

California State Archives  
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

**ALLAN GRANT**

Regent, University of California, 1967-1974

April 29, 30 and May 1, 1991  
Visalia, California

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

RESTRICTIONS ON THIS INTERVIEW

None.

LITERARY RIGHTS AND QUOTATION

This manuscript is hereby made available for research purposes only. No part of the manuscript may be quoted for publication without the written permission of the California State Archivist or the 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:

Allan Grant, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1991 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	(916) 445-2832
(prior years)	

## **PREFACE**

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

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

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

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

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

Oral History Program  
History Department  
California State University, Fullerton

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

Oral History Program  
Claremont Graduate School

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

Oral History Program  
University of California, Los Angeles

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

John F. Burns  
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY . . . . . i

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY . . . . . iii

SESSION 1, April 29, 1991

[Tape 1, Side A] . . . . . 1

Family background--Religious inspiration--Early interest in agriculture--Supporting family through farming--Brief academic career--Early farming experiences--Expansion into dairy business--Meeting his wife.

[Tape 1, Side B] . . . . . 37

Service on the Tulare County School Board Association--Marketing milk to Knudsen Creamery Company--Resolving labor conflicts--Health hazards for farmworkers--Leaving the dairy business--Moving to Coarsegold and building a cattle ranch--4-H--Organizational affiliations--Heifer Project--Church activities.

[Tape 2, Side A] . . . . . 73

Service on Tulare County Farm Bureau Federation--Cooperative marketing--Appeal of the Farm Bureau's independent thinking--Distribution of wealth and farm land--Efforts to draft Grant into the California legislature--Consequences of the New Deal--California Farm Bureau Federation.

[Tape 2, Side B] . . . . . 111

More on California Farm Bureau Federation--Governor Ronald W. Reagan appoints Grant to California State Board of Agriculture--Winning the opposition over to his point of view--Eisenhower Conference on Education--Philosophy behind his positions as regent.

SESSION 2, April 30, 1991

[Tape 3, Side A] . . . . . 137

Managing the farm--The farming community--  
Working with the Reagan administration--César  
Chávez and farm activists--Service as a regent  
of the University of California--Events leading  
to dismissal of President Clark Kerr--  
Ideological shift on the board of regents.

[Tape 3, Side B] . . . . . 172

Regental committee assignments--Relations with  
individual regents--Logistics of regents'  
meetings--Reagan's doodlings--Grounds and  
Buildings Committee duties--Appraisal of Santa  
Cruz campus.

[Tape 4, Side A] . . . . . 207

Controversy over acquisition of land at the  
Irvine campus--Perceptions of University of  
California, Riverside--Impact of university  
agricultural research--Audit Committee--Special  
Research Projects Committee and national defense  
work--Realignment of board of regents.

[Tape 4, Side B] . . . . . 239

Transition from board of regents to presidency  
of American Farm Bureau Federation--Student  
demands for administrative power--Professors  
Herbert Marcuse and Angela Davis--Why policy  
makers sometimes have to become administrators.

SESSION 3, April 30, 1991

[Tape 5, Side A] . . . . . 269

University finances--Tuition--Affirmative  
action--Open versus closed sessions of the  
board of regents--Regental relations with the  
legislature--Comparing the board of regents to  
the Farm Bureau governing boards.

[Tape 5, Side B] . . . . . 299

Impressions of individual regents with whom he  
served--President David P. Gardner.

SESSION 4, May 1, 1991

[Tape 6, Side A] . . . . . 310

Regental committee assignments--Why regents  
felt compelled to assume administrative duties--  
Student unrest--Regents' meetings--Equal  
opportunity--Influence of partisan politics on  
appointments--Ideological split on the board--  
President Charles J. Hitch.

[Tape 6, Side B] . . . . . 344

Presidential leadership--Impressions of  
university chancellors--University investment  
policies--Medical education and health sciences--  
More on university finances--Reagan's proposal  
to sell rare books to raise money for the  
university--Highlights of Grant's tenure on  
board of regents.

[Tape 7, Side A] . . . . . 379

Grant's travels throughout the world--Foreign  
trade--Grant's global perspective.

## INTERVIEW HISTORY

### Interviewer:

Dale E. Treleven, Director, UCLA Oral History Program

### Interview Time and Place:

April 29, 1991

Meeting room at the First Presbyterian Church,  
Visalia, California  
Session of two and three-quarter hours

April 30, 1991 (morning)

Meeting room at the First Presbyterian Church,  
Visalia  
Session of three hours

April 30, 1991 (afternoon)

Meeting room at the First Presbyterian Church,  
Visalia  
Session of one hour

May 1, 1991

Meeting room at the First Presbyterian Church,  
Visalia  
Session of one and three-quarter 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.

Grant reviewed the edited transcript and returned it 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

Patrick Allan Grant served as an ex officio member of the University of California Board of Regents from 1967-74 while president of the California State Board of Agriculture as an appointee of Governor Ronald W. Reagan. Grant's eight-year regency concluded after the California electorate approved Proposition 4 on the November 1974 ballot. Proposition 4--Regents, University of California, Legislative Constitutional Amendments--included several modifications to Article IX, Section 9, of the California State Constitution, among them eliminating ex officio regents' seats for presidents of both the board of agriculture and the Mechanics Institute of San Francisco.

Grant was born on November 22, 1906, in Perry, California, the son of Patrick Charles Murray Grant and Katherine Elizabeth Trankle Grant. After attending elementary schools in Gardena and Lomita and graduating from Lomita High School (1924), he attended Montana State University and the University of California, Los Angeles (at the time named the Southern Branch), from 1924-26. The Montana State University awarded Grant an honorary doctorate in agriculture in 1979.

From modest beginnings as small dairy and livestock farmers during the onset of the Great Depression, Allan and Irene Amanda Chinowth Grant, who wed in 1931, built a substantial agricultural enterprise near Visalia, Tulare County. They also became active leaders in many community groups, and Allan Grant in agricultural organizations at levels extending from local to international. His leadership activities included: Willow Elementary School Board (nineteen years); Visalia Union High School Board (eighteen years); State School Trustees Association Board; 4-H leader and president of the Tulare County 4-H Leaders Council; Presbyterian Church elder and Sunday School teacher and superintendent.

In 1976, after having served as president of the Tulare County Farm Bureau Federation, president of the CalFarm Insurance Company, and for twelve years as president of the California Farm Bureau Federation, Grant was elected president of the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF), the nation's largest and most powerful general farmers organization. He served on foreign trade advisory committees at the request of several United States presidents, was a member of President Reagan's Export Council for four years, advised Secretary of Agriculture Earl L. Butz during agricultural trade missions to six countries in the

Far East, and served on the Advisory Committee to the Agency for International Development (AID), which included exploratory trips to the People's Republic of China, Russia, and Israel. As a member of the National Board of Farmers and World Affairs Grant visited with Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in 1961; he was later presented the Second Order of the Treasure by Emperor Hirohito of Japan. Many of Grant's agricultural leadership activities, especially those pertaining to the AFBF, are described in Melvin L. Woell, Farm Bureau Architects Through Four Decades (Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company, 1990), 133-156.

Grant served on various board of regents committees, most prominently Audit, Grounds and Buildings, and Special Research Projects. His positions on issues before the regents, including a crucial vote of no confidence in University of California President Clark Kerr at Grant's initial regents' meeting in January 1967, generally agreed with those of Governor Reagan.

The Grants, who reside in Coarsegold, California, have two daughters and three sons, ranging from fifty-seven to forty-three years of age at the time of this oral history interview.

[Session 1, April 29, 1991]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, it's April 29, 1991, and I'm here with Allan Grant in Visalia, California, at the First Presbyterian Church. And we are going to get started at least today on an interview that will focus mainly on your tenure with the University of California Board of Regents. But I would like to begin by getting some additional background information. Just to begin with I'd like to know a little about yourself and your family. Where and when were you born?

GRANT: I was born on November 22, 1906, in a little town called Perry in southern California. It's between Redondo Beach and Los Angeles, closer to Redondo Beach. My dad was a Scottish immigrant to this country and he named me Patrick Allan Grant. At one time I asked him, "Why did you give me an Irish name?" And he said, "It isn't an Irish name," he said, "it's a Scottish name."

When the Pope sent missionaries to Christianize the British Isles, Patrick went there, and Columbo went somewhere else, and Augustine went somewhere else. But Patrick went to Scotland first and then he went to Ireland, so the Irish claim him. And that's not quite true, but it's a good thing for a Scotsman to tell about the Irish.

TRELEVEN: Why don't we get your father's name as well as your mother's name on the record.

GRANT: My father's name was Patrick Charles Murray Grant. And I'm the thirteenth Patrick in a direct line. My oldest son is the fourteenth, and his son, my grandson, is the fifteenth Patrick in a direct line.

TRELEVEN: My goodness.

GRANT: But he was a Scottish immigrant to this country. And my mother's background was Norwegian and German. My mother was born in San Joaquin Valley in 1880. Her mother was born in the mountains east of the valley in 1860. So on that side the family goes back a long ways. In fact, there weren't many people in this part of the world but Indians in those days.

TRELEVEN: I remember reading in your memoirs<sup>1</sup> how your mother's extended family were homesteading or something in the Tejon Canyon and Grapevine area.

GRANT: That is correct. And my mother told me that she being the eldest child had the job of milking the cows. So she would lock up twenty-four mongrel cows in the corral, leave the calves outside, and of course there was a cacophony of noise all night long. And she went out with a one-gallon Cudahy lard pail in the mornings to see how much milk she could get for the family. And the cows of course didn't want to let the milk down, so she would try to fill that one gallon pail from twenty-four cows. Then she'd turn the cows out so that calves had a preferential position as far as the milk was concerned.

They went to Bakersfield twice a year. It took two days to get to Bakersfield, and they stopped at what's now called Weedpatch. She said they really wanted to stop and so on, and the next day they went on onto town. Stayed in Bakersfield for a week to visit with friends and

---

1. Typescript in Grant's possession.

relatives and back to the Tejon Canyon for another half year. And if they ran out of salt or medicine, sent somebody on a saddle horse in between. If they forgot to get a loaf of bread, they didn't turn around and go back. In fact, they never bought any bread.

TRELEVEN: So, how did your father and mother meet?

GRANT: My father farmed south of Bakersfield at a place called Panama. There is a Panama Lane that I've seen as I've driven down State Highway 99.

TRELEVEN: Yes, that's right.

GRANT: And he hired a man by the name of Rudolph Trankle, a German immigrant, to work for him, and my mother was one of Rudolph Trankle's children, the eldest. When she was fifteen, my father, twenty years older, asked her to marry him, and she put him off until she was twenty-five and then married him.

TRELEVEN: And so we get your mother. . . . I can't remember whether we mentioned your mother's name or not.

GRANT: My mother is Katherine Elizabeth Trankle, and of course Katherine Elizabeth Grant later.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now again looking at your memoirs, you traveled around. You moved quite a bit when you

were a youth it seems.

GRANT: As a child . . .

TRELEVEN: And what was the reason for that?

GRANT: My father was an intellectual, a graduate of Oxford [University] with honors, but his capacity for economics was almost zero, and so he lost the farm in the Bakersfield area. Then because of his education, he worked as a bookkeeper for the Union Tool Company in Torrance. And then because he was an immigrant, and perhaps immigrants have a stronger feeling for the country than some of us who were born and raised here and have things that other people in other lands don't have, he was an extremely patriotic American. When the First World War started, he took me aside and showed me the headlines of the Los Angeles Times, "Kaiser Wilhelm Marches On Belgium," and he told me that you'll never see the end result of this in your lifetime. So he quit his job as a bookkeeper at the Union Tool and went to work building Fort MacArthur at Point Fermin [San Pedro]. And he shouldn't have done that, because they put him to work at common labor. He wasn't fitted for that and he got a sunstroke, a very, very severe

sunstroke when I was nine years old. When that happened they moved to a little town called Lomita, which is just south of Torrance. And when I passed my tenth birthday I told my mother I guess I'd better quit school and go to work to help feed the family, because my father wasn't able to work for months and months. Fortunately, we had a family cow so we had protein--milk for the children. And she got after me pretty roughshod and said, "You're not going to work for anybody else until you're twelve. You're going to go back to school." Fortunately for me she was making the decisions at that time, so I did go back to school. But I did make a big garden, so we did have vegetables for the family. But in retrospect when I think of a ten-year-old thinking he could make a living for a family of all those children, I think how foolish can a ten-year-old child be. Anyway, it worked out very well.

TRELEVEN: Now, all those children, how many was that?

GRANT: I was the eldest of eight, and I was ten years old when this thing happened, so I did the best I knew how. They didn't tell me to make a garden, I just did it. That was my first agricultural

experience.

It might be a point of interest to know that when I was twelve I started a Boy Scout troop, and I carried it alone--well, with the help of a neighbor boy, but he really didn't--he just gave me moral support--and I carried that Boy Scout troop alone for eighteen months, but I had to get an eighteen-year-old boy to come and be sergeant-at-arms because a fifteen-year-old didn't want to do what a twelve-year-old told him to do. Before I started I asked my dad, and he was in a darkened room because of his sunstroke. He couldn't be out in the sun at all, and that's all they knew to do for a sunstroke in those days. He told me that just because you want to start it doesn't get it started. He said, "You have to remember that you have to know all the things you're going to teach those other boys before you have the meeting each time. You have to know the semaphore code, Morse Code. You'll have to give a prayer before you start, and you don't read a prayer, you offer a prayer. So you'll have to do that, you'll have to salute the flag, lead them to salute the flag. You have to do all the

things that the Boy Scout leader does. Do you think you can do that?" And I said, as brash as a ten-year-old--twelve-year-old--can be, I said, "Yes, I think I can." And I guess I did, because we carried it for eighteen months until they found a Scout master for us.

Then later I attended a Bible study group of kids my own age. And there were two old maid schoolteachers that had this meeting every Tuesday evening. And the principal told them to quit it, and for some reason or other they came to me--maybe because I was leading a Boy Scout troop, I don't know. But they came to me and asked me if I would intercede with the principal of the school, and I did. I told the principal they weren't interfering with any schoolwork at all, there was no reason to stop it. And finally she capitulated to me, a thirteen-year-old, and let them carry on with their Bible study and fun and study club that they had every Tuesday night. When I think about that it seems ridiculous that a principal of a school would listen to a thirteen-year-old, but she did.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] You must have been pretty convincing.

GRANT: Well, I told her, "If you stop them, I'll be there every Tuesday night if I'm the only one." So she finally capitulated.

TRELEVEN: Okay, a couple of questions. What gave you the idea to start the Boy Scout troop at that time?

GRANT: Well, frankly my dad was. . . . My dad's study at Oxford was philosophy and theology, and he pressed upon me that my responsibility should be to a higher power than was on this earth. Theologically, he wanted me to feel that I had owed something to my creator. And I asked him if it would be of service to the creator to start a Boy Scout troop, and he said of course it would. So I went from there.

TRELEVEN: And that was roughly the same motivation for getting involved with religion, your family was religious?

GRANT: Yes, that was the same motivation that caused me to get involved in school board activities and the Farm Bureau [Federation] and church activity and so on because my philosophy is that I should emulate to whatever degree I can the servanthood of Christ. And that's what motivated me all my life. That's why I served on the [Willow]

Elementary School Board out in the country for nineteen years, sixteen years on the [Visalia Union] High School Board [of Trustees], and then eight years on the board of regents appointed by Governor [Ronald W.] Reagan. And of course, when he appointed me to that, he called me on the phone and asked me if I would be willing to serve as president of the [California] State Board of Agriculture. I said, "Yes, I would, but doesn't that automatically put me on the board of regents?" And he said, "Yes, that does, and that's what I want to talk to you about." So that's how I got to be on the board of regents.

Prior to that of course I was a delegate to [President Dwight D.] Eisenhower's White House Conference on Education because I'd been so active in school matters in the whole [San Joaquin] Valley. In fact, what I think is interesting is that I spoke one time in Fresno to all superintendents of schools and presidents of state universities and so on from Stockton through Bakersfield. And . . .

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: It was a large meeting. And one of those people

who heard me speak heard me say that Russia was going to launch a Sputnik within the next two weeks. And he wrote a letter to the superintendent of schools, because I was on the high school board of trustees, saying that you ought to demand the resignation of that naive high school board member who thinks Russia is ahead of us in engineering. And I had cautioned these administrators that we were getting behind in engineering courses in the state of California. And fortunately for me, the Sputnik went up before the next high school board meeting, and the president of that state university resigned, I did not. He did not need to resign, of course, because I wasn't making that public, making his letter public, but he maybe didn't know that, I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, let's back up again and take you back to a little earlier time, mainly your elementary and secondary education. I guess a question would be what courses or what subjects did you especially like when you went to elementary and secondary school?

GRANT: Well, I liked English. I personally like poetry.

I like good literature. And I had a high school English teacher who encouraged me on that score, but of course I got lots of encouragement at home from my father and mother, because they. . . .

From the time I was able to read I had a library card so I could get books at the library. All of us, all the children got books from the library, and my father's people from Britain always sent us books as presents. So we were encouraged to read from the time we could speak actually. So English was one of my favorite subjects. I never liked mathematics, but all of my brothers do, and these younger brothers are engineers--all but one. One is in business for himself. The others are all engineers, and only one of them has a master's degree, but the others went to UCLA and to [University of California] Berkeley and they do have their degrees. One of them did not, but he was intelligent enough that as a chief engineer for Hydril Corporation down in the Los Angeles area he had thirty-five licensed engineers working under him and he didn't even have a degree. And so apparently he was a top flight engineer. Another one was in charge of

the building of a tower for the detonation of the [atomic] bomb in Nevada. Another one was head engineer, chief engineer, for Patterson Bellow division of Byron Jackson [Pump Company]. The youngest brother who was in the air force in the Second World War was an engineer for Xerox [Corporation] and various other companies, and he has thirty-nine patents of his own. And his son has nine patents.

TRELEVEN: Wow. But you didn't like math.

GRANT: I don't even like two and two, whether you multiply it or add it.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

GRANT: My wife says that's not quite true, but I don't like math at all.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now I think if I recall your memoir correctly, your liking of English meant that you came in contact with an English teacher and she had a connection in Montana. And I can't quite remember the story, but . . .

GRANT: That's correct.

TRELEVEN: . . . why don't you repeat that?

GRANT: She was an excellent teacher, and her brother was operating the family farm in Montana. She knew

there was no money or land in the family and that I wanted to get into agriculture, so she encouraged me to write a letter to her brother asking for a job in the summertime as soon as I finished high school. My next younger brother finished high school in three years and I finished in three years, but my mother didn't want me to leave home until I was at least seventeen, and so she encouraged me to take some extra subjects and stay in school another half a year until I passed my seventeenth birthday. So I wrote to the English teacher's brother, and he told me to come ahead and he'd give me a job. So as long as I was there in Montana, I signed in as a freshman at Montana State University. And fifty years later they awarded me an honorary doctorate in agriculture. So I had not only got the honor of getting the honorary degree, but I had the honor of visiting with the freshman class that I matriculated with.

TRELEVEN: Let's fill in some names here. The name of the English teacher was?

GRANT: Mary G. Wylie.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And then you went to Montana and you

stayed with . . .

GRANT: I stayed for a full year. I didn't see my family from the time I left until I got back a year later. And I think the cost for a non-Montanian to sign in and start school there was only eighty dollars a year in those days. So I managed on eighty dollars.

TRELEVEN: So the family you stayed with was . . . ?

GRANT: . . . was the Wylie family, and I knew the whole family over time.

TRELEVEN: And this was in . . . ?

GRANT: Nineteen twenty-four I went to Montana.

TRELEVEN: What town would that have been?

GRANT: Bozeman.

TRELEVEN: That's in Bozeman.

GRANT: Missoula is the other university town.

TRELEVEN: Right, but this was Bozeman. Now why by the time you got out of high school did you feel you wanted to farm?

GRANT: Well, when I got out of high school I wanted to farm because, as I grew up under my father's tutelage. . . . And he asked me one day, "Why are you so interested in these truck farmers?" And I said, "Because I like what they're doing. I like

agriculture." And he said, "Well, that's fine." He said, "That's an honorable profession if that's what you want to follow. But," he said, "you need to go to school to be a successful farmer." But he said, "There's one side issue I'd like to mention as long as you've noticed these Orientals farming. It's against the state law in California for them to own land." He said, "I don't know any good reason for that, and as you grow older and are capable of doing anything about it, you ought to make it a prime issue to try to change that so that no matter who people are, if they're in this country they ought to be allowed to own land, because that's one of the prime freedoms that we have is to own something. And it's wrong for this country or any part of this country not to allow people to own a piece of land just because of the color of their skin or the slant of their eyes." So he started teaching me some philosophical ideas along with the encouragement to get into agriculture. And I didn't know how to get into agriculture, but I was forced into it later.

TRELEVEN: So these were Japanese-American truck farmers around Lomita?

GRANT: They were not Americans at that time, because they couldn't even be citizens. But they were . . .

TRELEVEN: That's right, because of the exclusion act [Immigration Act of 1924]<sup>1</sup> I think, yeah.

GRANT: They were truck farmers around Gardena and Lomita and in the southern part of Los Angeles County. Worked hard and did fairly well, but they weren't allowed to own the land that they farmed.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Just to think of some dates here. You would have gone to Montana about 19 . . .

GRANT: Nineteen twenty-four.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And then you didn't stay there but one year. Now what happened then?

GRANT: One year is all I stayed there, and then I came home. And I had to earn enough money to start school again, and so I worked for the Union Tool Company at ten hours a night. I think they paid me forty-five cents an hour, and I was the next man under the foreman on a crew handling ingots

---

1. H.R. 7995, 68th Congress, 1st Sess., Vol. 65, p. 8589 (May 15, 1924).

of steel, octagonal shaped, twelve feet long. And I stepped up to the position of what they called heater--taking care of the ingots as they were placed by the crane man in the furnace. And knowing at what temperature to let them come out to be put into the steam press to be pressed out into different shapes ready for the jackhammer man the next day to shape them into oil well tools. And one night the foreman said to me, "You're doing a good job," but he said, "I'll take over this particular ingot because it's high carbon steel and it's very, very expensive." And so he took it over. I said, "Well, I can do it." He said, "I know you can, but I better do it." When he signalled for the crane man to bring it out of the furnace, I said to myself, "Uh-oh, we're all in trouble." And as he brought it out it was not the correct color of heated steel, it was dripping melted. And sure enough the next night the superintendent of the plant was there and asked, "Who is the heater on this crew?" And I told him, "I am." And he said, "Well, we've had you here long enough. Do you know that you wasted \$1,500 worth of steel last

night?" And I didn't respond. And he said, "I think you've been here long enough. I think you better get your lunch bucket and go on home." And the foreman stepped up. He had thirty years of pension on the line, no union. He stepped up, and because of the kind of a man that he was, said, "Let the kid alone. I took it over last night and I burned it up. It wasn't he." The superintendent taught me more swear words than I'd ever heard before, and dressed us both down, took the skin off us both with a dull knife. But then he got through with his swearing and he said, "Well, both of you stay. Nobody's fired." And so that foreman with thirty years of pension on the line almost lost his job and his pension, but I had a high regard for that kind of a man. So then I left there because my dad died while I was still there and I had to earn more money. So I got a job in the oil fields in Signal Hill in Long Beach. It paid a few cents more an hour.

TRELEVEN: So this was '24-'25 or so?

GRANT: It was 1928.

TRELEVEN: 'Twenty-eight, okay. Now at what point did you

decide to go to UCLA for a year? Or as it was known then, I think, the Southern Branch.

GRANT: This must have been in '27, because I went to UCLA after I'd worked for a while. Then I went to UCLA. Then I went to work at the Union Tool. So it had to be about '27. Then after that I worked in the oil fields and said to my mother, "I can buy the groceries for these brothers and sisters, but I don't have enough money to buy the shoes and I've got to do something else." But that's when I started farming as a sharecropper.

TRELEVEN: Okay. What was your intent when you went to UCLA to get a bachelor's degree?

GRANT: Yes, I intended to get a bachelor's degree and I was thinking about going into agricultural research if I couldn't get started farming. But this tragedy of my dad's death forced me to farm in order to feed the family.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: And so that's how I accidentally got into what I wanted to get into. Although it's been always my philosophy that every adversity has its opportunity if you just see it. The adversity of

my father's death caused me to start farming as a sharecropper so I could feed the family. The adversity of a man with whom I leased going broke and leaving and leaving me his bills to pay two years later forced me to go out on my own and be a farmer in my own right instead of being a sharecropper. Every adversity has been an opportunity.

TRELEVEN: Okay, we'll get back to farming in a minute. But again going back to the Vermont [Avenue] campus, did you commute then by red car or yellow car or something like that?

GRANT: I didn't have any transportation. Therefore I must have commuted by the red car probably. I don't remember which one went that way. I do remember the yellow cars, because when I used to ride on the yellow cars to go to work it was at a time when great numbers of Polish people had immigrated to the United States. And I was certainly glad that they had the windows that would open, because I don't think I could have stayed in there with that much garlic.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

GRANT: The garlic came from their breath, from their

clothing, from their pores in their bodies. And unless someone has experienced that with a full streetcar of Polish workmen, with all of them eating garlic, one doesn't know exactly what that situation is. I didn't mind the Polish people. In fact, they're likable people. But I don't like garlic.

TRELEVEN: So while you went to UCLA that one year you were working at the same time.

GRANT: Yes, I worked as well as went to UCLA.

TRELEVEN: So you weren't spending much time socializing on the campus.

GRANT: No time socializing. I didn't have time at all.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: I'd always been taught by my mother and father that if anything happened to him, that I being the eldest was responsible for the family. And so I didn't have time to socialize to amount to anything. I did join a fraternity in Montana, and I don't think that's particularly anything to be proud of, because fraternities had quite a lot of problems in those days. And they've had some problems since then.

TRELEVEN: Yes. All right. Well, years and years later

when you were on the regents did you ever talk to [William E.] Bill Forbes about how you were on the campus at the same time? [Laughter]

GRANT: I think he knew it and I knew it, but we never discussed it to amount to anything, because I spent very little time on the campus except in class. One of the very interesting things to me was that if one did not have a passing grade in Subject A English, he was required to spend some time, one semester at least, in a special English class. And I was placed in that class, and I hadn't the slightest idea why they put me there, because English was the subject which I liked better than any other subject. And after being in that class for one week, the professor came and sat down beside my seat and said, "Why are you in this class?" I said, "I haven't the slightest idea." And he said, "You don't belong here at all." He said, "You don't belong here as a student any more than I do." He said, "Don't come back, and I'll give you a passing grade." So I didn't have to go to that class, so that gave me a little bit more time to spend at work.

TRELEVEN: My gosh.

GRANT: And I still don't know why I was in that class. I haven't the slightest idea. It's irrelevant, actually.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so your father died. You needed to do something to get more money, and I think according to your memoirs you suggested to your mother that you would like to begin to farm. Well, I guess the question is how does one begin to farm?

