bodies and minds?

FORBES: Okay. So medical education at those three campuses came about or were accelerated because of the problems involved with these hospitals, with these county hospitals. I don't want to get this askew with some other interviews that you have with Franklin Murphy, for example. He could, being a medical man, and being what he is, his impression might be different than mine. But this is my impression.

TRELEVEN: What was your sense of the level of commitment that the several governors had to developing health sciences facilities and getting positions out amongst the people? Training physicians.

FORBES: Are we talking now about getting doctors to practice in Lancaster and Palmdale when they were little . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Practice anywhere.

FORBES: I don't recall that any. . . . I can't be specific on any governor's attitude on that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, again, my impression is that the legislature was quite generous when it came to

funding areas in the health sciences. [United States] Public Health Service [PHS], National Institutes of Health [NIH], and even private donors. There seemed to be a lot of money that various entities had available for medical and health sciences.

FORBES: For health sciences? Yes.

TRELEVEN: At that time.

FORBES: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: So the situation. . . . Well, I can't say that. I'm still fishing for an answer. Why this enormous pressure, what I see as--again I use the word urgency, and I am looking at it from a distance--urgency, great amount of attention given by the regents to the development of the basic science and medical science facilities all through the sixties and on beyond that.

FORBES: Well, there has been great need for the improvement of medical facilities for the last thirty years and more. Even before that. I forget the date that Stafford Warren and Phil Davis got a medical school at UCLA, and that's way back.

TRELEVEN: Legislation session of either '47 or '46, right

in there. A struggle.

FORBES: Yeah. Right.

TRELEVEN: In Sacramento.

FORBES: But then it just, since then, it's so apparent now, in health sciences, whether it's Medicare or whatever we have, we're up over our heads in need for facilities to respond to the problems of society medically. Costs have risen exponentially, and we were forced, in a way, the university was forced in a way to move ahead in these three campuses, San Diego, Irvine, Davis, because of regional situations. We were pressured in a sense to do something.

TRELEVEN: By?

FORBES: By Sacramento. In a sense, it was a threat to the university. Did we want to do it or did we want to have someone else do it?

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: These hospitals weren't performing satisfactorily. And I think it's a very good thing that we moved ahead. Because I think they are a whole lot better now than they would have been.

TRELEVEN: The cost just seemed to keep increasing, though.



FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: For the University of California. It's like the deeper you get, it seems like it's a bottomless pit, that you just keep dumping money into medical facilities, and there's never quite enough. The next plan comes out, and the numbers are just astronomical.

FORBES: You talk about numbers, and my recollection is very clear at having special committees to work on this administration of these medical resources. People coming to the board saying, "Look, from a standpoint of money, we are performing these services and we have \$55 million in receivables."

TRELEVEN: I picked up on that. It became a hell of a problem.

FORBES: That's right. And we don't get this money. And I spoke up. I said, "Look, who are we doing this for?" "For people." And there was a little bit vagueness. "Let's talk to Sacramento about this. We are performing a service for the people of California. At least we need to be reimbursed, and we need the money that we have as receivables sitting there." I think before I got

off the board, there had been a method worked out where we were advanced some money against the receivables that we had coming to us. But we were in a fix financially because of what we were doing. It wasn't proper.

TRELEVEN: Well, according to my notes, you were looking at hospital accounts receivable of about \$50 million by mid-'75. An enormous amount.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: So when you get into this area of medical and health sciences, you are not only performing a service, you are really running a business.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And no business can thrive if it's running those kind . . .

FORBES: That's right. There were some individual cases and there were third-party people involved with insurance and various problems on these receivables. But it was very clear that we had performed services, some for the indigent, some people who couldn't pay, but it was a service--the county hospital!--on our books. And we need the money so that we can operate intelligently. Problems.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah. We could probably spend hours discussing it . . .

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: . . . because I know it had to do with Medicare and it had to do with indigent patients.

FORBES: Correct. Correct.

TRELEVEN: All kinds of. . . . And some of this was in the context of Sacramento County, and the county doesn't want to pay so much.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And, "Well, shouldn't the state pay some?"

FORBES: Sure.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. In fact, Fred Dutton, in '72, I think he said something, and this is a paraphrase of the kind of frustration that seems to have existed. He said, "More costs should be shifted from UC to the state. UC is spending too much on medical education and shortchanging other needed university programs." Something you'd agree with?