GRANT: Well, the only farming experience I'd had was the one summer on that farm in Montana where he raised hay to feed his Angus cattle in the wintertime and one other summer when I was younger when I worked on a hay baler in the San Fernando Valley north of Los Angeles during one summer. I paid five dollars at an employment bureau for the job. That was an interesting time, because I don't remember how old I was, maybe sixteen, and I boarded with the people. They were poor, extremely poor. Three little kids, three little boys, and the mother cooked pancakes for them, and I boarded with them. And the pancakes were made of flour and water, no milk. They didn't have a cow. And I think she

had baking powder or soda to mix with the flour, but she made pancakes three times a day. That's all they had to eat. That's all I had to eat.

TRELEVEN: Oh my gosh.

GRANT: But I had sense enough to go out to the . . . In those days they shocked the hay and then pitched it in a fork into the baler. And I'd go out after dark and lift a shock and pick some of that light green or yellow alfalfa and eat it, which gave me the protein I had to have to work.

TRELEVEN: Is that right? Wow.

GRANT: I felt sorry for those three little boys who just had the pancakes, and they were hungry within an hour of the time they had eaten them. And somebody asked me, "Why don't you quit?" I said, "Well, if the owner could work on it, I guess I could." And jobs were scarce. But I have always felt sorry for those three little boys who didn't have enough to eat, even though their bellies were full.

TRELEVEN: So you were a pretty large person, right, by the time you were seventeen, eighteen.

GRANT: Well, I was stronger than average because I'd always worked.

TRELEVEN: But you were well above six feet, weren't you?

GRANT: Yes, I was six feet tall, weighed about. . . .

Well, I had another interesting experience. When I was fifteen I worked on an ice truck delivering ice. And the truck driver was an alcoholic, but a real fine man. I liked him, but he had this alcoholic problem. And so on Mondays he couldn't always be there, and Monday was the day to deliver ice to the butcher shop. And the butcher shop took 900 pounds of ice, and blocks of ice come in 300-pound blocks. And what is done is to cut a 300-pound block in half and carry that 150 pounds up the stairway to put it above the meat in the aperture behind my shoulders. And I only weighed 140 pounds at that time. I carried 150 pounds of ice up those stairs. And I remember the first Monday that I did that the old German butcher sat down on his butcher block and said, "Where is Pete?" I said, "Pete's sick today." And he said, "Who's going to put my ice?" I said, "Well, I guess I am." And so I did hoist that platform and stairway around from behind out of sight and put it where it belonged and carried 900 pounds of ice up there. So Mondays

frequently that would happen, that I had to do the whole thing all day by myself and then take the truck back to where it started and then walk eight miles home. Now that sounds like quite an accomplishment, but in those days everybody walked. So to walk eight miles after running in and out of houses all day seems like a difficult job, and it does take a couple of hours to walk that eight miles home.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

GRANT: So it made a long day, but it isn't quite the same as people would think of today, because everybody walked in those days wherever they went.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You had these various work experiences, and I think you were beginning to tell me that you'd had the experience working on a farm in Montana.

GRANT: And in California.

TRELEVEN: Baling hay in the San Fernando Valley. But again, I have to ask how does one go about beginning to farm at that particular time?

GRANT: Well, I knew everybody in our hometown, and one of the boys about my age said his father was a

real estate agent and he knew a man in the San Joaquin Valley, Tulare County, who wanted to quit farming because he wasn't. . . . Or if he was making a living, just barely. And he thought I could buy this man's lease. So I went up to see the man and he wanted \$1,500 for his lease. I went to see the land owner, and he agreed to take me on if I could raise the \$1,500. So I borrowed that here and there and then moved the family to Tulare County on the farm and left my mother in Lomita to pay off the grocery bills and so on as I sent her money. And so we got started. And so the brothers and sisters had milk and cottage cheese and butter and eggs from the hens running around the barnyard and meat, because we did have chicken to eat. So we were better off than we were when I was working in the oil fields. But a year and a half after I started, in 1929, we started selling the milk, which belonged to the owner and myself, share it alike, for about \$2.65 for a ten-gallon can of milk, manufacturing milk.

TRELEVEN: And this would have been about 1929?

GRANT: And '30. In 1931 that same can of milk brought fifty cents, and half of that was mine. So

twenty-five cents per ten gallons of milk. The reason for that partly was because of the depression in all of agriculture, but also because grocery stores in Los Angeles sold at a loss leader a pound of butter for a penny. And so naturally the grocer across the street wanting the same customers would give you a penny if you'd take a pound of butter. And so that didn't help to keep the price up at all. So hogs that I had sold for thirteen cents as feeders when I first started were bringing in three and a half cents a pound as fat hogs. And other people would come and buy hogs to take home and butcher, to slaughter in order to save a little money. And I remember very vividly a man coming up from town, from Visalia, wanting to buy a hog to take home to butcher. I asked him which one, and he pointed out one, and I said, "Well, two hundred pounds, three and a half cents, seven dollars for the hog." He said "Seven dollars! It's no bigger than my dog." I said, "Go home and butcher your dog. You're not buying anything here. Just leave."

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

GRANT: And so he begged and pleaded and tried to talk me out of it, but I said, "No, you've already offended me enough. Just don't waste your time, just leave." I don't think he butchered his dog, but he went home.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] So you got started with the leasing arrangement and that means that you lease it for so much money and then you split down the middle the profit.

GRANT: I leased it for half, and the owner received half of the milk check and I received half. And if I sold any hogs he received half of that income. I took the other half. And we each spent half for the feed for the animals. And I could raise whatever feed I could on the land. One hundred and twenty acres were farmed and the rest of the 840 was pasture. This man went broke after a year and a half, and I found out later he hadn't paid any interest, principal, or taxes on the place during the time he'd had it, and so he lost it on deficiency judgment. And when he lost it, of course, he wanted to take his livestock away. And I said, "Fine, but half the increase in livestock is mine. And he said, "Well, there

isn't any increase to divide." I asked, "Why not?" He said, "Read your lease." He said, "The lease says if any cow dies or is condemned that you replace her with one bred heifer or two unbred heifers." I said, "But no cow died or was condemned." He said, "Oh, you're mistaken. Don't you remember I sent my representative up here about six weeks ago, and you went through the herd, and you said this cow was barren, this cow only has a calf about every two years, this cow has part of her udder spoiled?" He said, "You yourself condemned them." So I took the lease to an attorney. He said, "It doesn't say who condemns them, so I guess you're out."

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: I had the same family to take care of, my wife and I had just gotten married, and I didn't have any home for my mother, no home for my wife, no place to take all these brothers and sisters, and if you think I wasn't distraught, you're mistaken, because I didn't know what to do.

TRELEVEN: This means that potentially you didn't even have a roof over your heads.

GRANT: No roof over my head or my mother's head or my

wife's head, and all these children to take care of. So I admit being a religious person I went down to the river, and the Lord and I spent about three or four hours, I don't know how long, but anyway we discussed the matter, [Laughter] if that's the correct word, and figured it out, figured out what to do. And it worked very, very well, because it was at the depths of the Depression. And when a depression hits, whether it's India, America, or wherever it is, people in the country go to town. I don't know why, but they do. And that's when they distribute the food or food stamps or anything they have I guess is the reason. But anyway, farmers wanted to quit and wanted to leave the farm. So I went to different farmers in two different counties and asked them how they'd like to get rid of their Holstein cows, and they asked me what I had in mind. I said, "Well, I've got grass and you're having to buy feed. I'll take over your cows and I'll buy them at twenty-five dollars a head, and I'll pay for one cow a month out of the milk check, no money down, no interest." And for some reason or another, they said that was all right,

they'd do that. They wanted to get rid of them. So my wife and I walked those cows home ten miles, twenty miles, wherever I made the deal. We were back in the dairy business in just a few weeks. And before that though I'd gone to the woman [Amelia Seibert] who'd taken the place back on deficiency judgment and I said to her, "I can't leave. I've got this family to care for, and so I'm here. Will you take two years rent next year and nothing this year?" And for some reason or another she said yes. And so there I was back in the business of farming and delivering milk to Knudsen Creamery Company.

TRELEVEN: So on that place you had a roof over your head yet, so you were not. . . . You didn't have to leave.

GRANT: Didn't have to leave. I had a bunkhouse where the brothers slept and a house where my mother and children could sleep with a roof over their heads. And I moved my mother and the two youngest to town. And my wife came and cooked for those teenage brothers, for in those days the farmer had to feed the hired help, and so any hired help I had she cooked for also. And then

my cousin was with us going to school here in Visalia, and so she had a full job of her own to take care of a ready-made family. But it all worked out. I saw an ad in the paper for somebody who had sixteen brood sows to sell and I went to see him. And at his price, \$2.50, I bought them. I don't know where I got the money, but I bought them. Of course, the cows were giving milk by that time. We had grass, I didn't have any hay, and when I got those brood sows home on acorns and skim milk, I had a herd of brood sows in no time. Then I went down to Port Concepción to see a man I knew from high school days. He had Hereford cows, and he asked what I wanted to see him about. I said, "Well, you have cows which you haven't had much rain for a couple of years, and you're buying hay for these cows this winter." I said, "I'll take a carload of your weaning Hereford steers. I'll charge you seventy-five cents a month to feed them each, and a carload of your weaning Hereford heifers, valued at twenty-five dollars a head. At the end of two years I'll pay you the difference between what you owe me and I owe you." He said, "I've

never heard of such a thing, but I'll do it." So I was back in the dairy business, the hog business, and the beef business in a period of about six months for \$2.50 times seventeen brood sows. And so that's how I got into farming.

TRELEVEN: And the year we're talking about right now . . .

GRANT: It was 1931.

TRELEVEN: That was '31.

GRANT: The depth of the Depression.

TRELEVEN: Now let's just back up long enough to get you married. I guess the question would be, how did you meet your wife?

GRANT: Well, I had a cousin who had a girlfriend in Visalia. He lived in Redondo Beach and he used to come up to see her about every two weeks. That's quite a trip in those days.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: With the kind of transportation that we had. But he wanted me to go out with them, because we were cousins and friends. And I said, "No, I won't butt in on you. You only get to see your girlfriend every couple of weeks and so I won't butt in." He said, "Well, if she could find someone willing to take a chance on you, would

you go out with us then?" And I said, "Well, I surely don't have much time, but yes, I'll do that." So his girlfriend happened to know a young lady who lived two miles west of Visalia and she asked her, and she took a chance. And so that was a blind date which will be sixty-two years ago this year when I. . . . And in addition to that, I had gone to see her father when I first came to the ranch, because I didn't have any tools. Somebody told me that a man by the name of Chinowth might loan me a corn planter. And I had to get something planted. I came here the twelfth of June and if I didn't get something planted by the fourth of July, there wasn't no reason to plant it. So I went to see this man and he told me that he would loan me a corn planter. And when I turned to leave, I looked up toward the house, and there was a curtain pulled over and a young girl peeking out the window. And it just happened to turn out that she was the blind date later. Although I didn't know her at all and she didn't know me.

TRELEVEN: Her name is . . .

GRANT: Her name was Irene Amanda Chinowth. I think the

name originally from Kentucky would have been Chinoweth.

TRELEVEN: I see. Okay, I've got to stop a minute and turn the tape over.

GRANT: Okay.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, you said 1931. Now the Depression was hardly over, and you were getting involved in all of these different enterprises.

GRANT: Just getting really well started at that time. But when our eldest daughter was still young enough that she hadn't started school, two trustees came to see me from the country elementary school [Willow Elementary School] in our district and asked me if I'd be willing to allow my name to be put up to the county superintendent of schools to be named to the board of trustees, because they needed one more trustee. They only had two. And I said, "Well, our little girl will be going to school in another short time, so I guess I ought to serve on the board." And so one of them talked to me while the other went all around in the backyard

and looked at everything. I could see him walking around there, and I was wondering what he was looking for. When he got back, I said, "Did you find what you were looking for?" He said to the other trustee, "Yes, he's okay." I said, "How do you come to that conclusion?" He said, "Well, his wife doesn't cook out of tin cans, she apparently cooks a meal from start. And if she's that frugal, then he's probably frugal enough to spend the taxpayers' money." And so I have always said my wife put me on the school board. But they told me when they put me on the school board that I would have the whole responsibility. They didn't want to bother with it, and they said, "We don't have children in school and you will have." And one of them said, "Well, I will have two pretty soon, but only one. And so it will be your responsibility." I said, "Now, if you mean that, I'm willing to take it on, but not unless you mean it." They said, "Yes, we mean it." So I began to get acquainted with the school activity, and I decided that a one-room school is not really the very best, and even two rooms is not the best. But the first thing I did was to

divide the school into two rooms, and so we had four grades in each room.

TRELEVEN: The purpose being . . .

GRANT: To give the two teachers a better chance at each child so that the children would get more personal attention. And then I bought a Webster's Dictionary with a stand. There was no dictionary in the school. And the two other trustees just raised the dickens with me and said, "Why do you want a dictionary? This whole community went through this school without a dictionary. Why do we need one now?" I said, "Well, we already have it, so let's just forget it." And the next thing I did was to buy a new set of encyclopedia for the children, and they thought I'd lost my mind. Then I took the old potbellied coal stoves out and put in floor furnaces so that all the children would be warm in the wintertime. And they just put up with me, they didn't like it. Then I had the Edison Company [Southern California Edison] measure the footcandle power at each desk and had them revise the lighting system in the two rooms so that each child had adequate light. And so then over time

I raised the salaries of the teachers so they were commensurate with the salaries in the city school system so that we didn't get the leftover teachers. We had an opportunity for any teacher that the city had, providing she wanted to teach out in the country. So our children, including other children too, had no problem going from this country school into high school.

TRELEVEN: Sounds like you must have raised the mil rate too.

GRANT: Yes, but not very much. But I thought the children in the country ought to have the same opportunity as all children.

TRELEVEN: Was there that much resistance to providing even a relatively small amount of money to bettering the school?

GRANT: There was a considerable amount of resistance, because when I came to this area almost no farmer had more than an eighth-grade education. And they thought that was adequate. And it didn't matter whether it was a good education or whether they just could say, "I've been through eight grades of school." And so having had a little more education and also having some background of

education on my father's side particularly, I thought that children ought to have a better opportunity. And so those are the reasons behind my arbitrary activity on the school board. And I'm glad I did those things, because our children have done very well.

TRELEVEN: At that time amongst neighboring farmers there was a good deal of resistance . . .

GRANT: Yes, there was.

TRELEVEN: . . . to the idea that you needed more than an eighth-grade education.

GRANT: And also, I was ostracized when I first came because my English was not the same as eighth-grade English in the country area. And that was one thing. The second . . .

TRELEVEN: What do you mean by that, your English wasn't . . . ?

GRANT: My vocabulary was different than theirs. They had a very minimum vocabulary, having only gone through the eighth grade and had the leftover teachers out in the country.

TRELEVEN: You sounded a bit more cultured.

GRANT: I sounded snobbish to them. So I had to outlive that, and frankly I did modify my English. I

used more two-syllable words and so on.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

GRANT: So I finally outlived this ostracization that I had to begin with. But there was a second thing too, and that is that some farmers in this valley had been exploited by Los Angeles financiers, cheated. And so I had two things against me: I came from Los Angeles County, and my English did not suit the local people. But I outlived it I guess, because they soon asked me to serve on the high school board of trustees and on the [board of] state school trustees association and serve as president of the [Tulare] County School Boards Association and different things like that.

TRELEVEN: Okay, you get involved with the--excuse me--it was the Willow Elementary School at a certain . . . . And this was in the thirties?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How much beyond '31, or is it . . . ?

GRANT: I was nineteen years on that school . . .

TRELEVEN: No, but when you started you say your daughter [Joyce Irene Grant] was going to be entering school, so . . .

GRANT: I can't remember what year it was that I started

on that school board.

TRELEVEN: But it was still in the thirties.

GRANT: Yes. She was born in. . . . Let's see, she was born in '33, so it would have been probably '35 or '36, somewhere along there that I went on the board.

TRELEVEN: Now how did you . . ? You're still in Depression times, and you've explained how you made a couple deals to make money, but going on from there, how did you continue to build the farming operation?

GRANT: Well, as time progressed and I was on my own then buying cattle to build up the dairy herd, and as I increased the size of the dairy herd I had a larger income. And it was necessary of course, because during this time we were adding to our family numbers. Apparently, I was a successful farmer, because I cooperated with the Agricultural Extension Service of the university in many ways, although I didn't always agree with them. The director of Agricultural Extension in the county was quite amused from time to time, because he'd say, "That isn't the way we do it, Allan." And I'd say, "No, but I listen to you

people, and I'm glad for your advice and your help, but I make my own mistakes, not yours." And we always got along real well. But when I developed the land over time after I bought it . . . . And up until that time I was leasing it from the woman that I leased from that first time paying two years rent over one year.

TRELEVEN: Right, so you . . .

GRANT: I was still leasing from her. And she had financed her son by buying him the Cadillac [automobile] dealership in Pasadena, and he failed. Anybody that fails with a Cadillac dealership in Pasadena is not fit for very much of any economic activity. So then she bought him the Buick dealership in Pasadena, and he failed at that, so she didn't want to turn the farm over to him. So she saw that I was paying her more rent each year and saw that I was an actual producing farmer, and so she asked me if I would like to buy the place. And I told her I would like to. So I bought it on a contract with the Knudsen Creamery Company sending her part of the income each month and sending me the balance of it. And so she was absolutely assured of getting

her part, whether I had anything left or not.  
And so she was satisfied, and I was satisfied.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so that isn't what you call a land  
contract. It was a contract that specified that  
the profits from the marketing . . .

GRANT: Specified. . . Well, it was a contract, because  
I had an appraiser from the Federal Land Bank  
appraise the place, and she said, "Oh, that's not  
enough money." And I said, "Well, what is enough  
money?" She said, "Double it." I said, "Well,  
that's all right. I'll be satisfied with that,  
because I'll be paying it off month by month and  
so you'll always get your money." And she said,  
"That's fine." So we doubled the appraisal value  
by the Federal Land Bank, and I bought it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you marketed your milk to the creamery?

GRANT: That's right, Knudsen Creamery. And when I sold  
that dairy I was the second oldest patron they  
had in tenure. They had one other patron who'd  
been selling to them longer than I had and he was  
in the Los Angeles area somewhere.

TRELEVEN: So it was called Knudsen Creamery Company?

GRANT: Knudsen Creamery Company. I guess it's now owned  
by Kraft [Foods Company].

TRELEVEN: So . . .

GRANT: But also it might be well to mention the fact that over time I changed the operation as the opportunity presented itself. So when I sold the dairy we were a little bit unique in that I had permanent employees, I had housing furnished for them, and they got all the milk they wanted. If they had one child, they took what milk they wanted. If they had five or six children, they took what milk they wanted. That was part of their pay. And I had health and hospitalization insurance for them. I had life insurance for them. And I furnished work clothes for them in the barn while they were milking so they were always clean. And of course, that's not entirely altruistic, because I had a friend in the home, because the lady didn't have to wash those dirty clothes because they were furnished by me. And so I always had a partisan within the home. The wife was on my side. And if the man thought he wanted to change jobs, why, he probably had an argument with his wife. Anyway, they had vacations with pay. If they worked for me a year they got a week's vacation; two years, two weeks

vacation; three years, three weeks vacation; four years, four weeks; and that was it. No more. And also, in addition to that, they only worked six days a week. Finally their spokesman came to me and said, "We'd like to make a change in the free time." I said, "What kind of a change would you like to make?" They said, "Well, in the rotation if our time off comes on Saturday, we'd like for you to give us Saturday and Sunday off. Then we can take the wife and the children to the park or to the mountains or to the seashore, and it'll come out pretty close to the same." I said, "Let me take a look at it and I'll see." So it was pretty nearly the same as every sixth day, so that way they had an opportunity for the family to be together for a couple of days every so often. So I had a very, very stable work force.

TRELEVEN: Well, how did you develop the idea of providing what we call today fringe benefits way back . . . ?

GRANT: I don't know how I did. I was the only one. I didn't know of any others. In fact, one time when I was president of the California Farm Bureau [Federation] I got a call from somebody in

this county saying we're going to have a strike among the workers in Kings and Tulare counties. Can you come? I said, "Well, what's the problem?" They said, "We really don't know." So I came back home for a couple days, and it was a pretty ticklish situation, so I made arrangements to have the milk delivered to a processing plant up in Modesto if there [was] a strike, so that it wouldn't just waste. And then I said, "Let's send out a questionnaire and ask each dairyman, 'Do you furnish work clothes in the barn? Do you have vacations with pay? Do you get a day off a week? If a man milks, does he wash up? And does he also feed calves, or does he feed the cows?'" I had a separate man to feed the cows, separate man to feed the calves, and so on. But none of these questionnaires were identifiable. And so we got the questionnaires back and made it public, and so we raised the level of income of all dairy workers in two counties just by a letter. And that was the beginning of dairymen getting--the dairy workers--getting more money in the two counties. And I thought if I can do it, so can somebody else.

So you asked how did I happen to offer these kinds of things. I don't know why except that I had worked under different conditions. In fact, when I worked on the ranch in Montana I took a bath at the horse trough, and then I went back to the bunkhouse to sleep where the other men didn't take a bath ever as far as I know. And we didn't have any. . . . We left the door open, we left the windows open in the bunkhouse, but still it's not quite the same environment as sleeping in a clean place. So I thought workers ought to have the kind of treatment that you would want to have for yourself, that's all. I don't take any special pride in that except that I just think a person ought to be able to behave in a certain way.

TRELEVEN: So I recall in your memoirs you were also quite a person with horses and mules. And then you also indicate that about 1938 I believe you began to mechanize and . . .

GRANT: Mechanized practically entirely at that time.

TRELEVEN: Which means you purchased . . .

GRANT: Tractors.

TRELEVEN: A tractor.

GRANT: Yes, I don't remember. It wasn't '38. It was a little bit later than that when I bought a D4 Caterpillar. That's the next to the smallest size to begin with. Later I bought a D7 Caterpillar, and another time I had a D8 Caterpillar, the next to the biggest size they make. So that's again not altruistic. It was forced on me by the cost of labor, because I could do as much with that Caterpillar tractor in a few hours as I would do with seven hired men in a week or two. And so it was an absolute necessity. And I had to pay the Caterpillar driver more than I ever paid a mule skinner, but I could get lots more work done lots more quickly.

I remember the neighbor coming to see me during the depth of the Depression, the worst part of it. And he farmed the same land, a number of acres adjacent to me. And he said, "Allan, why do you pay twenty-five cents an hour to your labor?" I said, "Well, I guess, Harry, it's because I want to." He said, "Well, I pay fifteen cents." I said, "Well, Harry, you could pay more." He said, "Yes, I could." I said,

"There's a big ranch down south of here that pays eighteen cents. You could at least pay eighteen cents." "No," he said, "fifteen cents. I make three cents profit per hour on every man." I said, "Well, Harry that's your decision, not mine." He said, "Well, I can't get anybody until you get everybody you want." I said, "Harry, that's your tough luck, because I do what I want to do, not what my neighbors want to do." So you asked me why do I do these things. I don't know why. Just because I'm who I am, I guess.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well then, moving ahead with the farming operation, I think ultimately you went out of dairying.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And I was just wondering, you know, just wondering at what point you. . . . What I'm looking for is the kind of change in continuity in your farming operation.

GRANT: Well, I suppose I went out of dairy not because I didn't like it, but because I was so active in the Farm Bureau and 4-H activities, Future Farmers [of America; FFA], and all the rest of it that goes with anybody concerned about other

people, school boards and so on, that I was away too much. I was leaving a good deal of the responsibility to my wife and to the superintendent of the dairy. In fact, I don't think I ever told you this, but I'll tell you this at this point even though it may be extraneous. The superintendent of the dairy was a man with a real good solo voice and he used to sing hymns while the men were milking the cows. And I asked them--some of them were Catholic and some of them were Protestant--and I asked them, "Do you mind his doing this? If you don't like it, I'll tell him to quit, because you have a right to what you like and don't like. Here, do you want to have the radio going or do you want to have him sing hymns?" Every single one of them said, "Oh no, let him sing. We like it." But he got a sliver, a redwood sliver under his middle fingernail. And I said, "Herb, you better go to the doctor." He said, "Oh, I've had slivers under my fingernails lots of times." I said, "No, but you've never had a redwood sliver under there out of the horse barn." I said, "That's a dangerous sliver." No, he wouldn't

go. The third day he didn't show up for work, and I went to the house to see what happened. His wife said he didn't feel well, and he ordinarily drinks coffee before he goes to the barn at four o'clock in the morning, and this time he drank his coffee, but it didn't go. He had to drink his coffee through his teeth. He couldn't get his mouth open. I said, "That sounds like something he'd better go to the hospital for." So I called the veterinarian. He said, "You have a very virulent type of tetanus along the river, and particularly you say he got it from the horse barn, and he's very likely to get it from horses." And so I went back and told her, "Get him out of bed. We're going to the doctor." She said, "He doesn't want to go." I said, "It doesn't make any difference whether he wants to or not, he's going." So I took him in to the doctor, emergency, and the doctor was a personal friend of mine. And the doctor asked me, "What's the matter with him?" I told him about the sliver. He said, "When did he get it." And I told him. And he said, "He doesn't have lockjaw then." I said, "But I think he

does." He said, "Why do you think so?" I said, "I called a veterinarian. . . ." Then I had to scrape the doctor off the ceiling. He just exploded. He said, "You called a veterinarian before you talked to me?" I said, "Well, frankly, I've lost some animals to lockjaw and I've seen what the symptoms are, and he has the symptoms." He said, "He doesn't have lockjaw." I said, "Well, as a personal favor to me, will you treat him as if he has lockjaw even though you know he doesn't have it." Well, he thought a minute, he said, "Well, it won't hurt anything. I'll do it." Well, he died three times. At least he stopped breathing, and they had to resuscitate him. They had to put a tracheal tube in to get him started and various things like that, but they saved him. And he left my employment when he was sixty-two. And when he was eighty-five he wrote me a letter from New Jersey where he lives--where his daughter lives--telling me how much he was enjoying life. And if I hadn't been hogheaded he never would have written that letter. And my wife. . . . They sent him to a specialist in Fresno after he had

fully recovered, because he had a little heart murmur. And my wife asked the specialist, "Is he now immune to tetanus?" And the doctor said, "We don't save them. We don't know if any of them are ever immune, because we don't save them from tetanus." So if I wasn't hogheaded he would have been dead. Anyway, that's an aside, but a very interesting aside I think, from being in the dairy business.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, so what you're beginning to say though is that you were becoming more active in organizations.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And those cows have got to be milked twice a day, 365 days a year.

GRANT: With that kind of an operation you've got thirty or forty thousand dollars worth of expenses a month, and somebody has to take care of that. And unless you have hands-on activity, you don't belong in any kind of business without hands-on activity except as an investor with someone else running the show, and that isn't what I was doing.