FORBES: I'd agree with that partially. I'd agree that we needed to find an answer. I believe Dutton's comments were responded to by someone setting up a fund, a working fund to give the university

money that it wasn't getting from the receivables. I think that there was an advance forthcoming from the state. I can't be sure of that, but I think you'd find that.

TRELEVEN: So in all of this, what you are saying then is that there was--and tell me if I am wrong--there was some method of continuing discussion with the state by the university about picking up more of the costs.

FORBES: I'd say it was continuing, yes.

TRELEVEN: Because you, the university, are providing a service and you are going broke. Well, not quite, but figuratively speaking.

FORBES: Yes. We needed relief.

TRELEVEN: Just to look at the San Francisco. . . . You have about a hundred acres to work with in San Francisco.

FORBES: Not many. Pretty tough.

TRELEVEN: So, like at UCLA, there is about one way you can build, and that's up.

FORBES: Up.

TRELEVEN: It was in the context of San Francisco expansion-- I think this was the end of '63--and the context is there was pressure to increase the number of

medical students there from 103 to 145, assuming more legislative support. The state senate failed to provide the funds, and Governor Brown came to the regents' meeting and said that the legislature felt that not enough MDs were being trained for the money expended.

FORBES: Which Governor Brown?

TRELEVEN: Pat. He was simply relaying to the regents the sentiment of the senators at that time.

FORBES: So what did we do?

TRELEVEN: Well, did you get that kind of carping from the legislature frequently? In regard to medical education? That it's costing so much, and, "Where are these doctors you are training? They are not getting out here to our constituents where they are needed." That kind of thing.

FORBES: I'd generally say yes to that, although I'm not . . . . I don't recall specific hammering by the legislature. We may have some, as reported by the president. And I'm sure that there was frustration on the part of many because of the costs involved for medical education. The facilities are demanding and costly. It takes a long time to get someone through medical school

and out performing for the public.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Which would be clear to anybody looking at the regents' minutes.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And just looking at the. . . . Or the medical plan.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: You start small, you bring so many students on line, and then you increase it and hope to get up to, oh, I think 128 was the figure. The legislature also passed a bill<sup>1</sup> requiring that the California College of Medicine affiliate with UC. And ultimately it did: Irvine. In this kind of situation, you, the regents, are responsible for medical education under Article IX.

FORBES: Section 9.

TRELEVEN: And here you have the legislature passing a specific bill that requires you to have to . . .

FORBES: Perform.

TRELEVEN: . . . affiliate with or absorb or whatever this College of Medicine, which, I guess, had some

---

1. S.B. 1414, 1963 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1933.

problems. [Laughter]

FORBES: It had some problems. It was small. I'm struggling for the last name of Bill, somebody who was involved in it. And it was amicably solved by the regents. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Were legislative directives like that kind of a pain, though? Things like that.

FORBES: Oh, yes. Enervating.

TRELEVEN: There's another instance, this one involving UCLA, where Jerry Lewis and the Muscular Dystrophy Association of America in '74 went directly to the legislature. Directly to the legislature, to obtain funds for what is now the [Jerry Lewis] Neuromuscular Research Center.<sup>1</sup> It seems to have been an end run in a way.

FORBES: I draw a blank on that. I can't comment. He may have run directly to the legislature. The facts speak for themselves. But to my recollection, that was worked out on a local level, probably by Chancellor Young.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, it worked out, and it has worked out quite

---

1. A.B. 139, 1973-1974 Reg. Sess., Cal Stat., ch. 1183 (1973).

well. My reason for raising it is, here again, this is the regents' responsibility to decide the priorities, set the policy, and establish the priorities for medical education and health sciences. Yet, here again, the legislature passes what might be called a piece of special interest legislation.

FORBES: Well, one has to continue to bear in mind that Article IX, Section 9 is very specific and it lays out broad responsibilities of the university. The university was just a tiny entity in 1868 when it started. The Mechanics Institute in San Francisco was on the books before the university.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Through the long number of years, the state and society has become more and more complicated. And there are more and more people to nibble at the basic responsibilities and the thrust of the university. We are bound to have crosscurrents and challenges and people nipping at the edges.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And when that happens it doesn't make the regents' job any easier . . .

FORBES: That's right. More complex.



TRELEVEN: But it's something you have to live with.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: But it's interesting that the real trump card that various people seem to like to play is that if you, the regents, don't do this, we are going to give it to somebody else.

FORBES: Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: Interesting.

FORBES: And you have to weigh those threats. That's why early on the term of the regents was set: sixteen years. Now it's been cut to twelve. But it gives people a long time in office. And if you. . . . You develop experience, not with one governor, not with one set of legislatures, but with a long stream. I served through three governors, and they come and go, but the regental system goes on. There are always people who have had a number of years of responsibility and therefore experiences how to deal with threats.

TRELEVEN: Stability.

FORBES: Stability.

TRELEVEN: I think we are almost at the end of this tape.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: So why don't we pause for a minute.

FORBES: Fine.

[End Tape 9, Side B]

[Begin Tape 10, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, I just wanted to mention one more legislative intervention. The Song-Brown Family Physician Training Act.<sup>1</sup> Again, and I recognize this kind of activity from having been in Wisconsin where the same thing happened. Where a great amount of support began to develop for training what we call the old family doctor. But training them in a three-year residency program instead of just a one-year internship in a hospital before practicing, and something that . . . . But, again, that's another legislative act, it seems to me, that impinges a little bit on, say, what I could call regent-led. . . . On a regent-led plan for physician training. But you've explained to me already the push and pull that takes place. Of course, the further context is we need to train doctors who know a little bit about a lot of things about the body rather than

---

1. S.B. 1224, 1973-1974 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1176 (1973).

. . .

FORBES: A generalist?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. A generalist rather than a specialist who may know something about your big toe but not about your nose.

FORBES: Yeah. Right.

TRELEVEN: Or something like that. We mentioned these county hospitals. At San Diego, in addition, ultimately, I guess some agreement was worked out with the Veterans Administration. Do you recall that?

FORBES: I can't be specific on that. I'll just say yes.

TRELEVEN: About the mid-sixties. Of course, UCLA had that tie already with the VA.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: Again, it has to do with whether there are enough people to provide budding physicians with sufficient experience. The Orange County. . . . Sacramento County strikes me as being probably the most problematic. Right in the backyard of the state capital.

FORBES: Yeah. There were a lot of problems there.

TRELEVEN: If I understand the situation correctly, the situation got so serious that it jeopardized the

entire beginning of the Davis medical school.

FORBES: Well, I would say yes to that. Yes, those things were happening at the same time. And, yeah, one would impinge on the other. It was a very testy time.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Just maybe one more general question. You are spending these huge amounts of money on health sciences and medical education. How does a university measure the costs and the benefits that come from that kind of expenditure?

FORBES: I think this is difficult to do and you rely on the best minds you have available to advise you.

TRELEVEN: So if the costs seem to be endlessly escalating, you always. . . . There is nothing more to do except rely on these minds.

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

TRELEVEN: And assume that these are costs. Even though they are escalating we are going to have to absorb them.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Dutton, as I indicated, raised the question I think that--or raised the issue that I think had to do with the balance between medical education and other programs of the university. What's

your opinion of how well the university maintained that balance?

FORBES: My impression is that the university maintained it quite well. The university has advocates from all disciplines. No one is reticent about coming forward with his or her thoughts on what is best, and they are properly evaluated. Yeah, I think the university did and does a good job.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I'm going to shift gears. In looking through the Centennial Record again recently, I was struck by the fact that we could spend probably two years if we wanted to discuss every department, institute, program, and center of the University of California. It's an enormous operation, and we have to hope that researchers of the future will forgive us if we have slighted . . .

FORBES: Something.

TRELEVEN: . . . a favorite entity of that researcher's. At the same time I really do want to turn to the Education Abroad Program, because I've gotten a sense that this is a program that you were very warm towards, you were very involved with. I think we definitely need to include that

innovative program in this record. I guess to begin with, how did you become involved in Education Abroad?

FORBES: I don't know the genesis.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: I really don't know. But it struck me as something that other universities had participated in for a long time and something that we should get into. Fortunately we had some people who were interested in it, in developing a program. We had a wonderful pied piper, so to speak, in [William H.] Bill Allaway, who became the director of the program. We had a chancellor, Vern Cheadle, who was extremely interested in it. I believe he requested that his campus be the bell cow in operations. So the Education Abroad Program had its base in the Santa Barbara campus, although it was involved with all campuses of the university. Now, you can ask me specific questions, but I can tell you that we started out at Bordeaux. And . . .