TRELEVEN: But as you're phasing out of dairy, you're

maintaining livestock of various type on the farm  
or . . . ?

GRANT: When I sold the dairy, I sold 640 milking cows.

TRELEVEN: Six hundred and forty?

GRANT: Six hundred and forty cows.

TRELEVEN: My lord!

GRANT: And it took a couple of years to sell all the rest of them--the dry cows and the growing heifers and so on. It took a couple of years to get clear out of the dairy business. By that time I was so busy with the Farm Bureau and the Advisory Committee [to the President] on Foreign Trade with the three different presidents and so on that I didn't need to be bothered with the dairy. So that's how I moved out of the dairy business then. Of course that gave my wife a relief from not having to take care of it also. But it was worthwhile.

You mentioned horses and mules. There was a good market for mules, and so I raised mules most of the time, to some degree, clear back from the thirties. And the National Park Service or National [United States] Forest Service bought most of them as pack mules, even though they were

big. It didn't make very much money, but it was a pleasure to handle them. And you know, I just enjoyed that part of it.

TRELEVEN: So just to move along you've got the 840 acres. Then I think you were telling me over lunch that eventually you got a different farm?

GRANT: Yeah. I bought 640 acres of native pasture, undeveloped land. It all had to be graded. And then the treatment for that kind of land in order to modify the chemical situation is to add gypsum, and to eliminate the alkaline situation and eliminate some of the molybdenum by irrigation, although it had to be ripped about this deep. And then I put in 200 horsepower pumps and two and three-quarter miles of underground concrete pipeline--all expensive, but it made a good irrigated farm out of it. And I farmed that for a few years after we had sold the 840 acres. And then I sold that and still have the first trust deeds on it. And at the present time a buyer has built a modern Grade A dairy on it. And to build a modern Grade A dairy it costs about a half a million dollars. So he has a good farm, but I still have a first deed of trust on

it.

TRELEVEN: And when did you leave . . ? Listen, before I get on to that, I really haven't asked you to specify the locations of either farm, and maybe you should do that. In other words . . .

GRANT: The first farm was five miles northwest of Visalia. The second farm was about one mile north of Goshen, and Goshen is on the 99 highway [State Highway 99] west of Visalia. So 640 acres is just about a couple hundred yards from the 99 highway, east of the 99 highway, north of Goshen.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And at what point did you and your wife decide to move from the Visalia area up to Coarsegold?

GRANT: Well, when I sold that farm we still retained a home here in Visalia, south of one of the high schools.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

GRANT: And we lived there for a while. And then when I left the farm here for good I bought. . . . I saw an ad in the Western Livestock Journal for a cattle ranch for sale up in the mountains between Fresno and Yosemite [National] Park. And I went and looked at it. It belonged to the widow of a

former constable in that area, and she wanted to sell it so that she would have adequate income for the rest of her life. And so we bought it on contract. And she went with me in a pickup [truck] over the whole place first. And I asked her which springs continued to flow even in dry years and which ones stopped flowing, because a cattle ranch is no good without water. And so she told me and she told me right, correctly. Most of them continued to flow even after these five drought years we've had--all but one. And so I offered to buy it from her and asked her what she wanted, and she told me. And I said, "No, I don't want to pay that much. I'm pleased to have looked it over with you, but I'm not going to try to push your price down. I'm just going to leave." "Oh no," she said, "don't leave. Let's talk about it." I said, "But I don't want to tell you what I'll pay if you've got a certain price." She said, "Well, I was offered such and such a price cash." I said, "Well, you better take it then, because I don't want it." Then she said, "Well, what will you give?" And I told her, and she said, "What are

you going to do with it?" And I said, "Put cows on it." She said, "You're not going to subdivide it?" And I said, "No, I'm not going to subdivide it. I don't know what my heirs will do." She said, "I don't care anything about that. But," she said, "my husband and I rode horseback together over this ranch for years and years and years, and I don't want it subdivided. If you're going to leave it as it is during my lifetime, that's all I ask." And so she came down to about two-thirds of the price she'd been offered cash.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: And I said, "Well, I'll give you a letter guaranteeing it won't get subdivided during your lifetime, or put it in the deed, whatever you like." She said, "No, I don't want anything like that." She said, "If I can't believe the president of the American Farm Bureau, there's no point in selling it to him." So I said, "Well, I appreciate that confidence, but you're welcome to sign an agreement that it won't happen." But I did buy it and paid it off so that we don't owe anything on it.

TRELEVEN: And so right up to the--excuse me--present day

you live up there.

GRANT: Yes, we built a log house on the place. And I bought the logs just like one buys a prefabricated house and had a builder put it together. But the logs came from Missoula, Montana, so I guess that's nostalgic.

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned. Small world.

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And I think you told me, what, you lease out the land and . . . ?

GRANT: Yes, I bought a purebred herd of Red Angus cattle at first and used it for that. Then now it's leased out to a man who has a horse operation and pack trips back in the mountains and overnight trips of pack horses and mules and so on. And he has lots of horses there, maybe sixty-five head of saddle-type horses. And he's a good renter, wants to continue with it. We may lease him the whole thing including the log house. He lives in a mobile home and pays rent for that. We may rent him the whole thing a year from now and move back here to Visalia in the home that we still retain south of Mount Whitney High School.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I wanted to just backtrack a little bit

and I guess go back probably in most of these cases to the thirties and forties and just ask you about how you became a member and a leader in various organizations, I guess starting with 4-H.

GRANT: Well, my wife and I were 4-H leaders because we wanted our children to be in 4-H. We had heard from different people that it was difficult for country children to adjust going into a large high school, and we didn't want that to happen. We thought the children ought to have every opportunity to associate with other children to the degree that they felt secure in a large group of students. So we sponsored 4-H activity in the community and also we had the girls join in the Rainbow for Girls and things of that kind so that they did have social activities with children from the town. And we encouraged the other children in the country to participate with ours in those kind of activities so that we had not only with the school board, but I used to pick up all the children in a . . . . I modified an old touring car into a bus and picked up the children in the community, in the country, the children of the farmworkers as well as the farm owners and

brought them into Sunday school on Sundays so they had an opportunity to meet with other kids with different interests. The 4-H helped them too to feel secure and knowledgeable. Those were the motivations for getting the kids into 4-H and the motivation for our being in 4-H. But I also learned some things on my own too, because sometimes the parents of children. . . . The parents who worked on farms and had children in a 4-H club felt that they couldn't afford to have an animal project for the kids, so I gave seven boys each a feeder pig to encourage them. But that isn't the thing to do, I found out. They didn't have anything involved, no investment in it, so it didn't mean much to them. And but one boy, one of the seven, did a really good job with his. So I went to see him before the 4-H Fair in Tulare, the week before, and he wouldn't come out of the house. His mother came out and said, "He doesn't want to talk to you." I said, "But I have to talk to him, because he's going to show the pig next week, and he's done well enough that he'll get a ribbon. One or the other, I don't know whether it'll be first, second, or third

place, but he'll get a ribbon. He's done well enough." So she finally forced him to come out. He came out crying, and it's a sad thing to see a twelve-year-old boy cry, particularly for the reason he was crying. I said, "What's the matter, son? You've done a good job with your pig, and you'll get a ribbon next week." He said, "My dad butchered it." The week before the Fair.

TRELEVEN: Oh no!

GRANT: So not a one of the seven did any good at all. But that one, well, I just thought to myself after that, what in the world kind of relationship can he have with his dad from now on?

TRELEVEN: So you and your wife were then both 4-H leaders for many years.

GRANT: Yes, she taught the girls sewing, and I taught agricultural matters. Also then, I was active in the county on 4-H leaders activity and supportive of the agricultural extension service. And we added various other kinds of 4-H activities like electrical projects and all the science and things like that and broadened the activity of

4-H so that it could take in children who weren't just plain interested in agriculture.

TRELEVEN: And then somehow you ended up being the president of the Tulare County 4-H Leaders Council.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And it looks like one thing led to another in 4-H, huh?

GRANT: Yes, each time when the National 4-H gave me some kind of an honor for being an alumnus of 4-H, because when I was a boy wanting to get into agriculture--I don't think I mentioned this earlier--I managed to buy a Holstein heifer from one of the purebred Holstein dairies down in Los Angeles County. And so that was the cow that I had when the family had to have milk when my dad was incapacitated. And so that. . . . They weren't called 4-H in those days. They were called the calf club or the pig club and so on, but it was the same thing. And so because of that, having been active in that kind of thing from the time I was thirteen or something like that, why, they gave me an award as an alumnus of 4-H.

I think I'm an honorary life member of

Future Farmers, an honorary member of PTA [Parent-Teachers Association], an honorary life member of the agricultural commissioners association--all agriculture, most of it agricultural.

TRELEVEN: Right, right. And I noticed you're active too in the Dairy Herd Improvement Association, the DHIA.

GRANT: Yes, yes, we. . . . The business of artificial insemination for dairy cows is just coming in, and we're testing cows for production and trying to increase the production year by year, generation by generation. I did that in order to have access to the information available to get that done. We used our own bulls at first, but then when artificial insemination came in that was better than buying bulls, because with 640 cows I'd have to have quite a number of bulls compared to artificial insemination.

TRELEVEN: I'll say. And the Heifer Project was part of 4-H, or was that a . . . ?

GRANT: That's an interfaith relief and rehabilitation program.

TRELEVEN: Oh yeah, that's right.

GRANT: A long time ago a man of Mennonite faith was

portioning out powdered milk mixed with water to poor children in Spain. And he said to himself, "Why couldn't these people have dairy animals here and have actual fresh milk?" So he started what they call the Heifer Project. And so eventually they put me on the national board of the Heifer Project with all the Mennonites. I was the only Presbyterian on there, but they put up with me. And it wasn't just cattle, they make beasts of burden available, donkeys--where women are the beasts of burden traditionally--and bees for making of honey, rabbits where they can't have larger animals, and beef cattle, dairy cattle. In Mexico they made milk goats available to poor peons that couldn't feed a cow. So it's a relief and rehabilitation program interfaith.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: I don't know if I ever mentioned it, but I took a load of cattle to Japan for the orphan homes for the half-GI, half-Japanese orphans in 1955. I didn't get to see them delivered, because they had to be in quarantine for ten days. But I did go visit the orphan homes, and I asked a woman, "Why is this child bright eyed and hair looks

good and can hardly sit still? He's so full of life. And here's one that looks dull eyed and looks like he's not very well." She said, "This one's been here a while and had milk. This one just got here." And so it made me feel that it was a worthwhile trip, because, well, that's the reason that the Emperor [Hirohito] of Japan gave me the highest honor they give a foreigner, which is the same thing [Henry] Kissinger and [President Harry S] Truman and [Douglas] MacArthur and about a dozen other people have gotten. They think that's a great thing for the Emperor to give you an honor. But he gave it to me, because he said I started the modern dairy industry in Japan. I didn't. The Heifer Project did. But you don't tell the Emperor to go to the dickens when he wants to give you something.

TRELEVEN: And yes, you said the Heifer Project was originally a Mennonite project.

GRANT: Yes, to begin with.

TRELEVEN: To begin with. I see.

GRANT: But lots of people contribute to it now.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: Catholics contribute to it, lots of people,

because lots of people contribute to things that don't have to do with their own denomination. Nowadays they make a choice.

TRELEVEN: And at the same time by then in terms of the Presbyterian church, your church was located here in Visalia?

GRANT: This was it.

TRELEVEN: This is it.

GRANT: But it wasn't this building, it was another building.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: Original building, and I joined the Presbyterian church in Montana. I studied the catechism as a twelve-year-old. And a young man I worked for on that ranch was raised in Bozeman and his father and mother and two sisters lived in town. So when he'd go to town, sometimes he'd take me along, and I'd eat dinner with them. And that man was a very religious man, the father, and after a meal, evening meal, you were catechized. If you were a guest you catechized just the same as if you were a member of the family. And he found that I knew all the answers, so he asked me if I'd like to join the

church. I said, "Well, it's about time I did."  
And so I joined the Presbyterian church in  
Bozeman, Montana, while I was still a student.  
And he was a fine old man, but if you didn't want  
to be catechized you didn't get to come back.  
But if you were willing to be catechized. . . . I  
don't know, what's the chief end of man? The  
chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him  
forever, and so on and so on. Because I knew the  
answers he thought I ought to join the church.  
So I did.

TRELEVEN: And when you came up here and began farming as  
you say you joined the . . .

GRANT: Joined the Visalia church here. It was my wife's  
church, and her mother grew up in this church  
here.

TRELEVEN: Ah, I see.

GRANT: That's a long time, since she was born in 1880.  
So she was a member of this church all her  
life. My wife joined when she got to be old  
enough. And so the Presbyterian theology is in  
both sides of the family.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: Although I have no quarrel with it, that's

Calvinistic theology, and other Protestants are Arminian in their basic theology, although most people don't know what their theology is, whether. . . . Although Protestant. I would say that generally speaking most Catholics would know what their basic theology is. But most Protestants really don't know. Many Protestants join the church because they like the looks of the minister. He parts his hair on the left side or something like that. They don't have any basic reason for belonging. But I have to have more reason than that, and mine is Calvinistic, which happens to have become--even with the Catholics--happens to have become the national psychology in this nation. It's Calvinistic theology. Calvin eliminated the feudalistic system, which was then prevalent around the whole world, eliminated the divine right of kings, and those are the basic precepts, along with the ownership of property, which he sponsored. So our early history, colonial. . . . Well, as far as that goes, when they had the revolution the British called it a Presbyterian revolution. And the rallying cry of the colonialists was no

bishop and no king. But fortunately, our forefathers had sense enough to wipe that out so we have freedom of worship for any denomination now, and that's the way it should be. So I don't agree entirely with Calvin, which is presumptuous I know, because he was a student of theology. I'm not. But I do agree basically with his theology, which is the basic theology of this nation--the right of ownership, the right of worship where you want to, the right of the individual to do as he wants to do. And academic freedom was sponsored by the early colonialists. They even brought their schoolteachers with them as well as their ministers. And that's basic theology for the whole nation, even though each denomination varies to some degree, and that's the way it should be. I told you I think about my friendship with the monsignor, the Roman Catholic priest here in this town. I think I did. My daughter's first job after high school before she went to college, her boss was a woman who was a secretary of the head of the [Visalia] Chamber of Commerce and . . .

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. Why don't you pick it up where you left off?

GRANT: Okay. I just started to tell you about our daughter when she got her first job out of high school before she went to college. She came to me one night and said, "Daddy, you've got to do something." I said, "What is it I have to do?" She said, "The lady I am assistant to says her husband tries to kill her at night. He gets drunk and wants to kill her." I said, "Oh Peggy, that's probably an exaggeration." She said, "No, it isn't. She showed me where the butcher knife hit the breast bone and didn't penetrate." "Well," I said, "maybe it is serious." Well, the monsignor was a personal friend of mine and I had finally figured out that day, well, that neighbor, that man is a Catholic. So I can talk to monsignor. I went to see him, and with his broad Irish brogue O'Mahoney, Father O'Mahoney, came out of the parish house just as I got there, and he said, "What is it you're here for now? You're always trying to get me tied up in

something you're doing in the community. What is it this time?" I told him, I said, "You're the only one who can do anything, Father." "Oh," he said, "you always give me the worst jobs." But anyway, he said, "I'll try." Sure enough, the next day that man came driving into the lane lickety-split. He was younger than I was and bigger. And I said to myself, "He's going to get a meal out of this, but he's only been to lunch when he gets through." And I got all squared up for him, and he marched up to me and he said, "Allan, I don't like you, I never did, and I don't now." I said, "John, that's not why you came to see me." "No," he said, "I came to say thank you." I said, "Thank you for what?" He said, "You talked to the monsignor yesterday, didn't you?" I said, "Yes, I did." He said, "Well, thank you." He got in the car and drove off, and he never hurt her any more. See, the monsignor had an influence on him I didn't have. And it's a good thing. And so you don't have to do everything yourself if you've got friends, and the monsignor was a personal friend of mine, and I'm glad he was. I liked him.

Everybody did. Protestant or Catholic, they all liked him.

TRELEVEN: And in terms of your own activities in leadership in the church, that means you have been an elder and . . .

GRANT: Yeah, I was an elder of the church and I was a superintendent of Sunday school for seven or eight years. And I never had any trouble getting teachers for Sunday school, because I'd ask a woman or a man, "How about helping out in Sunday school?" "Oh, no, no, I can't do that." "Why not?" "Well, Johnny or Suzy is in a certain place in school. I couldn't do it until they get to such and such a place." Well, when they got to such and such a place I'd come back and say, "Well, you promised to start when they got to here in school, and here they are," so I didn't have any trouble. They promised, and they didn't want to break the promise. Then, of course, I had teacher training for them so that they knew what they were doing. And I didn't ask them unless I thought they were qualified to handle the job. Well, I never had any trouble getting teachers, anyway.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, in terms of--to continue this thread with organizations--how did you come to be involved initially with the Farm Bureau?

GRANT: Well, I was in the dairy business and I was raising swine also, hogs. And then I was in 4-H, and so they asked me to serve on the board representing 4-H.

TRELEVEN: On the . . .

GRANT: On the board of directors of Tulare County Farm Bureau.

TRELEVEN: Tulare County, okay.

GRANT: They wanted somebody representing 4-H leaders and their activity. So I think that was how I initially came on the board. And then because I was in the dairy business and the swine business, they put me as chairman of the swine section and chairman of the dairy section and so on, different things like that. Then they finally asked me to serve as vice president and then as president of the county Farm Bureau. And in the meantime as president of the Farm Bureau and as vice president, I was asked to serve as a delegate to the California Farm Bureau Federation. And I followed Norman Liddell of

Fresno County as their representative of these five counties or my district. And then they wanted me to serve on the board of directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation, and so I was elected there. In each instance I was asked to do it. I didn't seek it at all, because I had enough to do at home. But you always make time for whatever they ask you to do, and so it was advantageous to me as far as that's concerned. When a person says he's sacrificing this or that to do those things, you do. But also, you profit by it by gaining new knowledge about what's going on in your acquaintanceship with legislators and so on. And the necessity to let legislators know what needs to be done for your constituency. So it works both ways. You do sacrifice something, but you have to make room for it.

TRELEVEN: Well, just to put a timeline here, you would have gotten involved with Tulare County Farm Bureau, what, in the thirties do you think?

GRANT: Yes, it was very early on.

TRELEVEN: Very early on. And then?

GRANT: I was still a renter, not an owner of land at all.

TRELEVEN: Really?

GRANT: Yeah, I was just a renter.

TRELEVEN: What did you think would be good about becoming involved with the Farm Bureau in the first place?

GRANT: Well, when they first came out and tried to get me to join, it cost five dollars a year. And some of the old-timers came and asked me to join the Farm Bureau, and I said, "Well, what is a Farm Bureau?" And they told me and they didn't tell me very well, but they told me what they knew. And I said, "What's it going to do for me?" And so they were trying to tell me what it would do. Of course, with some education I knew that what they were talking about was valid. And so I said, "Well, if I do have some influence away from the farm this way I'd better take it on." And that's why I joined the Farm Bureau in the first place in order to strengthen the organization to have the influence I thought it needed.

TRELEVEN: So at the county level what issues would you have influence on?

GRANT: You have influence on the board of supervisors, on tax matters. And also, all the time I was a

member of the Farm Bureau practically I was a member of the chamber of commerce here in the town, because I wanted to have some influence on what happened here.

TRELEVEN: You were a member of the chamber of commerce?

GRANT: Yeah, practically all the time.

TRELEVEN: You were a joiner, my goodness!

GRANT: Yes, [Laughter] wherever there was activity I wanted my voice to be heard. Yes, I was a member of the chamber of commerce for a long, long time. The chamber of commerce honored me as Man of the Year, something or other, I don't remember what. Then the Boy Scouts honored me for what I had done different ways. My theology tells me that the greatest honor I ever received was given to me by the Lord to be the firstborn of eight kids, so I had the honor of helping them to get them through school and so on when my dad died. I think that's the greatest honor I ever had. One of my brothers said to me one day, "I've racked my brain for years trying to think how can I ever pay you back for what you did." I said, "Jim, you don't owe me a blessed thing." I said, "I've had honors and accolades to the nth degree

and I don't need any of them. The highest honor I ever had was this honor of helping you kids go to school." And that's exactly the way I feel about it. It wasn't a burden, it was an honor.

TRELEVEN: At the time you joined the Farm Bureau, were there other farmers' organizations you could have joined?

GRANT: The Grange [Patrons of Husbandry] was active at that time.

TRELEVEN: Grange was.

GRANT: But they had a selective kind of a way. Only certain people--I don't remember what the rules were--but only certain people could belong to the Grange, and it was a closed society, and the Farm Bureau was open to any farmer. I think, I'm not sure, but I think the Grange at one time had a rule that you couldn't be a member if you were Roman Catholic. I'm not sure of that, but I think so. Anyway, they were selective, and I didn't buy that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, there was a . . . Some people have called the Grange a rural Masonic Lodge.

GRANT: Yeah, yeah. The Masons, they don't ask you to join, but they give you all kinds of

encouragement to think you ought to join. And I never joined the Masons either, because they are selective. My dad was anti-Catholic. I'm not, absolutely not. But of course, he grew up in a different time when there was a lot of antipathy between the Catholics and the Protestants, and the Protestants were heretics. So he had a very strong anti-Catholic feeling, and I don't have the slightest bit of that. I don't like what the Catholics did in Britain, I don't like what they did about the Waldensians, but I don't like the Protestants burning the witches at the stake either.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And so who am I to say this is good and that's bad? Not me.

TRELEVEN: So out here in California there wasn't anything like a Farmers Union [Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America]?

GRANT: No. Oh, there was a taste of it here and there. But it didn't amount to anything. And anyway, California farmers are so. . . . Well, they have so many different crops that I think it would be easier for the Farmer's Union or Equity

[American Society of Equity] or any of those to get in where they have so few crops like they do in the Midwest.

TRELEVEN: I see.

GRANT: Here in California, fruit and vegetables and cattle and sheep and hogs and almost anything you can think of, with two hundred crops or more, two hundred and sixty now I think, something like that. So we've got so many diverse interests that there had to be an overall organization with no selectivity about it. So the Farm Bureau was way ahead of the others. And, well, it's proven over time. Others have about died out.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Now at the time, let's say in Tulare County, did the general organization also support cooperative marketing activities?

GRANT: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: But you marketed your cream through a private . . .

GRANT: Private, yeah. But at the same time there was a cooperative creamery over at Tulare. But I started out. . . . And this was just by accident, because the Knudsen Creamery was on the way to town. These kids could haul the milk to town and deliver it on their way to high school.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

GRANT: So it was a natural thing to sell to Knudsen. Of course, I knew the Knudsen people over time after that and was glad I went with them, because I knew them personally and their activity, social activities and so on, their cooperation with the chamber of commerce in the city and so on. So I was glad I chose the Knudsen Creamery.

TRELEVEN: So the county, they had a cooperative creamery and then they also had cooperative marketing mechanisms for . . .

GRANT: Yes, but the Farm Bureau had livestock marketing, and that was my interest other than selling milk was to have a place to take the hogs and the cattle that were no longer useful in the dairy. So the Farm Bureau was a natural for me to belong to.

TRELEVEN: Well, and you ended up being president, right, of the Tulare . . . ?

GRANT: I was president of the Tulare County Farm Bureau Federation, vice president first and . . .

TRELEVEN: How did that come about?

GRANT: . . . and then president. Well, they just asked me if I'd be willing to serve.

TRELEVEN: Are these competitive elections or?

GRANT: What's that?

TRELEVEN: Were they competitive?

GRANT: Not when I was elected anywhere. But when I was elected president of the American Farm Bureau, [William J.] Bill Kuhfuss was running, but the vote was 133 to eighty-three or something like that on the house of delegates, so it really wasn't a competition. They didn't want him, they wanted somebody else, and I happened to be there, so I was the one.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I don't know if you can remember back to the time you joined Farm Bureau, but if you can, what did you like about the philosophy of the Farm Bureau?

GRANT: I liked it because it fit my philosophy of a minimal government intervention in private enterprise. In fact, there is a dam on this [Kaweah] River now. And I tried my best to organize the people in the community and Kings County: "Let's build the dam ourselves. Let's not get the government involved in it. We don't need the government. We can build it and then we can make our own decision about the division of

water and so on." And they overrode me. They said, "No, no, the government's willing to build the dam. Let's let them build it." Then the whole nation pays the cost. Well, that's a good philosophy all right to have the nation pay the cost, but they have the government tell them what they can do with it then if they allow that to happen. So my philosophy is an independent philosophy, and the Farm Bureau came the nearest to that of anything I knew about. But I never signed up for any of the wheat, feed grains program, any of that. I just don't want government intervention in my business.

TRELEVEN: Does this go way back to the thirties? You never got involved with any New Deal farm programs.

GRANT: Yes, never, never. No, when I was raising hogs and I had a half section of land leased, I grew grain on it as well as alfalfa and hay. And they came out and said, "What do you got planted out there? Aren't you going to join the feed grains program and get the government subsidy?" I said, "No, I'm not interested." They said, "Well, if you have wheat in that field you've got to join. You'll be under control. You have to,

whether you like it or not." I said, "Go look at it." They went out and looked at it and said, "What is it?" I said, "It's hog feed." They said, "Well, what did you plant?" I said, "What do you think I planted? You went and looked at it." They said, "Well, it's a mixture." I said, "That's right. It's a mixture of hog feed." I said, "It's not wheat, it's not barley, it's not oats, it's a mixture." So they gave up, so I never signed up. I'm just too hogheaded I guess, but I just don't like government subsidy. Who am I to complain about food stamps if I'm willing to take the subsidy myself? And I watched the Farm Bureau over time get clear over to where I was forty years ago. Now they want the government out.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, tell me more about that, because I'm relieved to tell you that the name I was struggling with at lunch is O'Neal.

GRANT: Yeah, that's right.

TRELEVEN: [Edward A.] O'Neal from Alabama and [Charles B.] Shuman from Illinois, not alone but together with Grange, Farmer's Union, they really put together the New Deal farm programs. And it seems that

the Farm Bureau played a strong role in putting together the essence of the program, but then began to divorce itself.

GRANT: Shuman was the beginning of. . . Charlie Shuman was the beginning of the kind of philosophy I have.

TRELEVEN: Which is that government should stay totally out of agriculture?