TRELEVEN: My notes say that began in '62. Does that . . . ?

FORBES: About right.

TRELEVEN: Seems about right?

FORBES: Yes. That could be confirmed, of course, by checking the . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, the Centennial Record.

FORBES: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, [Laughter] theoretically the Centennial Record.

FORBES: Yep.

TRELEVEN: But anyway . . .

FORBES: But pretty early on it was decided that there would be some people travel to Bordeaux to look over the facilities, discuss the possible affiliation--or the relationship rather than an affiliation--between the university and Bordeaux, and meet the rector, Jean Babin, I believe. So I was part of that delegation.

TRELEVEN: A university delegation?

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: You and other regents? Or . . . ?

FORBES: Yes. Oh, yes. There were others. There were others. Tom Cunningham was legal counsel, he was along. But as I recall it would be Cheadle, Heller, and Tom Cunningham as general counsel. Maybe one or two others.

TRELEVEN: And this was . . .

FORBES: I wanted to. . . . You were going to ask was this before the first class went there or not.

TRELEVEN: No. You missed that time. I may have forgotten my question, though. Oh! The delegation. You were there to attempt to formalize a relationship between . . .

FORBES: Yes. To see if one could be worked out that made sense academically and financially.

TRELEVEN: And that's a large part of the reason why Cunningham went with you.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Yes. Yes. And we had. . . . The university had to determine if a year's study at Bordeaux would be essentially equivalent to a year on a student's present campus.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: Or whether you'd lose out academically. So we did. . . . Some of us went to Bordeaux, along with President Kerr, to get acquainted with them, for them to get acquainted with us, for us to see their campus, even some of their classrooms. It was interesting to walk into a classroom in physics and look up on the wall and see the



elements listed and to see berkelium and californium as elements there. It was rather exciting to see that. But we spent several days there, and then went to Padua in Italy. Padua. To meet with Rector Ferro and have him show us this room that had a little platform over there in the corner, and he took Tom Cunningham and me over and he said, "This was Galileo's study." Then we remembered that Galileo was a professor of mathematics in Padua in 1588, and it would be something to make your hair rise just a little.

TRELEVEN: Wow! I'll say. Make you tingle.

FORBES: But it was experiences such as these that illustrated the importance of having the university reach out internationally and give its students an opportunity to study abroad.

TRELEVEN: Now, is this the same trip that you also went to Georg-August-Universität in . . ?

FORBES: Which one?

TRELEVEN: Georg . . ?

FORBES: In Germany?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Göttingen?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

- FORBES: Yes. I guess we went to Göttingen on that same trip. Went to Göttingen and Erlangen in Germany. Both of them.
- TRELEVEN: Now, let me get this straight. You are going to all of these places with the intent at that time of seeing if arrangements could be made?
- FORBES: Yes.
- TRELEVEN: So no students had actually begun to go.
- FORBES: It was the year before. . . . As I recall it was the year before the first students went to Bordeaux.
- TRELEVEN: Okay.
- FORBES: That was our first year.
- TRELEVEN: Okay. And . . .
- FORBES: But we visited a number of universities so that then Bill Allaway, the director, could follow up and visit them again and hammer out the specific negotiations, financial problems: what will it cost our students to live there? Any academic charges. The arrangements so that we could proceed on an equitable basis.
- TRELEVEN: And having done that, then what? Report back to the full board?
- FORBES: We reported back to the board and got approval

from the board to start it. It was started and it has a been a great--quite a success ever since.

TRELEVEN: Right. Did you do follow-up kinds of things? In other words, as it got started, students would go for the year, did you talk to those students about their experience?

FORBES: Yes. I not only did that but I think it was in the second year. . . . No, it was a little farther along than that. I had a daughter who is a graduate from Berkeley, but she spent two years at Santa Barbara and then another two years at Berkeley. And she attended a year at Bordeaux in the program. So I. . . . And that could have been one of the reasons for my interest in it, because I had an offspring of university age and I saw what a wonderful opportunity it would be.

TRELEVEN: So she had a very positive experience.

FORBES: She had a positive experience. After her graduation she went back to France as a teacher in Rennes and spent another year in Rennes. That year I can be specific about because that was 1968, because we then--three of us, her mother and I and a friend--met her in Leningrad. Then

the four of us spent some time in Russia and Czechoslovakia. We came through Prague. Stayed there forty days before the Russians moved in and ousted [Alexander] Dubcek.

TRELEVEN: Really! Really.

FORBES: So that is a specific 1968 date. That's digressing from the Education Abroad Program, but it just shows you how small the world really is.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's . . .

FORBES: We, later, some of us, including Ellie Heller, visited the American University in Tokyo and the university in Kyoto. This was on another trip.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Actually I was going to get onto that: the other overseas activities of yours. But before we get onto that, is there anything more that you'd like to say about the Education Abroad Program?

FORBES: Generally?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Well, I think I've already indicated a very positive stance on it. And Allaway, who just retired this last year as director. And Mrs. Forbes and I went up to Santa Barbara for the ceremonies in which he was demoted, let's say,

with great regret. But in all these years, through the sixties, seventies, eighties, and now into the nineties, this program has flourished and is an important part of the university now.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: It just started in the sixties with one little campus. One nice campus in Bordeaux.

TRELEVEN: Right. And I think we should add that it extended outside Europe, eventually, as well.

FORBES: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: Into many other . . .

FORBES: I think Latin American . . .

TRELEVEN: Africa.

FORBES: . . . and the Orient.

TRELEVEN: Africa?

FORBES: Africa.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I think so.

FORBES: Yes. I think. . . . Yes, I think Johannesburg.

TRELEVEN: Well, you also did some venturing in and across the Pacific, I guess, is the way I might say it. You already talked about Maui and Johnston Island. But I know on a little listing you gave me, you had also listed some other things. First, American University in Tokyo. Now, what

was that all about?

FORBES: Well, in 1964 the Chinese University of Hong Kong was founded. There was a University of Hong Kong that dates back a long way, and it is and was for the British. But the Chinese did not attend. The Chinese got their higher education through a number of colleges. They were poor and struggling and some survived and others didn't. There were, through the years, about fifteen of them. But in 1964 the surviving three, Imperial, Chung Chi College, and one other, combined to form the Chinese University of Hong Kong, to be located, and it was located, on the campus of one of these colleges, Chung Chi, out in what was known as the New Territories. And . . .

TRELEVEN: On the island itself.

FORBES: On the island. Toward the bamboo curtain.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Outside of the crown colony itself that was on lease and under British dominion. The New Territories was not out there. Now, historically, of course, we know that the British have given up that, given up their hold on Hong Kong . . .

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: . . . in '97. But back there it was thirty-three years before the lease of the New Territories was to be negotiated--was to run out and may be subject to negotiations. But I'm a little ahead of myself. The university was established with the total cooperation of the director of the crown colony, with whom we met, and who was the first chancellor of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. The operating head of the Chinese University of Hong Kong is the vice chancellor. At Berkeley, a professor of economics, Cho Ming Li, was invited to go back to Hong Kong, to go back to China--he had been born, I think, in China--as the first vice chancellor. He, in turn, invited President Kerr and members of the board to come out for the ceremonies to mark the opening of this. As I recall, two members of the board, Ellie Heller and I, accepted the invitation and went with President Kerr and Vern Cheadle, who was involved with University Abroad Program, and our wives to these ceremonies. But en route, we went to Japan and visited the American University there in Tokyo for a possible

relationship of our Education Abroad Program.

TRELEVEN: Ah! I see.

FORBES: And we went to Kyoto and visited with university personnel there concerning that university. Problems of language in Japan was that the American University operating there did have English as the language that was used in the university, and that made it easier to get started. But this was all part of the gradual development of the Education Abroad Program. And also, to recognize a new university starting up in Hong Kong, because of the particular relationship with a Berkeley professor, Cho Ming Li.

TRELEVEN: I see.

FORBES: It was a very interesting experience. I might add that we came back in the fall of '64, at the exact time of the explosion, Mario Savio, and the Free Speech Movement.

TRELEVEN: So you came back about September 30th.

FORBES: September '64.

TRELEVEN: About September 29th or 30th. I've done some homework since the last time we met.

FORBES: Yes, you have. Yes, you have.



TRELEVEN: And . . .

FORBES: And from very quiet into the fire.