GRANT: Not totally out, because when I was on the Foreign Trade Advisory Committee and I met with [Pierre] Lardinois, the French spokesman for the European community, I said, "You can't stay clear out, because if any American farmer, if he's got any sense, could compete with any farmer anywhere in the world, but he can't compete with a foreign treasury, a foreign country's treasury." Well, Lardinois said to me, "You just tell me what your bottom line is going to be on the price of wheat, and I'll just set mine that much lower and I'll sell all mine." Well, of course he will, so the government can't stay out of it completely. But now they're working toward the objective of having as free a free trade as possible. And that's going to be done to the benefit of the

developing countries because they can sell their stuff without the European community pushing the price down. So I'm not a tearjerker, I don't believe, but I think we industrialized countries have done a lot of damage to the Third World countries by fixing it so they can't get anything sold. If our prices are such that they can't sell it, then they just can't sell it. So I still have the same philosophy I had when I first started it: the least government is the best government. And I say now today we've got way too many laws and way too many lawyers. We'd be better off without so many.

TRELEVEN: Ah, but you've heard this. I'm not raising any new issues with you, you've heard them all before.

GRANT: Oh yes.

TRELEVEN: And certainly one issue would be yes, but if we did it your way we would have probably, what, less than half the number of farmers on the land that we have now. And government needs to support a program to keep farmers on the land. How do you . . . ? You've responded to that.

[Laughter]

GRANT: I don't have any trouble responding to that. My wife and I have helped five young farmers get started in agriculture. We didn't give them anything, but they went to production credit from a credit system and tried to borrow. Well, one of them just got out of the navy in '46 and he came to me and said, "I've tried, but I can't get started." He said, "Will you rent me some land?" I said, "What are you thinking about, Clarence?" I knew his dad. Well, he said, "Forty acres." He said, "That's enough to start with." And I said, "Well, how are you going to farm it, Clarence?" And he said, "I'll borrow a tractor from my dad." I said, "When are you going to pay me?" Well, he said, "When I make the crop at the end of the year." I said, "Well, I think we can probably work that out." So I rented him forty acres, and he did well and he did a good job. Then I rented him a little more land. Pretty soon he was farming all the land that I had a cotton allotment for. I wasn't farming any cotton at all. And pretty soon he began to buy land from neighbor farmers. And you mentioned the fact that the farmers need to stay

on the land perhaps by somebody's definition. Those farmers did something else, and they liked it better and they weren't making a very good living on that land they had, because Clarence Ritchie is a better farmer than they were. A while back I said to my oldest son, "I guess Clarence Ritchie must be farming eighty thousand acres by this time." He said, "Oh no," he said, "you're way off. With his son he's farming over a hundred thousand acres--some of it owned, some of it leased, some of them shares." Anyway, I just literally went over all the farmers in that area where he first started. What are they doing now? Oh, one of them went and worked for a feed lot operator. Another went to work in town as a custodian in a schoolyard. Another did something else. All of them are still making a living, and they're not farming that land; Clarence Ritchie is. And I have a son-in-law, married our eldest daughter, who was in the state park service all his life. He had a good job and worked his way up to where he was in a pretty good position. He's retired now, but he thinks that there's too much money in the hands of too few people. And I

said, "Well, Jim, listen. As my brothers grew up and went away to college, then I hired men to take their place. And as time went on I farmed more and more land. Now at what point did I become evil?" "No," he said, "not evil. I didn't mean that." I said, "Well, you said there's too much money in too few hands. At what point did I have so much that I shouldn't have any more, and who makes that decision? The people who have that much or the people who only have this much? You'll get two different opinions. These guys down here that only make half as much as I did, they've got one opinion. Those that are where I am or higher have an entirely different opinion. How are you going to handle that?" "Oh," he said, "I can't argue with you." Well, I just think that what's the difference how many farmers there are? And I'm sorry for any farmer that loses out, but you can legislate equal opportunity, but you absolutely cannot legislate equal attainment. It's impossible.

I came home one time and a fellow who was a member of this church but a liberal said, "Well,

I see you got quoted on the front page of the Wall Street Journal." I said, "What are you talking about?" And that's what I'd said in some speech, and they quoted it on that little box at the bottom of the Wall Street Journal where they quote different people different times. Well, it just makes common sense. You can legislate equal opportunity, but you can't legislate equal attainment. It's impossible. I had a man that worked for me forty-nine years. He went to work for me when he was sixteen. He came out to see me, and this was in the depth of the Depression. He wanted a job. I said, "Earl, I can't pay you. I don't have any money." I said, "I've got too big a family and I've got to do all the work myself, I can't hire you." He said, "I don't want any money. I want to work for you." I said, "Earl. I can't do that, that's impossible. I can't just have you work just for nothing." Well, he said, "I want to work for you." He said, "My dad worked for your wife's uncle years ago. He thinks well of the family." And he said, "I'd like to work for you." We finally figured out fifty cents a

day. That's what I paid him, fifty cents a day. He worked for me forty-nine years over time. Of course, I furnished him transportation plus all the benefits that we had for everything else. And toward the last, he got so he couldn't. . . . Well, he'd come out there, but he didn't do any work, but we paid him just the same. Then I had him in the University of California Hospital, and they took out one kidney and took out a lobe of one lung, and he just got well like that. He retired, and he and his wife lived happily for quite a number of years. But he wanted to work for me whether I paid him or not, but I said, "No, I can't do that." But fifty cents a day. Anybody today would say, "Well, you exploited him." Well, I guess I did. But anyway, I think if a farmer can't stand it, it's just like Truman said, "If you can't stand the heat, get out of the kitchen." And I have sympathy for the guy who loses out, but I can't help him. If he can't help himself, I can't help him. He needs to be doing something else. My dad never made anything economically, but he contributed far, far more by

the kind of character he imbued each child with. It's better than if he'd left them a million dollars apiece. So being successful economically is not all there is to it. I don't think they need to stay in farming if they don't fit, any more than I would fit in one of my brother's engineering capacities. I just wouldn't fit, or it would fit like a glove on a man's nose or something. It just don't belong there.

TRELEVEN: So it's the better business farmer who will survive.

GRANT: Yes. And that's the way it will be and you can have all the do-gooder ideas you want and all the sympathy you want for the rest of them, but you either have a socialistic system or you have private enterprise system--one or the other. And we have modified it and mixed it up so that we've fouled things up to quite an extent, but eventually we'll have one or the other.

TRELEVEN: Well, you explained how through the county then you became involved in representing the district I guess on the board of the California Farm Bureau Federation. And again, you were drafted

to run for president?

GRANT: Yes, I was a delegate, which was a voting delegate, to represent this [San Joaquin] Valley here, five counties. And they seemed to. . . . Well, actually what does that is being articulate enough to express your feelings, your philosophy, and they either buy it or they don't. And they seemed to buy my philosophy, and I was saying the things each farmer in the Farm Bureau wished he could say, and saying it to legislators and saying it to Rotary clubs, Lions clubs, church groups, because I was making speeches all over the place. Even when I didn't have time, why, they'd ask me to come and speak. Also, because I was involved in education circles and I was speaking on farm credit or education or Farm Bureau or church matters. So I was known all over everywhere, and that's why they wanted me to serve on the legislature. I said, "No, I won't do it."

TRELEVEN: Who? Who wanted you to serve on the legislature?

GRANT: Well, when [J.] Howard Williams was a state senator from this area, he came to see me one time out at the ranch. He said, "Allan, I'm

dying of cancer and I want you to take my place." I said, "Howard, I'm not going to do it." He said, "Why not?" I said, "I made up my mind a long time ago to work in all kinds of voluntary activities, unpaid activities, and that's where I'm going to stay." He said, "But they need you in the legislature." I said, "No, they don't, Howard. You just think they do. There's somebody else who could do that as well or better than I." He said, "Will you consider it?" I said, "Sure, I'll consider anything for a friend, but I'm not interested in it. I'm interested in the fact that you're doing a good job, and I want someone to take your place if you're as sick as you say you are, but I don't want to do it myself." Well, the Republican Central Committee came to me after he died--he just died six weeks later--and told me Howard said to come to talk to you. I said, "I told Howard I didn't want to do it." They were angry. They said, "Your name is in the paper all the time, and we can just put you in there without any trouble at all." I said, "No, I'm not going to do it." They were angry. But

frankly, about ten years later, the same chairman of the Republican Central Committee came up to me after I was on the Foreign Trade Advisory Committee, he said, "Allan, we were wrong, you were right. You were influential in our behalf far more than we ever thought you could have been." He said, "We're glad we didn't get you to join the state senate." I said to him when he asked me, I said, "You go see Howard Way. He's a citrus grower over in Exeter and he wants the job. And I'll contribute financially to help him get elected." Well, he was elected, stayed seven years, did a good job. They didn't need me. They thought they did. Well, later they came and wanted me to run for the assembly. Incidentally, I had a mile and three-quarters of fence along the east side of an 840-acre ranch. John Guthrie stopped. . . . He had a ranch, ten thousand acres leased for grass. He was a cattleman north of me. Well, I guess part of it was farm, so he didn't have that, but he had a lot of acres. He said, "Allan, we need you in the state legislature and assembly." I said, "John, what are you talking about?" I said, "You're a

lifelong Democrat and I'm a lifelong Republican. What are you talking about?" He said, "I'll organize the Democrats, and you talk to the Republicans, and the two parties will put you in there just. . . . You won't have any opposition." I said, "John, you're crazy." I said, "That won't work, and you know it if you think about it a little bit. It can't work that way." He said, "Oh yes, it could." I said, "I won't do it, John, so just forget it." And then the Republicans came to me and wanted me to run, and I said, "Again, I'll tell you I'm not going to do it." I said, "There's a dentist [Gordon W. Duffy] over in Kings County and that's part of his district. He wants the job, and I think you can get my wife talked into supporting him and sponsoring him. And that way you get my name through her." Well, he was elected and he stayed and did a good job. But the legislature didn't need me. But you get your name in the paper and everybody thinks, "Well, he can do it. He's out there all the time, so let's have him do this too." They'll have you do everything they want you to do if you don't look out. So I chose what

to do, and when they asked me, I said, "Yeah, that fits, but this other thing doesn't."

TRELEVEN: What was the name of the dentist who got elected? Do you recall?

GRANT: Howard Way was the state senator for Exeter.

TRELEVEN: Senator. But then . . .

GRANT: I can't think of the dentist's name. I'd have to ask my wife.

TRELEVEN: Where's he from?

GRANT: He was from Kings County.

TRELEVEN: Oh, okay. We have a way we can look it up.

GRANT: Yeah, we can find it out. But he was a dentist, and I can't think of his name right now.

TRELEVEN: So when you were being asked to run for the legislature, was this while you were president of the California Farm Bureau?

GRANT: This was before I was president of the California Farm Bureau.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: I probably was a voting delegate, maybe president of the county Farm Bureau or some of those things back there. I don't remember just what it was.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: It's interesting to think about it, because my

philosophy is you do what you want to do in this country. You don't have to do what somebody else wants you to do. You can still contribute with your own volition and your own choice of what you contribute. I like that.

TRELEVEN: Is there anything you can think of offhand that made you not want to be a legislator?

GRANT: I'm not opposed to legislators. They're necessary. But also there's another thing, and that is in order to get votes if you want to accomplish something, you've got to see who's on the other side and you've got to see to what degree do I have to compromise my own ethics to get this man to support me. And it's pretty hard for me to figure out how I would ever compromise my own ethics. Too hardheaded or something to do that. But they have to do it, and I don't find fault with them for doing it. But for me to do that would be, I don't say more difficult, because it may be very difficult for them, I don't know. But it would be very difficult for me to compromise my ethics, to say I've got to get Joe Blow's vote on this so I'll have to modify my position so much. I don't want to do

that. I don't hold myself up as any paragon of virtue or anything like that. I just . . .

TRELEVEN: No . . .

GRANT: That's the way I am.

TRELEVEN: Right, right.

GRANT: And I don't change much.

TRELEVEN: You didn't want to get involved in the hurly-burly of politics. And the trade-offs.

GRANT: No, I guess that's part of it. But I wouldn't fault somebody for doing it, because we need them.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: But we also need somebody who will say to them, "Now, wait a minute, you're moving too far. You can't go that far. I can't support you." Just like I told [United States Senator Alan] Cranston, I said, "Cranston, I don't care who runs against you, I'll vote for him if he's a Democrat or if he's an independent or whatever he is. You don't belong where you are. You're a wrong one." Well, that's pretty plain spoken. I think I probably told you that when [United States Senator Robert] Bob Dole called me on the phone when I was president of the American Farm

Bureau, he said, "Allan, what do you think of my bill?" I said, "You're talking about that bill you put in for those tractor drivers who drove their tractors to Washington, D.C.?" "Yes," he said. I said, "That's to give them a guaranteed profit." I said, "You're clear off base, Bob." He said, "What do you mean by that?" I said, "It's irresponsible in the first place for a U.S. senator to put in such a bill. It's irresponsible, and it's not going to move. It's not going anywhere." He said, "Well, that's pretty plain spoken." I said, "Bob, I'm sorry, but you insisted that I tell you what I thought about it, and that's exactly where I am." And that's not what you're supposed to do as the president of the American Farm Bureau, but how do you get out of answering a man when he asks you something like that? You've either got to tell him or you've got to wishy-wash the other way. No, Bob Dole is an opportunist, and I don't want to be an opportunist.

TRELEVEN: When did you start to get involved in the Republican party at the local level?

GRANT: I guess when they wanted me to go into the

legislature is when I. . . . Well, I was always of that persuasion, but when they wanted me to go into the legislature, well, I guess you'd have to say that's when I really, really became. . . . Well, I've contributed to them for a long time, but then I guess is when I really got involved.

TRELEVEN: Does this mean you were part of, what, the county central committee or . . . ?

GRANT: No, I never was.

TRELEVEN: Nothing like that?

GRANT: My oldest son was, but I never was. They wanted me to, but I said, "No, I'll stay out. I'll contribute and I'll help in any way I can, but I don't want to be among the guiding people."

TRELEVEN: So going way back to the time you began to farm, despite [President Herbert C.] Hoover, you remained a Republican?

GRANT: Absolutely. Frankly, I think the beginning of the problem we have now in agriculture was with [President Franklin D.] Roosevelt. I think he . . .

TRELEVEN: Because . . .

GRANT: Not just his New Deal programs, but what happened to the countries that have just now gotten free

of communism. That's Roosevelt's doing. He did it.

TRELEVEN: He did . . .

GRANT: Because there were thousands and thousands of people who begged him not to turn them over to the Russians, begged him. Thousands of them just had almost a wake because of his being so friendly with Uncle Joe, as he called [Joseph] Stalin, and turning over those people to the communists. And so you take the full measure of Roosevelt, and Churchill too, because he agreed. They did intolerable harm to millions and millions of people. And also they started this business of the welfare state and food stamps and the dole. Well, a friend of mine who is active in Boy Scouts up there in the hills told me of his wife's cousin who is real insincere. When you get it right down to individual persons, it's easier to see it. His wife's cousin told him and his wife, "We don't get enough welfare so we're going to have another child. Not because we want the child but because we want the dollars." And so when you analyze that clear down to the base, how'd that come

about? It came about the beginning of it was Roosevelt, the New Deal. So I'm pretty opinionated in my attitude toward socialism. I don't buy it.

TRELEVEN: School lunch program, is that socialism?

GRANT: That's. . . . Well, you can go all the way if you want to. Why do we have service clubs, Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis? Because the church failed. The church used to do it. The church failed. My church failed. And I can make all the excuses I want to, and I can say I belong to the Lions Club because it's a service organization for thirty or forty years. And it finally folded, the Lions Club, but why do we have it? Because the church failed. Well, why did the church fail? You can go on and on and on about that. Everyone doesn't want to belong to a church. We have the freedom to worship or not and to belong to whatever church we want to. So I find no fault with that. But because the church wasn't strong enough to hold them, somebody said, "Well, we can have a service club and everybody can join whether they're of one theological persuasion or another, and we will service the community." But

then the service clubs didn't do all that was necessary, so then we say well, we turn it over to the government. Just like I wanted to build that dam up there. "No, no, let the government do it." So that's where we are. Instead of the church doing what the church is supposed to do, why, we say we'll turn it over to the government. And in some cases like what's going on with the Kurds [in Iraq] and those people over there, it's so big that unless the church had grown along with the population of the world, the church couldn't do it. So my ideas are not good enough for what the situation is today under the circumstances.

TRELEVEN: Well, I asked about school lunch program because that was a New Deal program. Do you feel that that is not a good program?

GRANT: It's a good program because it has to be now under the circumstances, because we had Roosevelt's attitude about the New Deal and the dole and subsidies and all that kind of stuff. So here we are, and so it has to be. Actually, when I was on the Willow school board we had lunches for the kids there in those years. My

philosophy, my theology--philosophy and theology are all the same practically--is I'm opposed to suing anybody. I've never sued anybody in my life, and I don't want to. I was sued twice; the first time I won, the second time I lost the case, but I won because the man was required to pay me \$200,000 in cash, and if you've got that much cash you can do a lot of things. So I really won even though I lost the case. And I could have won the case, because I was a member of the California Livestock Marketing Association board, and the judge had bought cattle through that marketing association and he didn't pay for them. So I could have had another judge. But I just put up with the whole thing until it was over with, so I came out smelling like a rose by getting the \$200,000 cash. Otherwise he would have paid it over ten years, and then a pittance. It doesn't get you anywhere.

TRELEVEN: What did you learn about Sacramento politics when you became president of the California Farm Bureau?

GRANT: One of the things I learned is that even though this country muddles along, usually eventually

they can clear things up. When we got [Governor Edmund G.] "Jerry" Brown [Jr.]--his father [Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Sr.] was a passable guy, but a bungler--but they got Jerry Brown in there, and he put in [Supreme Court Justice Elizabeth] Rose Bird in the supreme court. Then you get the kind of decisions that last for a long, long time, and the people corrected it. After a while they could see it. Some of us saw it coming and others saw it after it happened and decided, "Oh, we can't have this. We've got to correct this," and so they did. And that's still a real strong influence against the Democrats, because all you need to do is mention Rose Bird and then they'll say, "So-and-so is associated with her ideas? Well, we don't want that around." It lasts a long long time. And even though we're muddlers in this kind of democracy, it works over time.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I asked the question because clearly the California Farm Bureau is a power lobbying group, educational group.

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Which shall I call it? I'd better say

educational, right? [Laughter] But you in that capacity as the president would have worked fairly . . .

GRANT: Fred Herringer followed me and he's an extremely good businessman. There's a Herringer Farms, his brother's operation, not some other generation, and they're doing very well economically. But Fred's philosophy is not the same as mine, and his is somewhat different from the basic Farm Bureau philosophy. And so he tried to be real good friends with Jerry Brown, and he liked Rose Bird. And he's never been to an annual meeting of the California Farm Bureau Federation since he left the presidency. He wanted to be reelected and they wouldn't have him, so he's never been to an annual meeting of the California Farm Bureau ever since then. I like him all right. I never did agree very much with his philosophy. But I'm just reiterating what the general public will do, whether it's Farm Bureau or whoever it is.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: They'll eventually come around to where they say, "Oh no, we shouldn't have done that. We're going

to correct it."

TRELEVEN: Well, part of the public wisdom or view is that all the Farm Bureau members think alike. You seem to be saying they don't.

GRANT: No, they don't think alike.

TRELEVEN: They don't? Are there even Democrats in the Farm Bureau?

GRANT: Lots of them.

TRELEVEN: Lots of them? [Laughter]

GRANT: I introduced [Richard] Dick Markarian as a very influential and very excellent farmer in Fresno County. He's a Democrat and a liberal and Armenian. He got me to come and speak one time to a church men's group where he farms. He doesn't go to church, but his wife is very active, and so she asked him to get me, and so I went. So he introduced me at the meeting, and I started out by saying, "I'm pleased to be here, and frankly Dick Markarian is perhaps the most influential and the best board member on the California Farm Bureau Board." When the meeting was over he came to see me, and there were a lot of people there. He said, "Allan, did you really mean that, that I was the most influential man on

the board, the best board member?" I said, "Absolutely, Dick." He said, "How do you come to that conclusion?" I said, "Dick, you're usually wrong." I said, "You make them think and make them debate you, and then they don't just follow me blindly. They make up their own mind . . ."

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on, and you were saying that he was an excellent board member.

GRANT: Well, Dick Markarian was a good board member because he was usually on the wrong side, and I told him so. But I said, "That's worthwhile, Dick. We've got to have both sides. I don't want them just to blindly follow me," which they were inclined to do, because I was respected by the board. They'd think, "Well, maybe he's not quite with me on this, but it's close enough." But with Dick there, man, they'd just hammer and tong with him. They got the thing right out in front, and everybody had their say about it, and they'd always come out against Dick Markarian. And that's absolutely essential. You've got to have the other side or else people will blindly

follow somebody that they may not have good reason to follow.

Another board member, Howard Harris from over in San Benito, he graduated from Berkeley Phi Beta Kappa. Real, real smart. But somebody would bring up some matter, and Howard would say, "That's stupid!" So I took him aside one time and said, "Howard, you're correct, but your suggestion is out of line." I said, "You don't get anywhere telling them they're stupid." He said, "I didn't tell them they're stupid, I said the idea was stupid." I said, "That's all the same, Howard. It's the same price. You've said that was stupid, and that was their idea, so they're stupid. Now quit using that word." And he did quit using that word, and he was a lot more influential.

But we know him, my wife knows his wife, very intelligent. Actually, when we went up for this trial, the IRS [Internal Revenue Service], we sat down at the table in the conference room. Howard said, "Where'd you get the Connecticut marble?" And the lawyer said, "Connecticut marble?" He said, "I've been

meeting in this room for ten years. How do you know it's Connecticut marble?" He said, "I'm a geologist as well as a farmer as well as a specialist in earthquakes." And he said, "I know it's Connecticut marble. That's the only place this kind of marble comes from." And Howard was asked by the city of Hollister to represent them, even though he is not an attorney. And Moscovitz I believe is the water attorney who got the water from Owens Valley for Los Angeles, and he's a well-known attorney. And Howard Harris was the acting attorney for the farmers in the area. And the city of Hollister was trying to get three thousand acre feet of water for the city of Hollister. Howard won the case. They got three hundred acre feet, and Moscovitz at the beginning of the trial said, "I want to see your information." He said, "Come to my house, that's where it is." And so Howard said, "There it is in those file cabinets." And he said, "Twenty-eight file cabinets? It'd take ten years to go over that." "Well," he says, "it's taken me twenty years to accumulate it, but you're welcome to it." So Howard won the case and he is not a

lawyer. So he decided he wanted to show me how a city slicker did something or other when he first saw him. So there are some country yokels that know something; Howard Harris is one of them.

TRELEVEN: Well, I don't want to use these words but I will anyway: liberal and conservative. You seem to be saying there are both liberals and conservatives in the Farm Bureau. Can you differentiate geographically where Farm Bureau members tend to be more liberal and on the other hand more conservative? Is there any way to define that, or is that . . . ?

GRANT: I really don't think there is any way. To some degree. You mentioned O'Neal. Well, there's some that really wanted a liberal persuasion in the Farm Bureau for years and years and years. They're kind of getting away from it now. But for a long, long time that was the liberal persuasion of Farm Bureaus in the South, like O'Neal. And Allan [B.] Kline was kind of the lead dog in a sled dog team wanting things more conservative. And [Charles] Shuman is a conservative from Illinois. And Kuhfuss was conservative. [Dean R.] Kleckner now is

conservative, and I guess I'm conservative on most things, although the kind of benefits I had for my workers is supposed to be liberal. I don't know whether I'm a conservative or liberal, but basically I guess I'm hardboiled conservative. But I don't think it's. . . . I think rural people basically are more conservative than city people and a lot more conservative than any city that is a university town. Merced doesn't want. . . . The country people don't want a campus of the University of California at Merced. The big branch that they've been considering. And there are signs on the highway there: "No new city for the university." "Don't put the university in our county," because you just take a look at Santa Cruz and see what change that made when they put the university campus over there. Before that it was relatively conservative. Then you put a university there, it becomes almost ultraliberal with pass-fail ideas in the university and so on. So basically, country people, Democrats and Republicans, are basically conservative. City people are more liberal. And I think I mentioned

to you that one of the things I'm working on now is to get some seminars set up, and I've got a man from Texas who's doing it in California now. He's going to go up to the Dakotas pretty soon. He's been in Georgia. Seminars to help young clergymen--Roman Catholic, Protestant, any of the denominations of Protestantism--to understand what is the situation I'm getting myself into as a new clergyman here. Who are the decision makers in this community? What are the basic motivations of these people? What do they like and dislike about what's happening in the government? Then besides that, you have lots more Hispanics, lots more Asiatics now, so you've got different cultures that you get into. And you don't want any young man to fail in whatever endeavor he's entering as a clergyman or farmer or businessman or what. So that's what I'm doing now. And first meeting we had I may have mentioned to you had twenty-some odd clergymen there. And they all said, "Boy, this is what we need for our young men who are coming into the job," whether it's as a priest in the Catholic church or the Anglican church, or Protestant

minister, whatever. They need it badly. So that's another thing I'm working on. That makes me a liberal too, wanting to help somebody to be successful.

TRELEVEN: You said it, I didn't. [Laughter]

GRANT: [Laughter] Yeah, I said it.

TRELEVEN: You mentioned the Reagan phone call before, and this gets us to the California State Board of Agriculture. Had you had anything to do with the board of agriculture before?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: Nothing at all. Although I take it that Farm Bureau leaders had probably typically been selected.

GRANT: A chairman or member of the board of agriculture was named by the governor. He had to be someone known to the governor or known to the governor's advisers, and to be known he had to be active in some kind of a farm organization or they wouldn't know who he was. The main farm organization that involved crops was the Farm Bureau, so it's very likely to be a Farm Bureau member, even though he may spend most of his time at one of the marketing coops [cooperatives] or something like

that. But he's very likely to be a Farm Bureau member, even if he is active in his own marketing cooperative. But to be actually factual about it, when there was a question as to who would run for governor, I would see Reagan and I knew something about his ideas, his philosophies, because he'd been speaking different places. So I went to see him at his. . . . It was in his home, I've forgotten now. And I said, "Are you going to run for governor?" He said, "Yes, I am." I said, "Well, it's against the rules of the Farm Bureau for me to be partisan in my activity," but I said, "I'd like to hear what you have to say about what's your philosophy and so on," so we talked a while. I said, "Well, I'm going to openly and avowedly support you against Governor [Pat] Brown." But I said, "It's against the Farm Bureau rules, so I'm going to tell the Farm Bureau." So I did at the next board meeting of the Farm Bureau, I said, "Brown is going to get us into bankruptcy if we don't look out. He's got us going that direction, and so I'm going to openly support Reagan, who is going to run for governor."

"Now," I said, "if you want me to quit the presidency of the Farm Bureau now, I'll quit. But I'm going to do this for the good of California." But I said, "If Reagan loses, I will quit, but if he wins then you decide whether you want to kick me out then or if you want me to go now." And they said, "No, go ahead." And so I broke the rules of the Farm Bureau supporting him. That contributed to his choosing me for the presidency of the state board of agriculture. And when he called me I said, "Doesn't that automatically put me on the board of regents?" "Yeah, that's what I want to talk to you about." But he didn't say any more about it, state board of agriculture. That's all the way you do it.