TRELEVEN: Any other travels as a regent? Say, Mexico? Or Chile? I think the university established a relationship there.

FORBES: No. Nothing in Mexico for the university, nor to Latin America. We did go, I think I mentioned earlier, on a study of housing.

TRELEVEN: Yes. We've got that.

FORBES: We went to Britain and visited there.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: But as far as Education Abroad, well, we got it started and Allaway carried on.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I don't know how long you want to go. It's fine with me. My next topic was going to be Charter Days [of the University of California]. What's your pleasure? How tired are you getting?

FORBES: Well, I'm not tired. If you'd like to go another half hour or so? Would you?

TRELEVEN: Well, I think I would.

FORBES: Well, I'm thinking of you and your traffic and . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, for future researchers we can say that at 5:00 P.M., going from Pasadena to Santa

Monica, the traffic is terrible, so let's continue.

FORBES: Okay.

TRELEVEN: I'd like to move on to Charter Days. It's another area that you listed on a sheet for me as something you wanted to talk about.

FORBES: Well, they were significant to me in looking back.

TRELEVEN: Right. We can easily find the meaning of Charter Day by looking in the Centennial Record, 1868, the founding of the University of California. But what's the background of Charter Day at UCLA? Not Berkeley, but UCLA.

FORBES: The background of Charter Day at UCLA--now this is my quick reaction to that--is that UCLA is a part of the university system, and when the university celebrates Charter Day, whether it be Riverside or UCLA or Berkeley, it's Charter Day. Now, there may be an additional Charter Day surrounding the origin of UCLA and the campus in Westwood or [North] Vermont Avenue. But that's something else. But Charter Day is Charter Day.

TRELEVEN: Okay. At UCLA in the period we are going to talk about, '59-'64, the Alumni Association. . . . Is

it correct? The Alumni Association arranged Charter Days? Do you recall?

FORBES: I don't think that would be accurate. The Alumni Association was extremely active as an integral part of it, but I think that the Charter Day would be arranged by the university rather than the Alumni Association. Now, it happened that the president of the Alumni Association, being an ex officio member of the board of regents, pulls the regents into it a bit.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: We participated in it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So the impetus does not come, say, from the UCLA chancellor, it comes from . . .

FORBES: Charter Day comes statewide. It's the university.

TRELEVEN: Oh, okay. And I. . . . Charter Day is at Berkeley.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: And at this time also Charter Day is at UCLA. Now, how . . . ?

FORBES: Yeah. That reminds me that for a while there we were celebrating Charter Day at the different campuses.

TRELEVEN: Right.

FORBES: And it got to be a heavy burden on the president and a whole lot of people. I think it was through the years simplified.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, it costs money, too.

FORBES: That's right, yeah.

TRELEVEN: How did the process work in terms of who would be selected to be honored at a UCLA Charter Day?

FORBES: Well, you mean with honorary degrees, etc.?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, and . . .

FORBES: Well, that was arranged statewide.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So if Charles [H.] Malik was to be honored at UCLA Charter Day, 1959 . . .

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . who would make the decision that Malik would be honored?

FORBES: He would be invited. . . . I believe this, now . . . . I think he would be invited by the president of the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: It could be jointly with the president and the chancellor. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: But I'm pretty sure it would stem I think from

the president, but I better not be positive on that.

TRELEVEN: And it takes regents' approval. Or is this decided at the president's office?

FORBES: I think that the president might well have, in a February meeting, for example, mentioned that we have tendered an invitation to Malik, and if all things work out, I think he will be our speaker at Charter Day in April.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: So that it doesn't come to the regents as a surprise.

TRELEVEN: All right. So, in terms of who was honored, would you say that there was not any politicking amongst the regents?

FORBES: Oh, I don't think so. No, I don't think there was any politicking.

TRELEVEN: Over specific individuals who . . .

FORBES: Oh, I don't know if you have any instance in mind. I don't think of any. When you think of the chancellor of Germany . . .

TRELEVEN: Conrad . . .

FORBES: . . . which is Conrad Adenauer, I can't imagine anything but being delighted that a person of his

stature would come and be honored and speak.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Carl Sandburg. He should not have been remotely controversial.

FORBES: Nothing would bother him with his little cigars.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

FORBES: Wonderful, wonderful person.

TRELEVEN: I always have a problems with Spanish names when they don't have accent marks, and . . .

FORBES: Pedro Beltrán?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, okay.

FORBES: Of Peru.

TRELEVEN: Prime minister of Peru. You had these names listed, and I wanted to know . . .

FORBES: Why I listed them . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah, sure.

FORBES: . . . was that in the case of Malik and Beltrán and Adenauer and [Emperor] Haile Selassie of Ethiopia. Selassie I don't think was Charter Day, but that's beside the point. But the reason. . . . Each, for three times I presided at the luncheon that followed the Charter Day activities, Conrad Adenauer would speak as he did on the campus of UCLA. Then there was a break, and then there was a luncheon. At that luncheon

Adenauer would speak, and maybe Pat Brown would say a little something and so and so. I recall it because I was in the middle of it. It was just an exciting time. You think of what's happened, now, thirty years later, to Lebanon.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: Here was an extremely respected and quiet campus in Lebanon with Malik, and the sadness that's come to that . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah. American University.

FORBES: . . . country. And Pedro Beltrán, a distinguished statesman in Peru, was given an honorary degree and spoke. But it was my good fortune to be invited to preside at the luncheon. I guess maybe the Alumni Association put on the luncheon. Maybe that was it. Maybe that's how it developed. It was all tied together in a very neat package.

TRELEVEN: Anything more you wanted to say about Sandburg above and beyond his little cigars?

FORBES: Except to say that he was a delightful, delightful person. And in the robing room, I noted that he had a tiny little cigar, about two or two and a half inches long. I said, "That's

the funniest little cigar." It was kind of a round, like a float for fishing thing. And I said that was the funniest kind of cigar I ever saw. And he said, "Well, these are made especially for me because my doctors won't let me smoke a bigger cigar than this. I can have these, but that's all I can have."

Now, another Charter Day that maybe I didn't write down was when President [Dwight D.] Eisenhower was here. That certainly should be mentioned because that was . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, let's take them by years. 'Sixty-two, the smoker of big cigars . . .

FORBES: Sandburg.

TRELEVEN: [President] John [F.] Kennedy.

FORBES: Beg your pardon.

TRELEVEN: Jack Kennedy, right? In '62?

FORBES: In '62, that was at Berkeley.

TRELEVEN: That was at Berkeley.

FORBES: Right. That was an extremely exciting day because he was the speaker at Charter Day at Berkeley. That was '62.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: The members of the board and their wives were



invited to the University House on the Berkeley campus so that we could meet President Kennedy. I had the surprise of my life, really, in meeting him. He was bigger than I thought, with surprising, attractive blue eyes. His eyes were fascinating. And he was a charmer. The women were. . . . My good wife was just overwhelmed. But a signal personality. And after the luncheon, we were taken down to Memorial Stadium. I think there were probably more people in that stadium that day than had ever been there before or since. Because the stadium itself was full, and the football field was full of people. And he did not disappoint anybody. He made a great speech. The first five or six minutes--I was sitting quite close behind him, a little to the side--he ad-libbed the first five or six minutes. And he spoke beautifully. Then he turned to his notes and gave a tremendous address, so good that I asked Clark Kerr to get a tape of it. I think I provided a tape to somebody of this.

TRELEVEN: I walked out of your house with it.

FORBES: Right.

TRELEVEN: I had forgotten about it.

FORBES: I feel proud of the fact that I suggested to the chancellor at Berkeley, [Edward W.] Ed Strong, that we have a little plaque there in the stadium at Berkeley commemorating this. I sent him a small check for that, and it's there. I've never seen it, but I had a note from President Kerr that it was done. So it would be interesting to look it up some time. But that's Charter Day '62, and it was a tremendous success.

TRELEVEN: Sounds like it was overwhelming.

FORBES: Very exciting.

TRELEVEN: 'Sixty-three, our former president and then president of Columbia University, I think, at the time, Dwight Eisenhower.

FORBES: I guess he was.

TRELEVEN: I think so.

FORBES: I guess he was. This was . . .

TRELEVEN: 'Sixty-three. And this was at UCLA.

FORBES: This was at UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: Yeah. The big recollection there is something maybe I've told you before. And it's totally personal, but so natural. And that is that as we

were putting on our academic robes and meeting one another, I looked at my watch and mentioned to Mr. Eisenhower that it was now one-thirty in the afternoon in Augusta [Georgia]. This was the first day of the golf tournament. Augusta is where he lived for quite a bit of the time.