TRELEVEN: Well, I don't want to get too far ahead of the story, but let me ask the question since. . . . What did he talk to you about in terms of the board of regents?

GRANT: How long I'd been interested in education, what had I done in educational circles, and why was I interested in education. And I told him I had no idea I'd ever be on the board of regents of

the university without a degree. Why would they want me? And he said, "Well, I want you," after we had talked about what I had done. And then I've started way, way back there as a commissioner to Eisenhower's White House Conference [on Education], so he said he wanted me to be there. And so that's how I got there.

TRELEVEN: Okay. One of his . . .

GRANT: Again, I didn't ask for it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. One of the planks in his platform was to clean up the mess at Berkeley. You agreed with that.

GRANT: Yes, well, you saw the letter that he wrote to me.

TRELEVEN: Right. But to go back to the political thing, and you can explain this to me, as I understand it there was a schism in the Republican party about the mid-sixties and which faction of the party is going to have the power. The conservatives ended up with the power, and that led to Reagan. Is that roughly your recollection of what happened?

GRANT: Yes, to some degree. Also, I told Reagan, I said, "I don't know you at all, but you've

outlined your philosophy." And I said, "If your name was 'Jim Smith' I'd be supporting you. And so I'm not supporting you because you're Ronald Reagan, I'm supporting you because your philosophy is the same that I have, and that's what I want." And he looked startled and surprised, because I guess everyone wants to be friends with him. But I said, "I'm not supporting you because you're Ronald Reagan. I'm supporting you because your philosophy is what I want in the governorship of the state." And he accepted that, although it surprised him, because I guess most people don't say that.

TRELEVEN: And that philosophy being . . .

GRANT: Being order, and stop the chaotic situation that we have, and have an orderly situation with economic freedom, and stop this business of anarchy. I think I told you I had a Black Panther on my back physically one time. I was asked to speak about university matters to a big crowd. And the Students for a Democratic Society were there, and the Black Panthers, and all those. And I started to speak, and they hissed and booed, and I tried again, and they hissed and

booed. And I said, "Well, I can't understand your argument. I never was taught that. I was taught early to understand English, but I don't understand your language. Will you let me speak? Maybe you can understand mine." Then they calmed down a little bit, but pretty soon they started to boo and hiss again. I said, "Well, I've said some of the things I wanted to say. Now will you let me say some more?" And then some of them laughed, so that calmed them down some more. So I got through the speech all right. But the situation was chaotic, there's no question about it. And one of the things you asked me in a question was whose influence did I listen to or feel more than some others. Sidney Hook was one of them, Professor Sidney Hook. I don't know if you know him or not. But anyway, I listened to him. Alex [C.] Sherriffs was very good as the chief liaison officer for education. And I had the benefit of listening to him, though I don't agree with him entirely. But I don't agree with anybody entirely. They probably don't agree with me either. [Laughter] But I think that's one of the privileges we have

is to make up our own mind.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, before getting on to the regency in earnest, looking at Willow Elementary School and Visalia Union High School and the board of state school trustees association, again, that's part of your busy activity outside the farm. What did you feel you learned from those experiences that helped you become a more knowledgeable regent when you were asked to become one?

GRANT: Well, I think one of them is to see where the opposition is and see what you can do about it without having a face-to-face confrontation. For instance, when they were going to build this second high school here, the lead opposition was the owner of the Caterpillar dealership, Jack Treanor. So at the high school board meeting, I said, "Let's get Jack Treanor to go with us when we go to Sacramento to see if we can get some state funds to help build the high school." Well, they thought I was crazy. The only one who agreed with me was Hilton Bell, the superintendent, but he couldn't say much, because it was a board meeting. And I said, "No, let's see if Jack Treanor will go up there and listen,

because he'll get a broad picture of the whole of California and get some demographics that he doesn't have, and see what we can do." So I went back. . . . They finally agreed, but it was hammer and tongs to get them to agree. They all thought I was crazy. I went back to see Jack Treanor and asked him, "Will you go with us up to Sacramento so you can know the same things we know about the need for a new high school, the demographics of this area as well as the state of California, where the direction of growth is, and what's in the future for Tulare County/San Joaquin Valley?" He said, "Yeah, I'd like to go." Well, there you are. And so he said he would go. Not only that, he said, "I'll fly you up there in my airplane." So I went back to the board members and told them, and so we took Jack Treanor with us. When we came back, Jack Treanor, the lead opposition, was the lead force for building the new high school. Didn't have a nickel's worth of trouble. They wanted a new high school when Jack Treanor got behind it. And when just the school business, but when the. . . . I told you the story about Harry Tow, the city

manager, and the hospital. I eliminated the opposition to building a hospital, and it went through like that. They wanted a hospital. They didn't have somebody leading the opposition, and so we got the hospital. So you asked what did I learn. I learned I think the best way to win is to eliminate the opposition. I used to box when I was a kid. I used to go down to the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association] in San Pedro when the fleet was in, and I never got knocked down, I never got knocked out. I never even got knocked down, but, man alive, I sure wished for the bell several times. Whoo, man. But anyway, eliminate the opposition, and you've got part of it made.

TRELEVEN: Now, one further question, and then I think we will decide what to do then. We can go on to the regents or we can postpone till tomorrow. But what's the background behind your being invited to Washington, D.C., for the White House Conference on Education back in the fifties during the Eisenhower administration?

GRANT: That decision was made of course by people in educational circles in the state of California.

And I was speaking about education and promoting various ideas and ideals in education all over the state, because I was on the state school board association and the city boards, and having served on the elementary and high school boards, where they felt that I was knowledgeable enough to speak articulately about what they were interested in having said. So I think that's why they asked me to do it. You said that they send the names in, and then Eisenhower picks the names from their recommendations in the different parts of the country.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And by state school board, you meant the State School Trustees Association?

GRANT: Yes, the State School Trustees Association.

TRELEVEN: I see, I see. So you attended a conference, and we have a year on that. I think it was, what?

GRANT: I don't remember the year. But of course, when I came home from that they were wanting me to talk about it and analyze it and speak all over the state about it. And so that of course puts you in the position where your name is commonly known everywhere. And so one thing builds right on top of another, and pretty soon you're known not only

to farm people but to. . . . Well, I was known to church people, to education people, to farm people, and so on. That's why it comes about just kind of automatically.

TRELEVEN: What are a couple of things that you would tell people about the White House conference? What sticks out in your mind as having been significant about that conference?

GRANT: Well, it's too long ago for me to remember specifically or intimately.

TRELEVEN: No, sure.

GRANT: I have an acquaintanceship with it, but the main thing was that it was Eisenhower's opinion, and mine of course--that's why I remember it--his idea was you've got to do it at home. We can do all we can from Washington, but you've got to motivate the thing at home. And you've got to get your own people interested enough to be willing to support whatever you have in mind. And whatever you have in mind ought to be basics and not frills. And that's generally I think a very, very concentrated way of saying what I got out of it, was that he agreed that my philosophy of government and government intervention and so

on, that subvention of Washington funds to the state and subvention of state funds to the local district. One of the problems we've had over time is that pretty soon it begins to look there first. We want more and more and more from where it came from, because it seems so easy. And so you can find fault with it or you can agree with it, whichever you like. It just grows whichever way you have it. If you want government money, the demand for it continues to grow. If you want to do it yourself, that's harder to do, because you've got to convince people that are right there listening to you. But it's basically better I think. And that's what the Eisenhower Conference on Education seemed to be: Get with it! You need something, get it done. It was at that time when I came home from that meeting that I spoke about the need for additional scientists and engineers that we weren't getting. Right now we've got the same thing again. We're going to be short of engineers they say about twenty years from now if we don't get with it, because of the tremendous change in communications and all the rest of it that's happening at the present

time. If we don't do something about our growing shortage of engineers and scientists, we're going to get behind Japan and Germany. Germany is pretty. . . . They're pretty sharp people, even though we don't like some of the things they've done over history. They're pretty, pretty sharp economically.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Okay. Let's get back to Governor Reagan. How long did you have to think before saying yes or no to Reagan's wanting you to become the president of the board of agriculture and therefore a regent of the university.

GRANT: It was one conversation, one telephone conversation. That's all.

TRELEVEN: That was it?

GRANT: I asked him, yes, I asked him what he had in mind. I said, "What are your concerns?" And he voiced his concerns. I said, "They're the same as mine up to now. I haven't heard you except this one time," because when I met him at his home we didn't talk about that. We talked about the general government of California. So when I asked him different questions about the university and so on, well, generally speaking,

it was the same idea I had. So it was just that one conversation. I said, "Okay, I'll do it."

TRELEVEN: Okay. So if there are any pros and cons to weigh, you weighed them during the conversation, and you said yes.

GRANT: That's right. Of course, again I have to come to why I served on local boards in the first place. Alex Sherriffs and Reagan. . . . Alex Sherriffs was kind of an adviser to him.

TRELEVEN: Right, I think he'd been dean of students or undergraduate students at Berkeley.

GRANT: Something like that. And he had not vastly different but he had somewhat different ideas from what Sidney Hook had. And there are other professors that I visited with at that time. I can't think of the names now. I can see one of them. He's about six feet three or four or something, bald-headed, very sharp kind of a man, but I can't think of his name. And there were two or three others that I visited with who were of a relatively conservative mind. And Sidney Hook was one of them. And one of them was. . . . Oh, what do you call the atomic energy activity in Silicon Valley?

TRELEVEN: Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.

GRANT: Yeah, Livermore. I can't think of the man's name who was the lead scientist in that, and I visited with him quite a bit, but I can't say his name right now.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, we can fill that in.

GRANT: Yeah, but anyway . . .

TRELEVEN: He was in terms of someone who had an influence on you?

GRANT: Yes. I don't know whether he had an influence. He was supportive of what I was interested in. I was supportive of his zeal for research, so whether it's fair to say he had an influence on me or I had an influence on him, I don't know that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Right.

GRANT: But as far as loco parentis is concerned, Alex Sherriffs seemed to me to want a little more regulation of the students because they were still kids, and I didn't quite agree with that. I thought we ought to be handling more on a positive basis that we needed academic freedom, and children, whether sixteen, twenty-two, or whatever, don't have the experience behind them

that the faculty does, that the Academic Senate does. Therefore, they ought not to be making the decisions. When you think what happened at Harvard [University] and Columbia [University] and, well, Oberlin [College], some of the small colleges, it's crazy. They didn't belong. Their ideas didn't belong there at all. They didn't have the experience, they didn't have the knowledge, and the blacks were the craziest ones too. They were led by people outside the university, a lot of them.

TRELEVEN: Like Eldridge Cleaver, for instance?

GRANT: Rap Brown and Eldridge Cleaver and, of course, what's the girl's name?

TRELEVEN: Angela [Y.] Davis?

GRANT: Yeah. She was a student of course part of the time.

TRELEVEN: Well, she was a lecturer until the regents fired her. Right? Which we'll get into more detail about.

GRANT: I had as much trouble with the church people as I did with the board of regents on that, because the church people were, generally speaking, led by people of liberal persuasion--the hierarchy.

TRELEVEN: At the national Presbyterian level.

GRANT: Yes. Also, the Jesuits have a tremendous history of helping people to become better educated and more knowledgeable. But in too many cases they moved over too far to the left for my money. And I think the reason that those down in San Salvador got killed is because of their leftist persuasion, and the extreme rightists decided that they don't need them. I'm not in favor of what they did, but I think that's possibly what happened. And yet the Jesuits have a whole lot to be proud of over history. But they have the same thing in the Protestant churches, the Mennonite churches. Too much of the hierarchy is too much leftist.

TRELEVEN: Right, and you sort of got into this because of I guess what students were advocating they wanted at that period, which had to go under . . .

GRANT: Yeah, they wanted to decide who should teach and what they should teach. They don't even know. If you asked them they wouldn't know. And that's when I had that Black Panther on my back, because the students started asking me questions. The police came and made a V and got them out of

there, and I was turned around to answer a question. Immediately they closed up around me. The Black Panther got up on the table behind me and jumped over the students and onto my back. And I dropped my briefcase and got a lick or two at him and that's all. And if the students hadn't support. . . . They said, "Let him go. He's answering our questions." They weren't satisfied with the answers, but at least I was talking to them. And the Black Panthers, about a hundred of them, in the background behind the students yelling, "Knock the SOB down! Kick his teeth out!" And I don't know if I'd look like I do now if the students hadn't protected me. That's not an argument. If you're going to discuss something, discuss it. But don't start violence. And to occupy Sproul Hall, even though they didn't knock anybody down, that's violence. That isn't a discussion. So I'm for academic freedom. I'm not for violence. And I had a real knock-down-drag-out argument with the ambassador from Mexico to the United States about the new world economic order mixing up Marxism with capitalism liberation theology. He made a

speech to the Presbytery. Every single person there stood up except Allan Grant. Everyone stood up for the S. of a B. He made a pretty speech, and I guess that's why they stood up. But a pretty speech, it was clear off base from my philosophical standpoint. I don't know why they stood up. I wouldn't do that. Over in Libya [Muammar] Qaddafi made a speech. Everybody stood up except these two people here, my wife and I. He didn't like me. I don't blame him. Why should he?

TRELEVEN: Well, just so we have it on the record, the speech you gave and the altercation with the Panthers, do you remember where that was?

GRANT: It was in an auditorium. I don't remember who asked me or what it was about, but. . . . Well, it was about the university and about academic freedom and about the need for a common sense discussion and debate and yelling and screaming and yelling obscenities and deciding who should and who should not teach arbitrarily is not the way to do it. But that's basically what I was talking about. But they wanted to make the decision themselves, so when I said, "No, we have

to do it in an orderly way," they didn't like that. They didn't like me. That's all right.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, it's going on four, and Mrs. Grant has arrived, and I think that might be a cue that  
. . .

GRANT: Well, she's going to want to take me home and feed me. Not home, but to our daughter's place.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. So I wonder if this would be a good place to leave it, and we can pick it up tomorrow in earnest with your first board meeting, which was rather exciting. [Laughter]

GRANT: Yes. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: And get back to it at that point. So till tomorrow, thank you.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Session 2, April 30, 1991]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's April 30, and I'm in Visalia back with Allan Grant this morning. We were going to plunge headlong into the regents, but I had a couple follow-up questions after listening to the tapes that we made yesterday. In terms of your farming operation, how many employees would you say you had at any one given time?

GRANT: I think about seventeen was the most, and that was for quite a length of time.

TRELEVEN: Wow, so a big operation. And in terms of the bookkeeping for the farming operations, did your wife take care of that, or did you? How did you manage that paperwork aspect?

GRANT: Well, she and I took care of that for a long time. Then we had a little sick boy one time, and she was all over the state trying to find some help for him. He had encephalitis, sleeping sickness, and it destroyed his mentality, and so

he's now in a home. But at that time, when she was away so much, I was trying to take care of the children and do the farming and do the bookkeeping and so on. And so I wasn't doing a very good job at any of it. And I got a call from a man who said he was from the IRS and he wanted to look at my books for 1945-46. I said, "That's three years ago. How do I remember those kind of things?" Well, he said, "That's up to you. But we have to go over that record." So he came out to the ranch and we went over the record as well as I could, digging up what answers he wanted. Finally, he said, "Well, Mr. Grant, it's apparent that you're an honest man, but I'm here to collect for Uncle Sam and I intend to do it." I said, "What you have said is I don't owe anything, but you're going to collect anyway." And he said, "Well, you can say it that way if you like." I said, "Well, how do you come to that conclusion?" Well, he said, "You finance your operation and you show that you sold so many cattle one week. You turned over the money, so you say, the following week or two weeks later to your financing institution. It doesn't check

exactly. It may check dollarwise, but not dollars and cents." So he said, "I don't think you sold ten cows. I think you sold twenty cows. Now prove you sold ten and I'll be satisfied." I said, "I can't do that, it's impossible." "Well then," he said, "we'll collect the back taxes, interest, and penalty." So I paid it, but from that time on we've had an accountant and we've never had any trouble at all. And we should have had one sooner. However, somebody, maybe the man himself, I don't know, sent me a tear sheet out of a newspaper about six weeks later which said Frank Remanowski was sentenced to Leavenworth [Federal Penitentiary] for taking taxpayers' money and telling people that he was from the IRS.

TRELEVEN: No kidding. That was the person? I'll be darned.

GRANT: So we've always had an accountant since then, except sometimes we pay him several thousand dollars a year.

TRELEVEN: Sure.

GRANT: We pay him by the year, but we've never had any trouble.

TRELEVEN: I take it over that period of time the amount of paper required by the government has increased?

GRANT: Oh yes, oh yes, all kinds.

TRELEVEN: Which is one reason you love governments so much. [Laughter]

GRANT: We lease the ranch that we own at the present time, but we have to carry insurance on that ranch. But the man who leases it also has to carry duplicate insurance, so they charge double for the same risk.

TRELEVEN: You mentioned that there were some old-timers in Tulare and Kings County Farm Bureaus who looked at you as a fairly young whippersnapper and wanted to recruit you into leadership positions. Do you remember the names of some of those old-timers?

GRANT: Well, one of the oldest ones I remember was John Riggan, who was the ditch tender taking care of the ditch that delivered the appropriated water to the ranch we had at that time. And let's see, who else? Earl Henry was a farmer in the neighborhood. In fact, he was the first man who came to see me to get me to join the Farm Bureau.

TRELEVEN: Earl Henry, and he'd been an old-time member of

the Farm Bureau.

GRANT: He was a member of the Farm Bureau and was probably there when they first started. He was the one along with John Riggin who came and contacted me and asked me to join the Farm Bureau, and the fee was five dollars a year at that time.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, I wanted to ask that, because I don't know if it's recorded anywhere.

GRANT: Maybe, but I don't think so.

TRELEVEN: Now we've preserved these names for a while. As you were contacted constantly and agreed to participate in various organizations, was this a decision you just made by yourself? Did you talk it over with your wife? How did that work?

GRANT: Yes, we always talked things over before we spent any money for any material thing. So she was always a full partner as far as that's concerned, knowing what I was doing and why I did it. In fact, I had a notion to join the Masonic Order one time, and she was vigorously opposed to that, and I didn't feel nearly as. . . . I didn't feel strongly one way or the other, so I never joined the Masonic Order. And so I just mention that

illustrative of the fact that she and I did talk things over and tried to come to an agreement on whatever we did of any real import.

TRELEVEN: Well, I asked that, because it seems each time you did this it would take you away increasingly from the farming operation.

GRANT: Yes, when you come right down to it, being active in the Farm Bureau as a top leader for sixteen total years . . .

TRELEVEN: That's right.

GRANT: . . . during which time of course I wore a three-piece suit and an Albert chain, and was away from home most of that time. But after the children were grown, of course, she was with me a good deal of that time, and therefore she traveled with me to various countries and to various states in the United States.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: I think I mentioned to you that the last year I was president of the American Farm Bureau I was in nine countries and twenty-eight states in that one single year.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: And she was with me quite a little of that time.

TRELEVEN: You mentioned that that there were anti-Catholic feelings that ran in the community a bit. Was this what kind of anti-Papist sentiment that you'd seen here in the twenties and thirties? Was that flagrant at that time?

GRANT: It was dying out at that time, just the same as the anti-Negro feeling was dying out. Visalia at one time had a sign at both ends of the town, "No black stays overnight in this town." That was before I came. So the feeling was pretty high earlier, but it was dying out when I came, and frankly I hope I contributed to some degree to elimination of those strong feelings against Catholics, against blacks, against Hispanics, and others. I did the best I could and I hoped I helped to some degree to eliminate it. It does not exist now as nearly as I can tell, except that deep within some people it's still there, but it doesn't show as much as it did.

TRELEVEN: Because I know in some areas of the country, Midwest for instance, there was Ku Klux Klan activity, and it was more anti-Catholic than it was anti-black or anti-Semitic.

GRANT: You still have hate groups throughout the nation,

skinheads, as they call them, and radical blacks who are separatists, and so on. We still have those kind of things, but it's not visible here. In fact, the monsignor at the Catholic church said to me when I was in the hospital--one of the two times I've been in the hospital in my life--in his broad Irish brogue said, "Allan, you're not in the faith, but we like you just the same."

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] You mentioned yesterday that you found yourself philosophically in agreement with Ronald Reagan.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Before he announced that he was going to run for governor and then as he did run, what specifically did you like about his views relating to agriculture?

GRANT: Well, first thing he's not from agriculture and he's willing to listen. That's the first thing. The next thing is his opinion not on just agriculture but on everything meant the least government is the best government, providing you take care of the needs of the people that can only be handled by government. And I agree with

that wholeheartedly. And his strong feeling of patriotism appealed to me, I suppose because my father being an immigrant, being as patriotic as he was, gave me a considerable amount of that also. So my philosophy, my theology, and my patriotism were all mixed in one bag. They are all part of me, and Reagan seemed to have that same kind of attitude toward life.

TRELEVEN: Well, if you can remember back to the sixties, in terms of California agriculture, what were the chief problems that you felt should be addressed by a Reagan administration?

GRANT: The chief problem we had was markets as nearly as I can recall at the present time. Different people have told me that when I became president of the American Farm Bureau I helped to a high degree to nurture the knowledge, budding knowledge, on the part of American Farmers that they had a world market which they needed to attend to and not just a national market or a state market, a local market. Credit has been given to me by writers in different periodicals that I broadened the vision of American agriculture to a world vision. I hope that's

true to some degree.

TRELEVEN: And so in terms of California, this would mean in terms of export markets, that more attention should be given to those . . .

GRANT: Export markets and the idea that the Pacific Rim was going to be the biggest market of all for California in the future, Pacific Rim nations.

TRELEVEN: Okay. At the time Reagan became governor, how bothersome was the problem of César Chávez down a few miles south in Delano?

GRANT: It was just really beginning at that time. As I think you realize from my own feelings, my own attitude, my own relationship with my employees, I had no opposition to employees being treated as well as possible, economically as far as the farmer is concerned, but in every possible way. But Mr. Chávez I think helped to some degree, because he kept the thing in the forefront in the minds of everybody: consumers, farmers, and farmworkers. So to that degree, yeah. In some other ways I didn't agree with Mr. Chávez at all. And I was on a national program. I can't remember the man's name [Hugh Downs] who was in charge of it at the moment, but when we had a

break in the program he said, "Mr. Grant, I have to tell you something that I don't want you to repeat, but I want you to know how I feel." He said, "Walter [P.] Reuther and César Chávez are one of a kind. They have an objective in the distance that they're aiming for, and nothing is going to defer them from that. And anything they want to do they consider morally right to get it done." I said, "Yes, I know that. I know that about Mr. Chávez. I'm not that familiar with Walter Reuther, but I know that to be the case."

Further, I'll mention the fact that an ordained Protestant minister was called in at one time when I had a meeting of farmers from every Protestant denomination I could think of-- Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Church of Christ, Nazarene, etcetera. Twenty-eight of them together to meet with the Northern California Council of Churches. The chairman of that group was talking with me prior to getting the meeting come to order, and I said, "They don't want this minister in here with him." He said, "Why not?" I said, "Because he's lied to them." "Oh

no," he says, "he wouldn't do any such thing. He's an ordained Protestant minister." I said, "Call him in. I want to ask him two questions, that's all." He became Mr. Chávez's right hand man, left the ministry to do that. And I said to him, "I want to ask you two questions. Will you answer me?" And he said, "Yes, freely." I said, "Do you think the end justifies the means?" He said, "Absolutely." I said, "Are you willing to lie to obtain your objective?" He said, "Anytime, day or night." Then the chairman of that Northern California Council of Churches sat back in his chair and said, "Do you know what you said?" He said, "I know exactly what I said." So with that kind of philosophy--Mr. Chávez and his people seem to have that kind of philosophy--I couldn't agree with his tactics, although I could agree that he wanted farmworkers to have a better lot in life than they had.

TRELEVEN: Remember the name of the minister?

GRANT: I will have it in a minute, but I can't think of it right at the moment.

TRELEVEN: Well, we can fill it in. [Chris Hartmire]

GRANT: He happens to be a Presbyterian minister.

TRELEVEN: We can fill it in later.

GRANT: Yes. Be sure and remind me, because I'll think of it, but I can't think of it right now.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you would concede that on some ranches  
. . .

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . there were problems because of employers who were not treating the employees very well?

GRANT: I think I mentioned to you that my direct neighbor next door to me was paying fifteen cents an hour during the Depression. I was paying twenty-five, and a big ranch down the 99 highway was paying eighteen cents, and so there's no question but people have different attitudes toward their employees. And I don't disagree with people who have different attitudes, because employees are not all the same either.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: But there is a matter of equity.

TRELEVEN: Some years ago I was interviewing some old-time trade union organizers, industrial union organizers, and at some point usually in every discussion they would honestly say, "You know, you don't need a union if you have good

management."

GRANT: Well, to a great degree that's true. But I remember working for wages when I was getting ready to go to school, and when Edward L. Doheny was building a refinery down in southern California. . . . I think they called it Willows. It was north of the port city San Pedro, and I was told that it looked like this. They hired five hundred and fired five hundred every day.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: And it was just common labor, and that's all I wanted then was any kind of job to get some money behind me to go to school. And one of the jobs I had was sixteen men lifting a sheet of steel for the floor of a tank for crude oil. And that had to be riveted together. Eight men would let go and get under it with their backs and hold it in position while the other eight maneuvered it around . . .

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: . . . to line up the holes for the riveters. And the pusher, so called--that's what he was, a pusher--stood on that steel, and you lifted him

on with the steel. And he cursed and verbally flayed the men as they lifted it and got after them. And one young man standing near where I was lifting spoke up to him. He jumped and kicked the man in his chest which knocked him down, and then he stamped him into unconsciousness. And the others couldn't let go of the steel or it would cut somebody's legs off, so the man had no help. The sequel to it, though, was when those men had a chance to get together during the day, that night they did something which caused the foreman to have a different pusher the next day. He was in the hospital. They really almost killed him for what he did to that young man. So unions had to come under those circumstances. And so I'm not opposed to unions, but I am for trying to get things done without violence.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When Chávez calls for a boycott of table grapes, is that a form of violence?

GRANT: That's a form of violence and it's absolutely unfair. I remember during that time when I left church after the service, a lady came to me and said, "Mr. Grant, what are we going to do?" She

said, "He's threatened to boycott our grapes. Now my husband and I and our son do all the work on that forty acres of grapes. That's the farm we have. That's how we make a living." And she said, "If he doesn't allow us to sell them we'll lose the farm." And I said, "Well, his boycott is not aimed at you. He's aiming it at someone else but he's hitting you inadvertently, or maybe it's on purpose, I don't know." I said, "We will see to it that you get your grapes sold." So she was mollified, but that's part of the unfairness.

TRELEVEN: So the boycott affects maybe the smaller grower more than the larger person.

GRANT: More than the larger, yes. The larger one has the capability and the contacts in order to handle his product when somebody else with a smaller operation and less to sell can't do much.

TRELEVEN: Okay, you explained yesterday that you and Governor-elect Reagan shared some of the ideas about the university and you indicated in general some of these had to do with what? Order, ending what you called the chaos, which I guess you were referring to the student rebelliousness on

campus.

GRANT: The rebellions on the part of the students and the fact that they didn't have background knowledge to even know what they were wanting. When they didn't get what they wanted, they resorted to violence and to obscenity and profanity, which of course gains nothing. And they were really destroying or intending, or maybe not intending, but they were going to destroy academic freedom. And they did to some degree damage academic freedom in Harvard and Cornell [University] and places like that. And some people would say, "Well, that's only the big universities. What about the smaller ones?" Well, Oberlin and some others were damaged also. And the reason I say they were damaged is because the faculty did not stand up to them. The faculty did not protect academic freedom as they should.

TRELEVEN: Okay, we'll be talking more about that, but let's see. Somewhere along the line I guess you got your first notice that the regents would be meeting, and this would be leading up to your first meeting. I suppose that means that

Marjorie [J.] Woolman sent you some material?

GRANT: Yes, I don't remember, a stack probably three or four inches high.

TRELEVEN: What? [Laughter]

GRANT: And that all had to be read and not only read but retained to whatever degree was possible. An interesting side line I think might be mentioned here, and that is that Alex Sherriffs was Reagan's chief liaison man for education.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

GRANT: He told me that he would meet Mr. Reagan at a specified place, and they had duplicate agendas. He would say to Mr. Reagan, "I have read this material sent to me from the university, and this item number one is so-and-so, and I recommend such and such." And Reagan says, "That's the way it looks to me." "Item number two is such and such, and I recommend this." And Reagan might say, "Oh, no, no, I don't quite agree with that. We need a modification there." And he said he would go through the whole thing item by item, and Reagan knew each one just as if he had it before him. He wasn't even looking at the agenda, he was

listening to Alex Sherriffs and responding to his comments. He has a tremendous retention of facts and figures.

TRELEVEN: So this is something that Sherriffs would do with the governor before . . .

GRANT: Each time before the meeting.

TRELEVEN: Right. How about you? How did you manage to wrestle with that three to four inches of . . . ?

GRANT: Well, I met with certain conservative professors. I don't recall their names at the present time. I can visualize them.

TRELEVEN: Well, you mentioned Sidney Hook I guess.

GRANT: Sidney Hook is one of them, but there were two or three others that I met with on different subjects depending what the subject was. And that helped me tremendously.

TRELEVEN: You started doing this early on?

GRANT: Early on, yes.

TRELEVEN: How did you identify these particular professors?

GRANT: Mostly through Alex Sherriffs. Sidney Hook knew which ones were conservative and which ones were not.

TRELEVEN: You didn't want to talk to any liberals, huh?

GRANT: Oh yes, I've talked to lots of liberals, but it's

very difficult to talk to them, because they. . . . Perhaps I'm looking in the mirror when I say this, but they're not willing to listen to the other side. But it's very difficult to talk to some of them. Some liberals I can talk to, but some others seem to feel put upon by conservatives and they don't want to listen. I don't feel put upon by liberals, but some of them seem to feel put upon by conservatives, and I perhaps was as conservative as anybody else on the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I'm going to be a little. . . . Try to get you to be as meticulous as you can about your first meeting, because it was a rather momentous occasion in the history of the university. If I'm not mistaken that meeting was held in San Francisco.

GRANT: Yes, that's right.

TRELEVEN: The meeting was to start on Thursday I think. Did you go up the night before?

GRANT: I don't recall the day, but it wasn't the first part of the week. It wasn't the first day of the week.

TRELEVEN: No, no. It would have been . . .

GRANT: I don't recall the day.

TRELEVEN: Well, in one oral history [Harry R. Wellman]<sup>1</sup> that's been done in the collection, an individual remembers that before the regents' meeting, [Harry R.] Haldeman had a dinner for newly elected Governor Reagan. Do you remember being at a . . .

GRANT: No, I don't.

TRELEVEN: . . . any such dinner?

GRANT: I don't remember that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Was there any talk before the regents' meeting about [Clark] Kerr?

GRANT: I don't. . . . Well, yes, there were comments about Kerr, but I don't recall. No, I'm sorry I can't.

TRELEVEN: So as far as you remember, actually leading up to the meeting, there was no undercurrent of, "We're going to get Kerr tomorrow," or something like that.

GRANT: If there was, it was not openly and avowedly

---

1. Harry R. Wellman, Oral History Interview, "Teaching, Research, and Administration; University of California, 1925-1968." Conducted 1972 and 1973 by Malca Chall, Regional Oral History Office, University of California, Berkeley.

stated. It was just within the minds of those who planned to do such a thing, and I think generally speaking individually, not as a concerted effort.

TRELEVEN: What were your feelings about Kerr at that time on the basis of having met him personally or read the newspaper or whatever?

GRANT: I had no strong feeling against Kerr, because I think every man has a right to his own opinion. But that doesn't mean that I would agree with him, just as I wouldn't agree with someone else who had a different philosophical approach to something. It didn't make me angry at him or dislike the man, I just felt differently.

TRELEVEN: So the first time you met Kerr would have been at the first regents' meeting you went to.

GRANT: Probably. But I was not associated with that part of the university. I worked closely with the agriculture extension service, and to some degree I was acquainted with the agricultural research programs throughout the state. But I was not closely associated with that part of the university, even though my eldest son went to Davis and my eldest daughter went to the San

Francisco part of the university and studied nursing.

TRELEVEN: Kerr's attitude, and he's been on record about this, is that it was the Reagan regents that got him. Any comment on that?

GRANT: Well, I suppose it would be his feeling. I don't know why it wouldn't be, because the Reagan regents were conservative.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And they didn't necessarily talk things over ahead of time, although when I was going to go to New Zealand for two weeks vacation with my wife and also to meet with agriculturists in New Zealand, Alex Sherriffs asked me, "Are you going to be at the next regents' meeting?" I said, "No, my wife and I are going to be in New Zealand." And he said, "Will you talk to the governor before you leave?" I said, "Certainly." So I called the governor, and the governor said, "Allan, you're the swing vote." So some talk had taken place, otherwise who would know that I was the swing vote? And so I did come back from New Zealand, and I flew twelve and a half hours back to the regents' meeting and

attended a meeting all day and got back on the plane and flew back to New Zealand that same evening.

TRELEVEN: This was not the first meeting though, this was  
. . .

GRANT: No, this was later.

TRELEVEN: . . . sometime later.

GRANT: So I just state that, showing that some discussion had taken place, otherwise why was I the swing vote? So probably it had taken place before the first meeting, but I wasn't privy to it as far as I can remember. I am rather independent in my actions and nobody told me how to vote or what the vote was going to be at that time. This time that I speak about when I came back from New Zealand, I was told that I was the swing vote, but otherwise it just was obvious that the conservatives were on one side and the liberals were on another.

TRELEVEN: You could see that from the first regents' meeting?

GRANT: Yes, it's pretty easy to see that. Even without somebody saying more than just a few words, it's apparent. Fortunately for me, I am not an occult

or anything of that kind, but I know people pretty well when I meet them before they've said anything. I had an employee on the ranch who was far superior to me. Earl used to say to me, "Allan, you'd better be looking for another employee for the dairy," and he was one that worked for me for almost a half century. And I said, "Well, what's the matter?" He said, "Oh, he's having a domestic difficulty." "How do you know? Did he tell you?" "No, no," he said, "I just know it." Sure enough, in a couple of weeks that man would tell me he's going to leave and tell me why. Another time Earl said, "That man wants a job who came to see you, doesn't he?" I said, "Yes, he does." He said, "You better be careful." And I said, "Why?" He said, "The sheriff's after him." "How do you know, Earl?" "Oh, I just know." So there are abilities to read people without them saying anything, so it was not difficult to know where the regents stood. Some were not particularly liberal, but kind of on the fence and rather easily influenced. But usually they're either conservative or liberal, and the ones that are no

particular place are pretty easy to identify also.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Leading up to the meeting where Kerr got a vote of no confidence, Reagan did not gather you and others and say, "There's this important vote coming up, and I'm counting on you."

GRANT: No, no.

TRELEVEN: Nothing like that went on like that at all?

GRANT: Nothing at all. However, I would have to say that, having visited with Reagan before he asked me to serve as president of the state board of agriculture and having visited with him in his home, he knew what my general attitude was toward government, toward anything. Therefore, he probably assumed where I would stand if the question arose. I think that's the case, because I was not spoken to ahead of any regents' meeting and asked to vote in any special way. I was told, as I said, "You are the swing vote" one time.

TRELEVEN: Later.

GRANT: But never was I asked to vote a certain way.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: Never. Maybe it's because they knew it wouldn't do any good. You know I had already decided what

to do.

TRELEVEN: But when Reagan campaigned on cleaning up the mess at Berkeley, in your mind did that mean that Kerr was responsible for . . . ?

GRANT: Not necessarily. The faculty is the most influential part of the university . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes.

GRANT: . . . if they will allow themselves to be, and they should be. So I would say that the biggest problem that we had during those years was the faculty at Harvard and Cornell and Oberlin and San Francisco State [University] and various other places, the faculty was the one who capitulated under stress, things of that kind.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so at the meeting, January '67, I guess it was the first item of business taken up in a closed session, which I'll mention, because Mrs. [Elinor R.] Heller has been interviewed, and she has a public record interview,<sup>1</sup> so her count is fourteen to eight against Kerr.

---

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

GRANT: Fourteen to eight against Kerr.

TRELEVEN: Against Kerr, motion by [Laurence J.] Larry Kennedy [Jr.] and a second by Bill Forbes. You voted against Kerr. I guess the question is why.

GRANT: I'd have to go back in to really resurrect things in detail to know specifically why, but from my point of view and my appraisal of the whole thing, the faculty was beginning to capitulate to the attitudes of the students and street people so-called in those days, and that Kerr was not standing up to them as he should. However, as we know at Harvard the dean and the president did stand up to them, and then the faculty supported the dean and the president, and then within a couple of days they reversed themselves. And so the faculty at Berkeley was just as bad. They didn't stand up to the ruckus that was taking place, and so really it wasn't all Kerr's fault. But Kerr needed to stand up, and it didn't appear that he was. That's not an easy thing to do. I understand that line of difficulty, because I've been in press conferences where there were two hundred press people, probably thirty or forty of them were opposed to my views and it's not easy to

stand up to them, but it pays to stand up to them just the same, though it's easier not. And it would be my opinion that there is not a majority . . . . There was not a majority at that time of students who wanted things to be blown apart, but there are too many students or general citizens who won't stand up and be counted, and they need to.

TRELEVEN: Well, it appears that there was nothing on the regents' agenda for that meeting that said, "We're going to have a vote of confidence on Kerr." Apparently, Kerr asked for it. Anyway, so then the acting president was Harry Wellman after that. Had you known Wellman before, since he taught agricultural economics and so on?

GRANT: Yes, I knew him because my eldest daughter had applied to start a nursing career in San Francisco, and the quota was filled, and so she was turned down. But there came a vacancy, and I asked Harry Wellman to consider my daughter, because she was qualified and didn't have any problem as far as grades were concerned. But there was one vacancy, and she got it through Harry Wellman. I have a son-in-law who says you shouldn't use your influence to get things done,

and he feels strongly that many people in politics use their influence and they shouldn't do that, that everybody ought to have a fair shake. I said, "What about this time when I used my influence to get my daughter into school?" "Oh," he said, "that was a worthy cause."

[Laughter] I think she'd have gotten in anyway eventually, but that saved her a year.

TRELEVEN: Right. And the understanding as I understand it is that Wellman would be simply an acting president while you . . .

GRANT: That's right. It was not a permanent thing. He understood that.

TRELEVEN: While you looked for another president, which you finally got in Charles [J.] Hitch.

GRANT: And Charles Hitch told me that I wrote the longest letter to the president of the university that any president had ever received, because we were at that time deciding whether or not to take all university investments out of South Africa. And I felt strongly that if we . . . If anybody took the investments out, we would be acting negatively, because so many blacks in South Africa depended upon those jobs. If we took the

jobs away from them, what were they going to do while they were trying to eliminate apartheid? There would be a better way to do it than to eliminate jobs for people who needed work. And so I wrote quite a comprehensive letter to him about it, and he said it was the longest letter he had ever received or he thought probably any president had ever received from a regent.

TRELEVEN: So this was something written during the Hitch administration.

GRANT: Yes, right.

TRELEVEN: Which would have been before '70, well, before you left the board in '74. I want to get back to this liberal and conservative balance. I don't necessarily like those terms, but if we can agree that we understand. . . . At the time you joined the board in . . .

GRANT: Of course, in response to what you say about not liking those terms, that terminology, again, we've changed the meaning of liberal from what it used to be. So now everybody understands it to be liberal like [Michael S.] Dukakis or something of that kind. In fact, liberal as far as Academic Senate is concerned are those people

interested in academic freedom, which is right. So we've now changed the meaning of liberal into an entirely different thing. And so when we talk about liberal regents and conservative regents we have a different meaning than if we're talking about liberalities concerned to education and so on.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: We both understand that . . .

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: . . . when we use that word.

TRELEVEN: Right. So using your definition at the time of a liberal or conservative regent, you saw a certain balance when you went to the board in '67. Had that balance shifted by the time you left in '74?

GRANT: It seemed to me it had.

TRELEVEN: And which way?

GRANT: It seemed to me it had shifted in decision making. Perhaps not so much personality or personal conviction as much as decision making had shifted, because when I left the board of regents the change back to order out of chaos had already begun to take place. So it was not strongly evident at that time, but it had

begun. I think that's illustrative of the fact that the university now is not as it was in those years. It had begun to change. And when Reagan was deciding whether or not to run for the presidency of the United States, and he and I were visiting, I said to him, "There is a change taking place throughout the nation. The liberals are gradually losing ground, and conservatives are gaining ground, not just in academics and universities, not just in those kind of ways, but they're losing ground as far as their attitude toward the nation, the attitude toward international questions are concerned. You run as a conservative and you're going to win." And he looked surprised and he said, "What makes you think so?" I said, "It's too involved to talk about it now, but I think that's the case." And so I say that. . . . It's easy to say it now, because it's apparent that it happened, but that was what I said to him. I thought the change was beginning and in its beginning it was beginning to show in the university in the attitude and decision making of the regents, even though perhaps it might have been the same people who

were in the center and kind of divided their attitude who were moving toward the conservative side.

TRELEVEN: Well, at the same time more Reagan appointees went on the board of regents.

GRANT: Oh yes, that's part of it too.

TRELEVEN: And you think that's part . . .

GRANT: That's part of it, yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . of the new orderliness within the regents?

GRANT: Yes, I do think so. I think also though it was the feeling of the regents who were already there that the general populace was moving that direction, so it's only natural for people in decision-making positions to reflect the feeling of the general populace. So I think they were affected by what they were hearing, seeing, and reading throughout not only the state, but the nation. I think they could see, as somebody said a long time ago, the handwriting on the wall.

TRELEVEN: [Frederick G.] Fred Dutton saw the handwriting on the wall?

GRANT: I don't. . . . Frankly, I don't think Dutton's vision is very good about anything. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] How so?

GRANT: Well, it was stated by another regent that he is amoral, and I have a pretty strong feeling that that's a pretty good appraisal. I don't know what he thinks of. . . . Well, I do know how he feels toward me, but I don't know what he thinks of me.

TRELEVEN: I don't either. I don't think he's been interviewed yet either.

GRANT: Well, he's welcome to say or think whatever he pleases.

TRELEVEN: Right, right.

GRANT: Those things don't bother me. At one time a man said to me, "Allan, you're too willing to listen to criticism." I said, "Absolutely not. I want to hear it, because if some of it's valid or if all of it's valid I want to know it so I can change."

TRELEVEN: I'm trying to think of a few of the other more liberal people on the board. [William K.] Coblentz, did he . . . ?

GRANT: Who?

TRELEVEN: Bill Coblentz. Did he become a little . . .

GRANT: He was . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . more conservative as time went on?

GRANT: . . . almost a conundrum I felt when I was on there. I never knew quite where he was.

TRELEVEN: And [Norton] Simon's been thought of as being a liberal. He's a Republican, but a liberal Republican.

GRANT: Yes, he's on the liberal side of the Republicans. Remember, Republicans are not all the same anymore than Democrats are all the same. A friend of mine was a lifelong Democrat and his philosophy was about the same as mine. But I suppose he was a Democrat because his father and mother were. I don't know. And so it's not easily determinable that way.

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

TRELEVEN: So I think what you might be suggesting is between Reagan appointees and the times becoming a little more subtle that the board was becoming less liberal and more conservative by the time you left.

GRANT: Yes, to amplify that to some degree the Students for a Democratic Society, the Black . . .

TRELEVEN: Panthers.

GRANT: . . . Panthers and so on being violent in their

attitude, that's a direct opposite to what most Americans want, no matter what party they belong to, liberal or conservative. They don't like violence and don't want it. And they were able to see this violence on television and they began to back off and say, "No, I'm not with this group. I don't like it." And so it was I think apparent to any lucid observer that things were changing. Then, of course, as you say the appointments by Reagan were making that visible to most people.

TRELEVEN: Okay, when you joined the board [Theodore R.] Ted Meyer was the chairman and like you an ex officio member, representing the California Mechanics Institute. Then he was succeeded by Bill Higgs-- DeWitt [A.] Higgs, excuse me--for several years. He was followed by, if I have my memory correct, William French Smith for several years, and that doesn't quite take us up to '74. What I want to know though is, when you as a new member went to the board, how were the committee assignments for you determined? Did you indicated any preference for committees or . . . ?

GRANT: No, if you just look at the record you see that I

was not placed on any committee that the liberals felt was of any great importance.

TRELEVEN: Oh, what do you mean by that? Grounds and Buildings [Committee] is not important?  
[Laughter]

GRANT: Well, it's kind of mundane as far as they're concerned. Every bit of it is important, of course, but I drew the conclusion very soon that they wanted me on committees where I wouldn't cause any trouble.

TRELEVEN: Really?

GRANT: And I can't cause any trouble on Grounds and Buildings. You need Grounds and Buildings. And on Special Research Projects [Committee] and so on. There was very little opportunity for me to cause trouble there.

TRELEVEN: How about Audit [Committee]?

GRANT: Audit? No.

TRELEVEN: Can't cause trouble there either?

GRANT: No, because we had. . . . In fact, we had good auditors, so there was very little for the chairman of the Audit Committee to do except to oversee the thing. So I'm not resentful at all, but I am observant, and so I know that I was

placed on committees where the old-time regents and the . . . I don't know exactly what kind of an adjective to use, but anyway, certain regents thought that I belonged on those committees, and that's where I was placed.

TRELEVEN: How would you rank in order of priority the importance of various committees?

GRANT: Well, those that had to do directly with the Academic Senate . . .

TRELEVEN: Which would be Educational Policy [Committee].

GRANT: Yes, educational part of it. That's the most important part.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Finance [Committee]?

GRANT: Finance?

TRELEVEN: Finance.

GRANT: Finance is important, but of secondary importance. If the academics is important, then Finance takes second place, because you have to have the academics financed adequately and so Finance is second to the program.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So you come to the board and there are some I take it already powerful regents. Who comes to mind when you mention powerful and influential regents?

GRANT: I'd have to look at the list of names to refresh my mind about it, but William French Smith was very influential, although he said to me one time when I was speaking on a subject--I don't know whether I was for it or against it--he said, "Allan, get your vocabulary down here where the rest of us know what you're talking about."  
[Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Really? [Laughter]

GRANT: Now I don't know what the subject matter was. It's too long ago. But I had no trouble getting along with William French Smith. But [Dorothy Buffum] Buffy Chandler was one of the old-timers who. . . . Her family was old-timers in the university.

TRELEVEN: Yes, right.

GRANT: And she had no particular rapport with me, or I had no rapport with her to speak of. And who was the man who played football? Big man, I can't think of his name.

TRELEVEN: [Robert O.] Bob Reynolds?

GRANT: Who?

TRELEVEN: Robert Reynolds?

GRANT: Yes. He had been there quite a while and he was

influential with the old-timers.

TRELEVEN: Well, you had a . . .

GRANT: Canaday was another one.

TRELEVEN: John [E.] Canaday, yeah.

GRANT: Canaday is the same name as Kennedy, but it's changed in this country I guess.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, you've got [Edwin W.] Ed Pauley on. He'd been on the board since 1940.

GRANT: Yes, he was a long, long time benefactor of the university and very influential with the rest of them. I got along with him fairly well, but . . .

TRELEVEN: Even though he was a Democrat.

GRANT: Yes, oh yes.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

GRANT: He and I got along without any difficulty.

TRELEVEN: [Edward W.] Ed Carter's another one who'd been around.

GRANT: Yes, he was a long time influential member of the board. He and I didn't agree on a lot of ideas. But those people have pretty well intended, wanted to be the decision makers. And I didn't particularly want to be a decision maker, but I wanted to speak my piece when I agreed or disagreed with them. I didn't have any

difficulty that way. But I will say that I did not enjoy my time on the board of regents. I did what I thought I needed to do, and I think I fulfilled my obligation there to whatever degree I was capable of. I can't say that I really enjoyed my time on the board of regents. I would have to say it was a job that needed to be done and I was willing to do the best I could on it. But to say that I enjoyed the relationship with the regents and so on would not be true. Individually, with some of them, [W. Glenn] Campbell I got along with fine, and Mrs. [Catherine C.] Hearst was a personable person to get along with. No difficulty at all. I don't remember exactly what her philosophy might have been in different things, but she was basically a conservative person.

TRELEVEN: Well, I want to get back to the committee stuff, but first in terms of meeting routine, what would be your routine in terms of let's say there was going to be a meeting in Los Angeles? When would you leave Visalia?

GRANT: In time for the meeting. That's all.

TRELEVEN: In time for the meeting. You didn't go down the

night before for dinner?

GRANT: No. Once in a great while, but only if that just happened to be the case. I didn't make it a point to be there at all. Frankly, I have never liked parties since I was a child. My mother insisted on my going to a party when I was about fourteen, and I didn't like it. I asked her, I said, "Don't ever ask me to go again, because I don't like parties, and I don't want to go." And also because I'm a teetotaler, I was an outsider. When I went to a civilian orientation conference back in Pensacola [Florida] at the Naval Aviation Schools Command for a demonstration of American firepower, the military, marines, the air force, the army, navy and so on, I was there ten days with about 175 businessmen and corporate leaders. They had what they called a hospitality hour every afternoon that lasted two and a half hours. That's not too long for the generals and the admirals, but that's too long for the officers beneath them. And they would get pretty tipsy by the end of that time. And I remember it very vividly, because the first one of those afternoon things we went to an orderly came to me

and said, "Mr. Grant, will you do me a favor?" I said, "Certainly. What would you like me to do?" He said, "The commanding officer's been after me three times and giving me hell because you don't have a glass." I said, "I'll hold a glass for you." And so he gave me something in a glass, and I don't even like ginger ale. I don't like soda water. I'd rather have a drink of ice water. That's not a theological conviction, that's just a habit. I just never have liked alcohol. And I've checked the questions asked of alcoholics, and every single one for me is positive, so if I drank I might be an alcoholic, I don't know. And so I've never. . . . Well, I'm just a teetotaler, and that sets you apart, because everybody drinks at one of those things, whether they want to or not. I don't, but everybody else does. So I held a glass each day, and I still had the same glass full when I finished, but that satisfied them.

TRELEVEN: So this would mean that you would not go the night before to the regents' meetings.

GRANT: No, no.

TRELEVEN: And at the same time that's when certainly a lot

of informal conversation took place.

GRANT: Oh yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: And I don't want to say deal making, but that's a little too strong.

GRANT: But people make up their minds at that point. And I made up my mind after I read the material and independently acted as a regent. I don't need someone to tell me what I ought to do, and so I didn't go to those dinners. Occasionally, yes, if it just happened to be the case.

TRELEVEN: Okay, if it just happened to be the case, I mean rarely, are there particular other regents that you did like associating with?

GRANT: Oh yes, I'd visit with Campbell. I'd visit with Mrs. Hearst. I visited with. . . . Not with Coblenz, once in a while with Coblenz, but he seemed flighty enough that he's difficult to visit with. Not with Mrs. Chandler, but with William French Smith from time to time, and others. But they didn't particularly want to visit with me some of them, and so I didn't bother.

TRELEVEN: Is some of that because you, being a farmer, you were somewhat looked down on? Did you ever get

that idea?

GRANT: If my being a farmer what?

TRELEVEN: That they looked down on you because you were, quote, "just a farmer"?

GRANT: Well, I know Mrs. Chandler did.

TRELEVEN: Really?

GRANT: Oh, yes. She thought of me as a lesser person.

TRELEVEN: Really.

GRANT: That's true. It doesn't bother me. I just don't want to have anything to do with her, and I didn't. I don't resent that. I just don't agree with her. Frankly, I think I'm at least as intelligent as she is, and the fact that I started below her station in life in my view of America, that's totally irrelevant. It doesn't have anything to do with it. And so my wife can't handle that, but it doesn't bother me in the slightest. That's why I say when this man said I'm too willing to listen to criticism, I said, "Well, I have to. I want to hear it. I solicit it and then I appraise it, and if part of it's relevant, then I'll try to change. If it isn't relevant, I'll dismiss it and it's of no meaning to me. I don't bother with it." But

that isn't the case with lots of people. It hurts them: "This man said this." They say, "I can't hear it. I can't listen to it. I've got to stop it." Well, I don't want to stop it. I want to hear it. And so I knew exactly how Mrs. Chandler felt toward me, and that's enough. I don't need to hear it and I don't want to be around her. She has let me know what she thinks, so thank you, Mrs. Chandler, that's enough. What was that other man's name? Ross? Dutton's friend.

TRELEVEN: Roth. [William M.] Bill Roth.

GRANT: Roth, yeah. He felt much as Mrs. Chandler did toward me. But I could talk to him, because he would respond. So each one of them at the time, but as I said, I don't let it bother me, so I dismissed it and I have to work at it to bring them back to mind, because it didn't bother me. I knew where they were and dismissed them from my memory or mind.

TRELEVEN: Did you look on them as being somewhat privileged, urban people, at least some of them in terms of where your values are?

GRANT: Having adequate money put them in a place where

they could wield influence that other people without that amount of money could not wield. So I understood that, but I did my best to wield what influence I had in what I felt were appropriate places. And I could win just as often as they did. So those are things that kept me from being bothered by their attitude. Their attitude is--from my personal viewpoint--is totally irrelevant. We want to get this job done or else we can't get it done, and we'll maneuver and get it done another way at some future time.

TRELEVEN: Okay, then usually Thursday, if I understand things, the committee meetings took place. Would you tend to attend all of the committee meetings?

GRANT: All I was supposed to attend, yes. I tried my best to fulfill my obligation, and whatever responsibility was given, I accepted.