TRELEVEN: Yes. Sure.

FORBES: This was a big event for him every year, and I'm sure he was a little disappointed that he was in California and couldn't be out there watching. And I said, "I believe that by the time we finish with this and get to the luncheon that we'd have some scores on the early finishers. Would you like them?" "Oh," he said, "that would be wonderful!" And I said, "I'll get them for you." So [Andrew J.] Andy Hamilton. . . . I don't know if you know Andy.

TRELEVEN: Sure.

FORBES: But Andy was nearby, and I waved to him and told him that the president would like that. And he said, "I'll get 'em." So at luncheon he brought them to me, Andy did, some scores. I said, "Wouldn't you like to give them to the president?" So I had Andy do that. But that was

just a nice little touch.

TRELEVEN: Sure. Let's turn this over.

[End Tape 10, Side A]

[Begin Tape 10, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we are back on the other side. So  
Eisenhower gave a speech that day.

FORBES: So he gave a speech that day, right. Yes.

TRELEVEN: We all remember him as not being a dynamic  
speaker, I guess.

FORBES: Well, it wasn't. . . . Nothing comes to mind, as  
I think back. I'm sure it was very well done.

TRELEVEN: Okay. 'Sixty-four, [President Lyndon Baines  
Johnson] LBJ and [Mexican President] Adolfo López  
Mateos, the president of Mexico. So you had two  
presidents. I should add that that same year  
Johnson dedicated the Irvine site.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: June 20, 1964.

FORBES: That's right.

TRELEVEN: What comes to your mind when . . . ?

FORBES: Let's just stop that for a minute.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: What comes to mind when you think of LBJ at  
Charter Day?

FORBES: Well, I think that. . . . Nothing particularly outstanding at Charter Day. I think my memory is focused more on Irvine, which was really the birth of that campus and something that Dan Aldrich did with tremendous success. Aldrich had worked out some kind of a wooden platform. These are the early, early days of Irvine, and there wasn't much there. But there was a reviewing stand with LBJ there meeting people. And this is totally personal, but the thing that amused me was the fact that my good wife had a special outfit for the occasion. She had. . . . It was yellow from shoes to dress to hat. She was yellow, dressed in yellow. And as she was introduced to LBJ, he leaned over and said, "Ma' favorite color." [Laughter] Indicating that he liked yellow, that he was observant, that he was a heck of a good politician. He only said, "My favorite color."

TRELEVEN: Oh, boy.

FORBES: But I don't have any great comments about Charter Day.

TRELEVEN: Well, Johnson was still on the honeymoon, presidentially, I would guess, at that time.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Were you any part of the loop in terms of the arrangements for Charter Day at UCLA in 1964?

FORBES: In 1964?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

FORBES: This was when LBJ was there?

TRELEVEN: Right. In the arrangements that developed and the logistical hassles that developed between Murphy and the president's office?

FORBES: You're giving me a signal of some kind, and I will say no, I was not involved.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You can probably be. . . . But Tom Davis never talked to you about this?

FORBES: No. No. Tom Davis talked about that? No. No. No, I don't know what you mean by that.

TRELEVEN: Well, it had to do with interplay between the Alumni Association, the chancellor's office, the president's office, the president's wife, and Ed Pauley, at least at the beginning, because Pauley had the connections . . .

FORBES: With LBJ.

TRELEVEN: . . . with LBJ.

FORBES: Yes.

TRELEVEN: The only rea. . . . I don't want to get into

detail at this moment, but Davis ended up just being absolutely furious with Kerr and apparently never forgave him.

FORBES: Nope. I was not aware of that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

FORBES: And I wouldn't know what Tom was furious about, so we can just let it pass because I don't know about that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Okay. That might be a good place to leave it for today. I'm at this point ready to get into an area called student rebellion, and that is going to take us into Free Speech Movement [FSM], Byrne Report, and so on, so it seems like kind of a logical stopping place.

FORBES: Okay. Fine.

TRELEVEN: If we get going on that we might be here another two or three hours, I suppose.

FORBES: Well, a while.

TRELEVEN: So for today, thank you very much and we'll get together next time.

FORBES: Fine.

[End Tape 10, Side B]