TRELEVEN: And then come Friday there would be a meeting, the meeting of the full board.

GRANT: That's right.

TRELEVEN: And some of it open, sometimes executive or closed sessions, and it all went very smoothly, right?

GRANT: Yes, it did go fairly smoothly.

TRELEVEN: How about between meetings? You would meet once a month. It seems to me you did not meet in December nor one month in the summer.

GRANT: I forget which one it is.

TRELEVEN: Something to that effect, but between meetings, whenever they took place, would there be additional communication between the university administration and you as a regent, or let's say the governor and you as a regent?

GRANT: Not so that it would be noticeable or evident at all. I didn't participate in those kind of things. And frankly sometimes I would surprise the governor and probably displease him, because I was not privy to any predigested plan to do something or other. I took my own action at the time, and sometimes it would surprise him that I would make certain motions when he probably had talked to somebody else and had suggested we do that next meeting and not this meeting. I don't know, but I did surprise him, and it probably displeased him because of my independence. I don't know that. I just sensed that.

TRELEVEN: Well, in a way what you're saying is that you were by no means a Reagan regent or a "kept"

regent by Reagan. Isn't that what you're telling me?

GRANT: I guess it depends upon one's interpretation of words. Well, I think I told you that when I went to see Reagan and told him I wanted to support him, I said, "If your name was Joe Blow I'd still support you because of your philosophy, not because you're Ronald Reagan." And so that's the way I felt about whatever I did on the board of regents or anything. I was cooperative if I agreed with him. If I didn't agree with him, I was myself. I don't remember any problem we had as far as actions of the board of regents where I would disagree with him, because our philosophies are the same. But I didn't do that because he was Ronald Reagan, I did that because I'm me. So that seems maybe presumptuous, but I don't want or don't tend it to be or don't think it is. But I do consider Ronald Reagan a friend.

TRELEVEN: Good.

GRANT: But you don't always agree with your friends.

TRELEVEN: Right. How often do you recall that Reagan would come to the regents' meetings?

GRANT: I don't remember a meeting that he didn't come

to.

TRELEVEN: Really?

GRANT: Yes. I know there were some meetings when he wasn't there just because I know how busy he was, but I don't recall those meetings. As far as I am concerned in my memory, he was there each time. And there's another thing. I think I may have told you that he doodled, and I picked up the . . .

TRELEVEN: I don't think you've said it since we've been recording, so go ahead.

GRANT: Well, during the meetings, Reagan would doodle. His doodlings were caricatures of somebody, not the people in the meeting, but somebody: a cowboy smoking a cigarette; or a lady, a coquette with her eyelashes down and looking up at something. Anyway, caricatures. And one time when we got up to leave he left it there on the table. I said, "What do you do with those things?" He said, "I don't do anything with them." I said, "Do you mind if I pick them up?" He said, "I don't care. Help yourself." So I picked them up. Next time I did the same thing again. After I'd done that at the end of

each meeting several times, he said, "Allan, what do you do with those things?" I said, "I give them to my grandchildren." And later on he said, "How many grandchildren do you have, Allan?" I said, "Well, I give them to more than my grandchildren. If a boy or girl has done well in school and seems to be of the same philosophic persuasion that I am, I might give one of them to that child." And he said, "Well, that's a worthy project." And I read later that one of those, not one I had but another one, sold for \$15,000.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: So I'm glad I gave them to my grandchildren.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

GRANT: I guess I must have picked up fifteen or twenty of them, because he always doodled as the meeting was going on. And it was always that same kind of picturization.

TRELEVEN: Well, I can't ask you to compare his attendance with that of other governors because you only served as a regent under Reagan.

GRANT: A short time.

TRELEVEN: But he technically is the president of the board, and he chose to always delegate that . . .

GRANT: Yes, that's right.

TRELEVEN: . . . whether he was there or not.

GRANT: I think it's been very seldom that the president of the board handled the board. I think they always did it the way it was done while he was there.

TRELEVEN: I believe that's correct.

GRANT: And I frankly think that's better.

TRELEVEN: To allow the governor, then, an opportunity to . . .

GRANT: Yes, that allows him an opportunity to speak.

TRELEVEN: Did Reagan speak a lot at regents' meetings? Now what do I mean by speaking a lot? I mean, did he actively participate?

GRANT: He actively participated, and if it was a question of philosophical difference, then he would speak. But if it was a question of finance or something of that kind, why, he just voted. He didn't have very much to say about that. But philosophical differences brought him out in the conversation.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I want to get back to your committee assignments. I think we need to dispel the theory that Grounds and Buildings was not

important. I mean, there was a lot going on. You were on that committee fairly consistently, and you chaired the committee . . .

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . several years in a row. Give me a little insider's view of what the Grounds and Buildings Committee actually did.

GRANT: That's difficult to do after this length of time. What they did was consider. . . . Well, for one thing, everybody knows how this state has grown in population, and the university has grown just the same way, even though it costs more to go to the university than it used to. So there was always a problem with adequate facilities, and that intensified all the time. It never got any less. In fact, it got to be more of a problem all of the time. So the question of adequate facilities was foremost in the minds of the regents all the time. But a mundane subject such as Grounds and Buildings only needs people on the committee to consider demographics and population growth rates and so on. So that was in the minds of the committee all the time: how do we handle this thing that never goes away and

in fact intensifies as time goes on? But there was always also the question, how big can or should the university get? How large can it be and still be handled? How large can it be and still give the individual attention to the student that is necessary? And if you have a growing number of professors and an intensified program as time goes on, you have more subjects and more subjects specific to one kind of discipline. How do you handle that as it gets bigger and bigger and bigger? So those were some of the things that the Grounds and Buildings Committee was considering all the time. Then it is not easy, of course, to develop a new campus. That's a tremendous job to develop a new campus with all the planning that's required to have the facilities necessary for each different discipline.

TRELEVEN: And in terms of the overall campus plan, this would be something Grounds and Buildings would be very involved in.

GRANT: Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: And I take it the day-to-day kinds of detail were handled by the office of the president.

GRANT: Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: But Grounds and Buildings, you would be involved in. . . . Well, there was no site selection going on by the time you joined the board.

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: Irvine had been selected, although it was being skirmished about. We'll talk about that later. Santa Cruz had been selected. At the time you came to the board, was there still some idea that the San Joaquin Valley campus might be developed?

GRANT: It was talked about, but there was nothing very serious about it. It just was talked about in kind of ethereal terms. Nobody knew where it would be or what would be required. Frankly, the population growth in the San Joaquin Valley has been subsequent to the time that I was on the board of regents. I mean, the intensified growth in the San Joaquin Valley has been subsequent to the time I was on the board of regents. It's the fastest-growing part of the country now and the state. So that has caused a growing interest in having a campus somewhere here. But it wasn't growing that way at that time, because the growth at that time was still in the parts close around

San Francisco, Los Angeles, and San Jose. Now people don't seem to mind traveling clear from Los Alamos to San Jose and clear from Stanislaus County to Sacramento and San Francisco. They go from Madera County clear down into the city of Fresno, and two hours of transport doesn't seem to bother them at all. It makes a tremendous problem with the environment for us. By transportation I mean roads and so on, but it didn't. . . . Nobody was thinking about it at that time. It wasn't a problem.

TRELEVEN: Because I think even going back to the Master Plan,<sup>1</sup> Donahoe Higher Education Act,<sup>2</sup> 1960, and I think early in the sixties, Carter kind of urged the board to purchase property in the San Joaquin Valley for a campus. Then just developing and expanding the existing campuses seemed to draw away from the possibility of the San Joaquin campus ever being a reality, at least for a

---

1. 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.

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

while. And then came some hard budget years, and it seemed to die out for a long time. And you were commenting yesterday, there seems to be some increased talk about it again.

GRANT: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: And lots of pros and cons over somebody wanting it in his or her backyard. But anyway, getting back to '67, that idea was kind of on the back burner, I guess at that point.

GRANT: That's all, that's all. Carter was correct, but it wasn't evident enough for other people to join with him--that growth in San Joaquin Valley--that he could see that it was necessary some day to have it. But of course you had opposition from Davis, because this is an agricultural area and so they didn't want any competition. And so there were those kind of things: opposition from the academic people plus opposition from people who don't want a liberal university in their conservative community. So it was what Carter . . . . The idea Carter had was all right, but it wasn't feasible at that time.

TRELEVEN: So at the Davis campus they do consider this kind of their bailiwick.

GRANT: Oh, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Where does the Riverside bailiwick come up to from the south?

GRANT: I don't think it comes up here at all.

TRELEVEN: Doesn't come up here, I see. Hmm.

GRANT: Oh, people know it's there, but that's about all. They don't really think of it as part of their bailiwick, and it's just there. I think they're wrong, but that's the way they feel about it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, my understanding is that Grounds and Buildings also had to pass on recommendations about structures and architects to be selected to build those structures. How did that work?

GRANT: I don't remember exactly, but I do remember visiting and meeting with architects and discussing in the committee this architect, that architect, and so on, what was their past record, what have they done before, have they been associated with the university, if it was a new one what had he done that might fit in with university likes and desires. So we did do that, but I can't remember specifically which ones. But when I was farming, I built several houses on

the ranch because we furnished housing, so I had an interest and a knowledge about building, but not about university buildings.

TRELEVEN: Well, some of the names, [William L.] Pereira [and Associates] did a lot of work for the university. William Pereira . . .

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . did the Irvine Plan. [Charles] Luckman [and Associates] did a lot of work, I think especially in Santa Barbara.

GRANT: I remember Luckman. They did a lot of work.

TRELEVEN: Do you have any sense of politics being involved in the selection of architects?

GRANT: No, only the very careful analysis of each one's background and knowledge about what was needed by the university and why it was needed and whether or not they understood the whys and wherefors of building. Not just the putting up of the concrete wall, but knowing why it was put up here and why it was put up there and what was to be the use of it and whether or not they understood the discipline that would be using that particular structure and so on. They had to have that knowledge as well as the knowledge of making

a safe building in an earthquake area. They needed more knowledge than just how to put up a building.

TRELEVEN: Sometimes, usually in the context of budget making time, in terms of governor's budget and legislative analyst review, A. Allan Post is a name that everyone seems to remember. There was the charge made sometimes by legislators, legislative analysts, that the buildings that the University of California built cost more than, say, comparable buildings for state universities. Do you recall that?

GRANT: I don't remember how it was resolved, but I do know that that is a charge that's been leveled many, many times. And to some degree there's validity there. Just as when a rock hit our windshield. We were going under an overpass, a rock hit the windshield and it made. . . . It actually shattered the inside part of the glass, and it hit my wife's hair above her face. I think the rock was thrown from above, because it hit the bottom edge of the windshield, and a rock from the back wheels of a truck usually hits the top of the windshield. So I got some bids on it

before I had it repaired, before I ever took it to an insurance company, and in each case they asked, "Are you insured?" "Yes." "What company? Yes, okay, I know that company." The first one wanted \$100 more to put that windshield on than the second did, the reason being, well, he thought, well, it's insured so he will get \$100 more. And with \$100 deductible, the kind of insurance we carried on that car, why, we would have gotten. . . . All we had to do was go to the first bid and we'd have gotten more money ourselves. And we didn't do that. We went to the cheapest one. Well, the same thing applies when you're getting someone to do government work. They look to see whether or not they can add a little here and there. And so frankly, I think that taxpayers are being taken for a ride not just on university buildings but on any building put up for the government, for any part of the government. If you're going to do it yourself, why. . . . Well, I built a new home on the ranch that we sold. When I got all through with it, my insurance friend said, "What value do you want to put on it?" I said, "Oh"--this was a

long time ago--"\$24,000." "Oh," he said, "I can't do that. I can't justify it." I said, "What can you justify?" He said, "Well, this many square feet, why, at the very lowest between \$45,000 and \$50,000." I said, "But \$24,000 is what it cost. I know every penny." "Well," he said, "I can't do that. You have got to have more on it or I'll hear from the head office, because they'll say it's worth \$50,000 and you say it's worth \$24,000, but you can't replace it for \$24,000." I said, "Yes, I can, because I'll do it myself. I'll see to it that everything is done my way." Well, that's something that we can't get away from. If you're going to have a government building, you have to have contractors' bids, and they all know that they can add to it in order to make a bigger profit than they can for an individual who will look at it from his own personal viewpoint. So we always knew that the university building was going to cost more than we ourselves would think they ought to cost. Well, that's still a fact, even though some people may contest it. Builders, contractors might say no, they know better than

that, but they don't. I know that's true.

TRELEVEN: Well, knowing that kind of sentiment was coming out of the mouths of some legislators and others in the state government, did that make the committee attempt to watch costs more carefully in this?

GRANT: They did. . . . I always felt that the committee was sympathetic to that understanding and were willing to look very closely at costs, but also I knew they could not keep the costs where they thought they ought to be. They had to concede to some degree that the costs were always going to be higher than they wanted them to be. I state that categorically. I don't think there's any question about that.

TRELEVEN: Now, amongst the facilities that you had to pay attention to in Grounds and Buildings were facilities related to medical education and health sciences. There seemed to be and there was lots of stuff on the agenda relating to not only constructing things but also leasing arrangements, contracts with county hospitals, that kind of thing. Do you recall being involved in that?

GRANT: No, I don't. I don't recall that. I know there would be just without recalling specifically what we were discussing, but there had to be, because whenever you have health facilities, you have to have certain kinds of health facilities. You don't have just a building. And same thing with the Livermore laboratories. It's a different kind of interest entirely. And so we were considering those things and the reason for those changes or differences, but I don't recall them.

TRELEVEN: As part of Grounds and Buildings, I take it that you ultimately visited every one of the campuses.

GRANT: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: I'm just stunned sometimes about the amount of building activity that was going on, especially in the sixties.

GRANT: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: But it continued even well into the seventies. When you would go to a campus, what would you be particularly interested in looking at or looking for as a, say, as a member of Grounds and Buildings? What were you interested in seeing on each of the campuses?

GRANT: Well, one thing is accessibility, because

students spend an awful lot of time going from one place to another. That's one of the problems a student has is getting from here to there when he needs to. He's only got a limited time to do it, so that was one of the things, accessibility. Another thing that you're bound to look at is the aesthetics of the plant, because the taxpayers have got to pay for it and they want it to look good. And they don't think it ought to cost any more to look good than it does to be functional. So those were two of the things that were. . . . Well, as soon as you get there, you see both of them without knowing anything about the insides of the buildings. But those were the first things you see and want to see. And then another thing is where is the administration of this thing. Is he isolated so that he never sees what goes on, or is he where he's kind of in the traffic lane so he knows what's going on all around him? Those are some of the items. And then, how does the Academic Senate function? Who functions in the Academic Senate? Where do they function? Where do they meet? And is it so that they all will understand

what the total program is in the whole thing?  
Those are some of the kind of outside things that  
one sees.

TRELEVEN: And those are some of the things you would look  
for. Now, Santa Cruz was developed along some  
pretty radically different lines in terms of the  
I don't know if we could call them cluster  
colleges or what the phrase was at the time. How  
did you feel about the way the Santa Cruz campus  
was planned and was developed?

GRANT: Well, I didn't like it at all.

TRELEVEN: You didn't like it at all?

GRANT: I didn't like it at all. Part of that is a bias,  
and I admit to biases. I do have biases the same  
as lots of people do. Part of that was because  
of the chancellor's idea of pass-fail. Well, one  
of the biggest problems I had on the board of  
regents was to fight Fred Dutton and Roth and  
some of the others who wanted to lower the  
standards for the Chicanos and the blacks. I  
thought that was the most racist thing they could  
do, because from my point of view, a black or an  
Hispanic has the same rights, privileges, and  
responsibilities that I have. And if you lower  
the standards for them, then you place them in a

derogatory position. You are saying to them, "You're not equal to me, and therefore you have to have special dispensation here in order to let you come up some degree to where you ought to be. Not where you should be, but to some degree to where you ought to be." And so with my bias about their pass-fail thing also caused me to look askance at some of the physical placement of the campus, and wondering, is this part of this pass-fail thing? Or what is the reason for having it set up this way?

TRELEVEN: Okay, and the chancellor must have been [Dean E.] McHenry, Dean McHenry.

GRANT: Yes, Dean McHenry.

TRELEVEN: Still, what would you say, though, about the physical layout? Part of the problem identified especially at Berkeley in the Byrne Report<sup>1</sup> several years before you joined the regents was that in this so-called massive university, students felt alienated. They got lost. And Santa Cruz seemed to be developed so that there

---

1. Report on the University of California and Recommendations to the Special Committee of the Regents of the University of California by Jerome C. Byrne, Special Counsel [May 7, 1965].

would be more intimacy among smaller groups of students. At least that's the way I . . .

GRANT: Well, there are two ways to look at it. You can look at it as helping one group to have some feeling of togetherness, but also you can have also the other way to look at it is seeing one group setting themselves apart because they don't feel a part of the total. And I think the latter view is more valid than the first one. I think when you separate them that way, it causes a certain amount of clique to develop, and I don't like that. I want to feel that I'm a part of . . . . Well, when I was living here I wanted to feel that I was a part of the community contributing in my small way to the community and the total community, not. . . . Well, there are lots and lots of Dutch dairymen moving up here from Los Angeles. They are a clique. They have their own Christian school. Nobody can teach in that school unless they're Dutch.

TRELEVEN: These are Dutch Reformed?

GRANT: Yes, there's a Dutch Reformed church here. And they seem to set themselves apart within the whole. And that's the way that the Santa Cruz

campus looked to me, and I don't agree with that. We have developed a nation which is the envy of the whole world as far as that's concerned, because we are a nation of different peoples. And the university, the Santa Cruz campus set themselves up with what seemed to me cliques, and I'm not for that. I wonder how much each one of those cliques feels it is a part of the total campus at Santa Cruz, or is this home to him right here when you leave home and circulate in the total campus. That's my feeling about it.

TRELEVEN: San Diego was somewhat the same idea with cluster colleges, although San Diego started as a graduate school and then gradually became somewhat more undergraduate oriented. But what were your thoughts about the development of the San Diego campus at that time?

GRANT: I don't have any concrete appraisals to make of that. Because of its proximity to Mexico, there is a certain amount of Mexican influence on the San Diego campus, just as there is a certain amount of influence from Mexico on the city of San Diego, not just according to the type of

buildings and so on, but interchange between Mexico and the United States being so close together. The same as there is in Texas, with one town on one side of the river and another town on the other side of the river. There's a tremendous mix there. I don't see that as negative, but I see it as a difference from other parts of the total university. I don't think it's bad, but it is a different kind of a campus because of its proximity to another nation.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. Then there was Irvine, and Irvine turned out to be a controversial campus. At least it made the newspapers a lot. As I gather, some of it related to the agreement between the Irvine Land Company and the regents of the university. When I'm interviewing various people, I'm still trying to sort out, you know, what the situation was based on each individual's recollection. So what was the particular problem at Irvine as you remember it?

GRANT: Well, you'll have to remind me of what the Irvine Ranch people had to say to the university.

TRELEVEN: Well, an agreement was made so that Irvine Land Company donated outright so many acres to the university. Then there was to be an inclusion area surrounding the university, and the Irvine Company was going to. . . . The regents were going to pay the Irvine Company so much per acre for the inclusion area. That in turn was part of a master [campus] community plan which Pereira had developed. Then as things went on, it turned out it took a long time to get the price per acre finally agreed on. And then, as near as I can read it, the Irvine Company then by 1970 decided that the city was going to be far, far larger than it had been initially planned. And some regents, notably Norton Simon, were very upset over this. He felt it was an abrogation of the original agreement. Does that help?

GRANT: Yes, but that to one degree or another happens whenever a new campus is started. In Merced County the opposition to the campus being on a large cattle ranch is that there'll be a new city there and there would be unjust enrichment for the owner of that land, because he's naturally going to develop all the land surrounding there

to his benefit. He's going to sell it for a far higher price than he could get for it right now as a cattle ranch. So that same feeling exists whenever a new campus is started. Or Irvine, this strong feeling about Irvine was far more than it is some places, because the owners of the Irvine Ranch were dictating what the university, what the taxpayers should do for Irvine. That developed a tremendous amount of anathema on the part of taxpayers. Whoever knew about it wasn't going to like it, because it was going to cost them tax money to do that. So naturally, Simon was voicing the opinion of an awful lot of people. There's no question about that. And so that would be the same. . . . Well, it is the same case in this proposed new campus, wherever it is. Some people want it, some people don't. But those that don't want it have a philosophical opposition to it. Those that do want it have a dollar appraisal on it for themselves. It's going to help them financially: "If the thing comes here, then I will benefit from it monetarily." So it's a mix of reactions to any new campus wherever you put it, whether it's

Irvine or anyplace else. Irvine raised a flag for everybody to look at--skull and crossbones. This is not according to our likes. So Simon was just voicing the opinion of an awful lot of people.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's in the context of Irvine that there's a now famous meeting. It was in October of 1970 where, incidentally, at the time, Simon was also running in the primary for U. S. Senator. No, the primary was over. The general election was coming up, and Simon had lost. But in any case, it's in that context that Simon charged that at the October meeting of the regents, there was a conflict of interest going on because William French Smith and Carter both were trustees or directors, whichever the term is, of the Irvine Land Company. And that's the meeting that resulted in a big headline in the L.A. Times "Reagan, Regents Clash" or some such. You seem to remember that meeting, because there ended up being a little shoving going on. I wonder if you could recount that for me right now. And I'm asking you to do it, because newspapers are not always correct, and your recollection seems to

differ a little from what the L.A. Times says.

GRANT: Well, my recollection is accurate as far as I'm concerned, and I talked to Reagan about it later, so he knows what it is too. And that is that there was a real hot discussion, and Roth and Fred Dutton were badgering the governor consistently through the meeting up to that point when we had a recess. And I sat at the corner of the table and Dutton next to me and Roth to his left. Reagan was across the table from us. I have a color picture taken at that meeting. It's somewhere at home. I don't have it here. It shows where I'm on that side and Reagan is over on the. . . . It's almost directly across a big table in a square position. And Reagan is talking to me in the picture, or I'm talking to him. I've forgotten which it was. And we had the recess, and Reagan jumped up and rushed around the table to where I was next to Fred Dutton and said to Fred, "Fred, did you call me a liar?" And Dutton said, "Take it any way you like, governor." And Reagan got squared off and was just ready to smash Dutton in the face, and Dutton hadn't even prepared himself for it. And

every camera, television camera, was turned right on those two, and I stepped between them and pushed Dutton back so Reagan couldn't reach him, and that cooled off Reagan, because he couldn't reach him, and I was in the way anyhow. So the newspapers came out with the story that Reagan had pushed or shoved or hit Dutton, I don't remember what it was. I guess it was different in different papers. But anyway that's what they said. So I called Reagan, and he was in San Diego somewhere at the time, and I called him from somewhere else in California after I'd read the paper account and said, "I see you got your name in the paper." He said, "Yes, where the hell did they get that I hit Dutton? I never touched the man." I said, "Of course, you didn't touch him. You couldn't reach him." He said, "What do you mean?" I said, "I stepped between you and I shoved Dutton back out of your reach." He said, "Why did you do that?" I said, "Because if you've got to hit him, wait till after the election." Well, Reagan said, "That's not bad advice. I guess maybe I'll let it go at that." And so that's what actually happened was

I was party to it. I didn't want the television cameras to get a picture of Dutton getting his face smashed by the candidate who was running for election.

TRELEVEN: Well, I wonder if it was the same meeting, because it was right around election time.

GRANT: I think it was the same meeting. Reagan was in San Diego, and I had gone wherever I was. I remember I called him in San Diego, because I had to find him. I was somewhere in central California when I called him that evening after I read the paper.

TRELEVEN: Now, was that an aberration that at a regents' meeting that things would get that intense?

GRANT: Yes, it was, because feelings were strong at some regents' meetings, but never coming that close to violence. Dutton has an aspersion, a feeling of aspersion for anybody who is conservative. Well, he has a feeling of aspersion for lots of people. [Laughter] But that time he had been badgering the governor. Every time the governor said anything, Dutton would belittle it or have some derogatory response to it. And so it got pretty hot.

TRELEVEN: Did Simon badger people too?

GRANT: No. No, Simon had very strong opinions and he was inclined to belittle other people's opinions because they didn't jibe with his, but he didn't badger them like Dutton, who is like a fox terrier dog. He's constantly having something to say when really what he has to say is totally irrelevant some of the time. In fact, one of the other regents says that Dutton is amoral. I don't know whether he's amoral, because I don't know him that well. But his behavior would indicate that he is not very sympathetic to anybody else and their views.

TRELEVEN: Okay, we were talking about a few of the campuses in terms of Grounds and Buildings. I wanted to ask your general opinion of something else and that is while Irvine develops, San Diego develops, Los Angeles takes far more students than had been initially indicated in the master plan, Riverside seems to kind of languish.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Is that your sense? What accounts for that?

GRANT: There is a general impression among the San Joaquin Valley residents that Riverside is a

research station.

TRELEVEN: Still? A research station as it definitely was years ago.

GRANT: Yes, and frankly I have a friend who attends the same church I do now who used to be in horticulture research at the Riverside campus. Riverside has contributed measurably to the nation as far as research is concerned. But that contributes to some degree. UCLA has a name in California second only to Berkeley and Stanford [University], so I'd place it almost on a level with Stanford in the minds of the general public as being only second to Berkeley. Some people say Stanford is second to Berkeley, but UCLA does have that reputation throughout the state.

TRELEVEN: But it seems that Riverside, I don't want to say it languishes during this period of rapid development and construction of other campuses, but it comes to mind a little now in these times, because Riverside has relatively few students at a time when other campuses are bulging over.

GRANT: Burgeoning.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah. And talking about building another campus and so on. But I'm just trying to see

what your sense of the reason is for Riverside not developing very rapidly.

GRANT: I don't have any real keen observation to make on that except that over time the reputation of UCLA and Berkeley--and Stanford, of course outside the circle--but Berkeley and UCLA have the prestige which causes people who have attended the university campuses, one or the other, to have a preferential position when they seek a job. And if they've gone to UCLA it's easier for them to get a position than it is if they've gone to Riverside. It may not be valid, it may not be justifiable, but it's a fact of life just the same. So my children went to San Francisco or Davis, although my youngest son went to Cal Poly [California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo], because his interest was greater for their kind of curriculum. But Berkeley and San Francisco and UCLA are the ones that are thought of when anybody thinks of California educational circles.

TRELEVEN: In terms of campuses related to agriculture, though, as opposed to Riverside, Davis developed quite rapidly professional schools and law.

GRANT: When I visited Mexico the farmers, Mexican farmers who are in some proximity to the border, have their education either at Texas A&M [University], Arizona State [University], Davis, or Berkeley. They didn't get their education in Mexico. They didn't get it at Riverside, which is closer to them. They got it at Davis. And they are very, very competent farmers. They farm the same way California farmers do. And of course, they speak English. One of them, very interesting side link extraneous to this, but his biggest production is quail eggs for bars. He has a cattle ranch, but the biggest part of his income is quail eggs boiled and sold to bars in the United States. That's about as unique an occupation as I can think of.

TRELEVEN: Being an agriculturalist yourself, of all the campuses did you take kind of a special interest in Davis?

GRANT: No, not necessarily. I suppose from my biased opinion of myself I have a broad interest in education. And in fact, when I was at a fairly large meeting of industrialists and manufacturers and so on back in the east somewhere--I don't

remember where it was or what the occasion was--I was visiting with three other men who were top flight industrialists. Finally, after about an hour of visiting with very, very strong opinions voiced, one of the men said, "Aren't you in agriculture?" And I said, "Yes, I am." He said, "Well, you haven't said one single word about agriculture in the last hour." I said, "You people are not interested in agriculture. We've been talking about foreign trade, we've been talking about monetary and fiscal policies of the government. Those are the things you're interested in. Why should I bring up agriculture, which is clear outside of your orbit of interest?" So my interests are not just agriculture. Even though I made a living farming and have done fairly well at it, I have other interests as well. So I was interested in Davis and its welfare, yes, but not to the exclusion of anything else.

TRELEVEN: Well, I raise it partly because Davis is quite well known for the kind of innovative technologies and scientific things they've developed relating to more efficient agriculture.

GRANT: And I've known the chancellors at Davis over time and I've known the vice presidents of the university who are interested in agriculture as intimate friends, but that's only part of my interest. I don't mean to belittle Davis in the slightest, but I have other interests too in education, because my daughter is a nurse. I'm interested in San Francisco.

TRELEVEN: Right. And I don't want to give the impression that I'm asking you this because Davis is an "Aggie school." Yes, it was, but it has law, it has engineering, it has medicine, and professional schools as well. I suppose I was thinking more in terms of perhaps geographical proximity to where you are, some of it agricultural related. But I don't want to. . . . There's one thread of agriculture that I don't want to drop, and some of this may have happened after you left the regents. But I know that in more recent times there has been devoted--it's been somewhat controversial--Davis has devoted more research time and interest into alternative farming methods. How do you feel about that? Because my understanding is this is

experimentation to see how you can farm with less pesticides and less insecticides and that kind of thing.

GRANT: That's part of it. There's no question about that being part of it. The farmers would like to use less--too costly. They don't want to use any more chemicals for pest control than they have to. They don't want to spend that money. And my son, eldest son, is operating an almond orchard for me and on his behalf, but because I owned it to begin with. And he didn't use any spray at all last year or this year. And across the road where they have a larger operation, they used a couple hundred dollars worth an acre for chemical control of insects. So he has the same idea I have, that you don't want to use anymore than you have to. So farmers would like to have some way to eliminate as much of it as they can. And also, I don't know whether you're aware of it or not, but I was instrumental in helping to develop a joint research program between the United States and Israel on agricultural research. And together, the United States government and the Israeli government each put \$40 million into the

program. That has developed now into \$120 million available for research, and still they do a tremendous job of research there on drip irrigation and the irrigation of certain crops with brackish water and so on, Of course, Israel is like California; they don't have all the water they need. And so it fits very well. And so if you can produce using the facilities and the finance and the land and the water that you have with less cost, then so much the better for the consumer as well as for that farmer producer. So I'm glad they're working on those kinds of things.

TRELEVEN: At the same time--we're getting a little bit away from the regents here, but that's fine--at the same time you, according to the book<sup>1</sup> which is in my hotel room actually, the one on Farm Bureau presidents.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I think in terms of the chapter on you, you were described as being quite opposed, strongly

---

1. Woell, Melvin L. Farm Bureau Architects Through Four Decades. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall-Hunt Publishing Company, 1990.

opposed, totally opposed to any government regulation of certain kinds of pesticides and insecticides or whatever. So what you're saying is that it's good if the farmer can use less to lessen the cost, but you don't want the government regulating the use of these?

GRANT: No, I do want the government regulating the use of them, but I would like the government regulating the use of them for everyone equally, not just for one particular place. And if the government's going to regulate the use of chemicals here in the United States, then we're going to bring food stuffs in from other countries for the consumer to use, so let's have the same kind of regulation on their part as on our part here. The same thing applies as far as price of the finished product is concerned. If we are going to compete in an open market for the sale of a product, we can't compete with a foreign treasury; we can only compete with a foreign farmer. And so it's the same thing. Let's have it fair and equitable for everybody. But farmers want as little control as is necessary and yet adequate control to guarantee

to the consumer that he has a safe product. But to use as little of the material as he possibly can use and still get the job done.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Anything more that you'd like to add about the Grounds and Buildings Committee experience?

GRANT: I don't think so. I think frankly the university is doing a pretty good job overall against tremendous opposition sometimes from people who are shortsighted about what the university ought to be doing. But I think overall the university is doing a good job, and people of the state support the university I think whenever it wants to do things like building a new campus or adding facilities wherever they seem necessary.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, another one of your innocuous committees was Audit [Committee]. The record I have shows that a firm by the name of Haskins and Sells seem to be the consistent auditors. I haven't asked anyone this. Why would Haskins and Sells tend to do this year after year after year?

GRANT: Well, the reason for it is that they were doing a good job, and they were easy to talk to, and if corrective suggestions were made, they were always open to conviction. They were willing to

listen to board members, and board members of course don't have the opportunity to see the total picture until the audit is presented to them all in one piece. So it takes time for the Audit Committee to look the thing over, and Haskins and Sells seemed to be very receptive to listening to any kind of correction or criticism about their work. And of course, that can be measured in any way you'd like to see it. But it seemed to the committee that they were doing a good job.

TRELEVEN: Well, how precisely does it work? Haskins and Sells completes the audit and then submits a report to the president's office?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And then the president's office, the president . . .

GRANT: The president of course . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . is a member of the committee.

GRANT: . . . is a member of the committee, and so he then brings it to the committee at the committee's request or at his suggestion or both. Then the committee takes quite a lot of time to look at each one. They don't just pass

it over automatically, they look at it very carefully. And some members of the committee as I had some experience with building and so and spending money, because these are business people that are on the board of regents, as I was, with a knowledge more than just in their own particular activity. And so they do look at it very carefully. They scrutinize it. And Haskins and Sells were receptive to that kind of appraisal.

TRELEVEN: And is this something that would be sent out to you at your home, or must all of this material be considered in the committee meeting?

GRANT: Well, we took time to look at it, so as I recall it was sent to us ahead of time and then we came together and looked at it corporately. Anyway, it did take a lot of time.

TRELEVEN: I would think so.

GRANT: What's that?

TRELEVEN: I would think so.

GRANT: Yeah, sometimes we had to have a special meeting and go over it again or specific parts of it. And Haskins and Sells were always glad to take whatever time was necessary to justify their

opinions. And sometimes we'd convince them that they weren't quite right on something. We were very careful about it, because each one of those members of the committee were businessmen in their own right, and so they looked at it from that point of view. Is it good, or is it nearly good, or is it something that has to be changed?

TRELEVEN: Special Research Projects Committee, that doesn't seem to be the way to slough somebody off in a corner, and that . . .

GRANT: Well, I knew Dr. [Ernest O.] Lawrence quite well in a friendly sort of way.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

GRANT: And of course Lawrence Livermore Laboratory came out of him and his dreams and so on. And I had a very high regard for Dr. Lawrence.

TRELEVEN: But this would take you to. . . . Special Research Projects had to do then with Livermore and Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory?

GRANT: Yes, both of them.

TRELEVEN: Right. And in order to be on that committee, you had to get a security clearance? Is that right?

GRANT: Yes, I think so. As I recall, we did. Yes, I would think so.

TRELEVEN: So people were running around Visalia asking questions about you. [Laughter]

GRANT: I expect so.

TRELEVEN: That was at the time and continues to be a controversial area.

GRANT: Yes. Always will be.

TRELEVEN: It came up again this past year in terms of the renewal of the UC contract with the Department of Energy. And the Academic Senate I think has voted consistently to urge the regents to cut off their relationship and to stop contracting. What's your feeling about the relationship between the University of California and the Los Alamos and the Livermore laboratories?

GRANT: I'm for it.

TRELEVEN: For it? Why?

GRANT: I'm for it. The Academic Senate is opposed to it, but I think they're mistaken.

TRELEVEN: Well, tell me why you're for it.

GRANT: Why I'm for it?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: Because, well, for one thing if you were just looking at jobs and dollars and so on, it's an asset to the community to have it there, so I'm

for it for that purpose, if that was the only thing I was considering. But also, I think it's important enough that it does not detract from the university; it adds to the prestige of the University of California. And if you add to the prestige of the University of California, you add to the opportunity for students from the University of California to profit by their chosen profession, whatever it is, whether it has anything to do with Livermore or Los Alamos or something entirely separate from it. You add to the prestige of the university, you add to the opportunity for students who graduate or matriculate through the university. And I think frankly that that research is worthwhile for the nation, and therefore I don't find any negative thing to cause me to feel in agreement with the Academic Senate.

TRELEVEN: Okay, in terms of what you did and what you saw, I'm not going to ask you that, because it was classified at the time and it might be classified now unless there's. . . . Well, I'll ask you about a few other. . . . I know John Canaday was a strong supporter of the laboratories, and you

probably got to know Norris [E.] Bradbury a little bit down in Los Alamos.

GRANT: A little bit.

TRELEVEN: But today it would be asked as well as it was asked then if I were, say, a dissident student. I would say, well, "Why is the university in the business of making bombs?" How do you respond to that?

GRANT: Well, I would have to voice my bias on that score, and that is that I know my two younger sons spent their Vietnam [War] time in the navy. I know quite a number of people who served in the navy. I know from listening to them that when the U.S. navy was ready to go into Yokohama before Japan was conquered that that whole mountain as the ships would have sailed into Yokohama was covered with cannon ready to blast every single ship and kill hundreds and thousands of American men, but Truman said, "Yes, drop the [atomic] bomb on Hiroshima and on Nagasaki." And so the war was over. I also know that at one time. . . . I can't remember which one it was. It seems to me it was Stalin. It might have been [Nikita] Khrushchev who said what he was going to

do, and the president of the United States said, "Do it and I'll drop a bomb on Moscow." He said, "I won't do it." So I'm biased. And so people find fault with our having slaughtered hundreds of thousands of people in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and I'm not opposed to Japanese this far after the end of the war, but I would rather they died than our American sailors should die. And so making a difficult judgment as Truman had to make, I am for the fact that he did it. And so also thinking about the forty or fifty years of peace we had after the Second World War, the reason we had it was because we had the bomb. I don't like that, but that's the reason. And so my bias shows clearly, but I have to be in sympathy with the fact that we had forty or fifty years of peace because we had the bomb.

TRELEVEN: But isn't there a contradiction between that and academic freedom? Because the university as you emphasized yesterday should be a bastion for academic freedom, and yet the university really doesn't have that much control, say, over the employees of Los Alamos and Livermore.

GRANT: That's true. But out of academic freedom comes

personal freedom. And academic freedom is basic to many of the freedoms that we have. If we don't have personal freedom, then we regress to a kind of anarchy. And I think because we have the bomb, we have had personal freedom for half a century, and that's worth something. So I think to that degree, we have to digress from the top position of academic freedom to a close look at what has transpired because we made that concession. Again, I have to say that's a bias on my part, and people have a perfect right to their own conclusions. But that's where I am.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Some positive things come out of something called the Nuclear Science Fund. My understanding, and it's public record, is that the university, when it made a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission or later the Department of Energy, that there's an overhead cost that the university gets. It was set at 45 percent, I believe. And that built into a fund which the regents could use for loaning, to provide the building with various kinds of structures that would not be provided for in the governor's budget or the regents' budget and so on. And I

certainly got the sense that in reading through the regents' minutes that in Finance Committee, somewhat in Grounds and Buildings, that out of those committees would come recommendations that some of the money be spent for, and then you as a regent would help to allocate according to priorities about where that money was going to be loaned. And it's an enormous amount of money overall. So my conclusion--see if this agrees with yours--is that the Nuclear Science Fund played a rather important role in building substantial portions of the university.

GRANT: That's right, yeah. It was money that was there, that was available, and up to the discretion of the regents as to what you do with what money is available, and it was used. It comes back to the difference of opinion that legislators, that senators and congressmen have on the use of Social Security funds. The money is there. Better use it for whatever seems to be a priority.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And so I have to agree that if the money is there, it's better to use it than to just leave

it there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, that gets into a larger battle, which I don't know whether to wade into right now or to . . . . How am I going to do this? Because it really gets into the kind of what I'd call attempted legislative incursion into the operations of the regents, because of pressures to use more of that money for operating expenses. Shall we tackle that now, or shall we wait?

GRANT: Oh, I think we'd better wait.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] So your consistent feeling, to get back to the laboratories, is that they are a positive benefit to the university and to the state of California.

GRANT: Yes, I don't think there's any. . . . In my mind, there's no question about it.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: But then somebody else could have his question. He's welcome to it. But I don't have much trouble making up my mind about things like that. I think it's a positive factor.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Now again, I don't want you to answer this so that you're breaching any classified

information, but when you and Canaday and others on Special Research Projects would go to these sites and you were briefed and so on, what was the . . . ? I don't want to say what the quality of the briefings were, but did that help convince you that this is first a good reason for the university to be involved in the laboratories? That's not . . .

GRANT: That wouldn't be the total influencing factor, no, because I do read and I used to subscribe to Intelligence Digest, which is the oldest continuing intelligence publication in the world, [Kenneth] de Courcy's publication. But I don't have it any more because I don't have to do with the university or Farm Bureau or anything else. But it goes back to like 1913 or something like that, and they have information that comes out in the newspapers maybe a year later or something. They're way ahead of everybody else as far as information is concerned that the general public doesn't have. So reading that kind of stuff, my opinions were formed that were only solidified by going to Los Alamos and to the other one. And so I can't say that their showing us around that

place did much more than just solidify my position that was already there, already felt that way. Well, I told you about talking publically about the Sputnik going up.

TRELEVEN: Yes, right, yesterday.

GRANT: And a university professor retired, because he didn't even know it was going through. It went up within two weeks. Well, why didn't he? I don't know. But he made a mistake in resigning. He shouldn't have.

TRELEVEN: What would you say about university control relating to Livermore and Los Alamos? Does the university . . . ? I mean, you have the regents' Oversight Committee [of Department of Energy Laboratories], as it's called now, but is there really that much control?

GRANT: No, no. There's not that much control except by suggestion, that's all. It's not really control. It's only by suggestion and by the attitude of the regents recognized and appreciated by the people at Livermore that. . . . It's not really control I think. It may be supposed to look like it, but it isn't. But I still think it's satisfactory.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I guess in '73, '74, you were on Educational Policy. By then someone might have got an inkling that the constitution was going to be changed.<sup>1</sup> [Laughter]

GRANT: [Assemblyman John] Vasconcellos [who aggressively promoted the idea], I won't forget his name. I think it's a mis. . . . Just to categorize it simply, I think that it was a mistake. They took off the Mechanics Institute and the president of the state board of agriculture and put a student on there. And students don't have any background, and agriculture contributes multibillions of dollars to the economy. The student produces nothing yet. He is totally ignorant of economics, of finance, of necessary policies as far as the university is concerned. Well, he's just a plain novice. He's not evil or anything, immoral. He just is a nonentity at that time. And so it seemed to me that Vasconcellos's bill was totally without justification. Not because it was me. I was

---

1. S.C.A. 45, 1973-1974 Reg. Sess., Cal Stat., r. ch. 85 (1974).

about through. That's irrelevant. And during the time I was on the board of regents, they mentioned several people who had come from the state board of agriculture who had contributed measurably to the university and to the board of regents and to the decision making. Not that I did. They were talking about people prior to the time I was there. But anybody with as broad an interest as anyone who could be named to the presidency of the state board of agriculture, a broad interest in the whole economy of the nation, or the world as far as that's concerned, is qualified, I think, to serve on the board of regents. But apparently Vasconcellos didn't think so, and he was able to convince the people that that should be the case.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and that led up to the initiative.<sup>1</sup>

GRANT: What's that?

TRELEVEN: That led up to the initiative on the ballot in 1974 that in a way was kind of a compromise, because when you were on the regents and before there was always someone, a legislator, too, who

---

1. Proposition 4 (November 1974).

said we should amend the constitution so that the terms are only eight years long.

GRANT: Yes, of course they did change it after a while.

TRELEVEN: How would you assess that shoving it back to eight years, reducing the term to eight years?

GRANT: Well, frankly I think that eight years is better. I don't have any quarrel with that, but there also is something to be said for the fact that after you have served a certain length of time you know more about it than when you first start. But I think eight years is adequate, frankly.

TRELEVEN: So it's against that kind of pressure or that kind of influence or whatever we want to call it that in a way the initiative seemed to be in terms of length of term kind of a compromise, because it became twelve. I don't understand totally what was behind the idea of removing both ex officio regents for the Mechanics Institute and the board of agriculture.

GRANT: I didn't take any active part in opposition to it at all, not any.

TRELEVEN: You didn't. Well, because it would look like, what, conflict of interest, I suppose?

GRANT: Yes. I didn't say anything about it publically. I did to anybody who asked me a question. I answered their question, but I didn't take any position publically about it at all. But I do think it was wrong. I think considering, well, the way the university started was agriculture and mechanical arts.

TRELEVEN: Right, Land Grant College.

GRANT: Yes, and I think it still is a university of all disciplines, and agriculture being as important as it is, and the Mechanics Institute is perhaps a good place to choose some . . .

[End Tape 4, Side A]

[Begin Tape 4, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Just so we pick up all of your last sentence, because I lost track of the recorder, you were saying that in terms of the Mechanics Institute and the . . .

GRANT: I'm not intimately familiar with the Mechanics Institute, so I can't say that that's exactly the right place to choose somebody from, but because the university was a university of agriculture and mechanic arts to begin with, what they were talking about at that time were people who make

their living from manufacturing, invention, and so on, and maybe that's the right place. But as far as agriculture is concerned, I feel strongly that nobody would be chosen for the position who does not have a pretty broad knowledge of all of the economy of the state. And it would be hard for me to conceive of anybody who wasn't knowledgeable about education, about finance--in addition to agriculture--about trade, about fiscal matters of all kinds relating to the university as well as to the state and the nation. So I don't know why a person from that position would not be adequately prepared to serve on the board of regents. So I don't know a good reason for taking them off and putting a student on. That seems like a step backward, because a student really doesn't have background enough to function as a regent. He or she may be able to tell the regents how the students feel about certain disciplines that are being worked on in the university, but that's about all the contribution he can make.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I think some of the context of the student regent was going back some years to the fact that

students were shut out of virtually all kinds of decision making on the campus, in the university system. That's probably some of the background for that. Faculty Senate was also offered the opportunity to have a representative on the regents. They declined, because they said it would be a conflict of interest. I'm trying to think right now whether there is any regent who could even distantly be called a farmer. I don't think so on the current board of regents. And I may be wrong. I'm not as familiar with the current regents as past ones. But isn't the elimination from the constitution of the agricultural representative, isn't that kind of symbolic of the declining power that rural interests have and that farmers have and the agriculture . . . ?

GRANT: Perhaps to some degree, but anybody who is in that position as president of the state board of agriculture is not only a farmer.

TRELEVEN: No, I understand that.

GRANT: Because farming was the way I made my living, but my interests were way beyond the farm. In fact, I remember getting my shoes shined one time in

Washington, D.C. And this black shoe polisher said, "What do you-all do, boss?" I said, "I'm a farmer." He backed off, stopped shining my shoes and backed off and looked me up and down and said, "Mister, you don't look like no farmer to me. You-all looks like a banker." [Laughter] But looks I guess aren't everything.

TRELEVEN: Well, let's say hypothetically the constitutional amendment would have failed. Jerry Brown, I take it, would not have renamed you president of the board of agriculture.

GRANT: No, he would not.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] So your term with the regents would have been over.

GRANT: Oh yes, it would have been all through anyway. I wouldn't have minded it being all through except for the reason being that I think that would be the wrong reason, because somebody else would be the head of the state board of agriculture some day and he wouldn't be on there either. So I don't think the reasoning. . . . Of course, Brown wouldn't name me anyway under any circumstances.

TRELEVEN: After your eight years of ex officio term were completed, had you been asked to have a regular

term as a regent, would you have taken it?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: No? Why not?

GRANT: Partly my age.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And the fact that I had been all this time away from home on the Farm Bureau and with the Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade, with [President Gerald R.] Ford and [President James E.] Carter and Reagan, and also on the Advisory Committee on AID [United States Agency for International Development] with [Peter] McPherson and just been away too much. I wanted to be at home. And my wife wanted me to be at home after all those years. She was with me a lot towards the last, and went with me to all kinds of other countries and so on, but it was time to be at home.

TRELEVEN: Time to be at home and just in time to run for the presidency of the American Farm Bureau Federation. [Laughter]

GRANT: Yes, I didn't quit. I thought I was going to get a rocking chair, but it wasn't to be the case. I told them I won't stay long. If you really feel

that you need to make a change, well, you can put my name up, but I won't stay long. I only stayed two terms, four years. They didn't want me to quit, and Reagan didn't want me to quit being on the Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade, either. But it's time to quit. I'd had all the accolades one man needs anyway.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Let's get back to some areas relating to the business of the regents, policy of the regents. There seemed to be about the time you came on the board a great amount of interest in administering discipline to students and wanting to see discipline administered, and from the regents' level trying to establish and enforce regulations relating to students. And this was necessary why?

GRANT: It was felt it was necessary because of the attitude of the students, or a lot of the students, toward the university and wanting to take over the university and to decide what's to be taught and who is to do the teaching. And that was at base of the whole thing.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, you mentioned that again yesterday. Are you thinking specifically of Cleaver's "Social

Problems 139X"?

GRANT: That was part of it, but the great numbers of students were thinking that they ought to be the decision makers and not the Academic Senate. And as I said before, Harvard and Cornell capitulated to them. And if you do enough of that, after a while you politicize the university and you have the same thing you have in South America and in Asia to some degree, that nobody knows what's going to be taught, and political decisions are made rather than academic decisions. And the Academic Senate abdicated their responsibility and then turned it over to the students in those cases. And some people say, well, maybe it was the liberal. . . . I mean the conservatives that were being hammered at, but Harvard and Cornell are not conservative, neither one of them. And so it happened wherever the Academic Senate was foolish enough to allow it to happen. And the Academic Senate ought to be making the decisions, otherwise you don't have academic freedom.

TRELEVEN: Okay, the regents set the policy in terms of student discipline, and they expect the president to enforce it, and the president expects the

chancellors to enforce it and so on. At the same time, it wasn't a perfect world out there.

GRANT: No, totally imperfect.

TRELEVEN: So there were some bothersome things going on, to put it mildly, that certainly provided the backdrop for a lot of student demonstrations, which certainly you were personally a part of, because, like it or not, as a member of the board of regents you were considered a member of the establishment.

GRANT: Absolutely, absolutely.

TRELEVEN: And you were . . .

GRANT: And almost, not a flagship of the establishment, but a banner or a target or something, because they thought of the establishment as being staid and hidebound and unmovable, immovable, and so they didn't like that. They wanted their own ideas picked up as valid, whereas their own ideas were totally at odds with the Academic Senate. Their own ideas would take away the freedom to research, freedom to think, freedom to make decisions, the opportunity for discussion, and coming to a conclusion by compromise. They don't want to compromise anything. They wanted it all

their way. And that doesn't work even for grown people, let alone students. One of the questions that Alex Sherriffs used to raise from time to time with me with loco parentis, "Do you think that the university ought to take the place of the parents in training these young people to do the right thing?" He said, "You can't do that. The university can't take the place of the parents. They're up here at this age, and all their fixations have already been determined, and they're at this point now where somebody has to say, 'Well, this is the behavior, and these are the parameters within which you operate, and you can't get out of that.'"

TRELEVEN: Okay, so the rules are put down by the establishment, which includes you.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And you expect them to be enforced. Was it inevitable then that that would mean bringing police into the environment of academic freedom?

GRANT: Yes, it's almost inevitable when you have the determination not to compromise under any circumstance. The mere fact of occupation is not violent perhaps to begin with, but it precedes

violence. So when the police rescued me from the Black Panthers, they had to be there, because the Black Panthers were screaming. Well, they seemed to have a leader, a black. They were all black. They broke the door down to get into the regents' meeting. I think maybe it was Santa Cruz. And the leader was leading them in a chant such as you might have at a football game, only the words were different: "Lynch the governor, kill the regents, kill the governor, lynch the regents" in unison. And it was so loud we had to change the meeting to another place. So they were still saying that, and when the Black Panther got. . . . When I was stopped by the students to answer questions, a Black Panther jumped on the table and jumped off of that on my back, and of course that pleased the rest of the Black Panthers who were outside this group of students who had surrounded me. And they were yelling, "Kill the son of a bitch! Knock him down! Kick his teeth out! Make him remember this meeting!" Well, that's not compromise, that's not discussion, that's demand for my ideas and no one else's. And so the fact that you have

that attitude brings the police in. You can't leave the police out of it. One of them stepped on Mrs. Hearst's foot and shoved her to knock her down. Fortunately, somebody caught her before she hit the floor. And that kind of violence is totally unacceptable as far as I'm concerned, and therefore you do whatever's necessary to stop that violence, because the bulk of the students are there to learn. You have a small minority there to disrupt the whole thing, and so violence breeds violence, so you have to have the police. And when they came after me, they formed a V to get to me and then took me out of there to where the meeting was progressing. And I wouldn't look like I do now if the students hadn't protected me.

TRELEVEN: Outside of those kinds of confrontations that you're talking about, what efforts did you as a regent make to talk to students on campuses during this period of turmoil? I mean, if you were going to meet, say, in San Diego, would you spend some time trying to talk to students at San Diego?

GRANT: Not by my own choice, no, but if they wanted to

talk to me, they were welcome to, and I would stop and talk to any of them that wanted to talk. But I didn't choose to set up any formal gathering.

TRELEVEN: No, but I mean just walking and saying . . .

GRANT: Oh yes, I talked to them, and they of course didn't agree with my views, those that wanted to talk. Those that were there for business and wanted to learn didn't want to talk to the regents. They wanted to study. So any that you talked to were those who were wanting to develop a problem. And they tried their best to develop that problem by the questions they asked. The questions were posed in such a manner that your answer would antagonize them to ask another question, which they hoped would lead to a confrontation.

TRELEVEN: Did you have any empathy for the students, at least protesting students, say, when [President Richard M.] Nixon bombed Cambodia? And everything seemed to be quieting down a little, well, relatively speaking. The People's Park issue created disturbances on various campuses as you'll remember. But then in the seventies

things were getting a little better, and then came the bombing and then sort of a . . .

GRANT: Yeah, that stirred them up of course, because they were looking for something to coordinate their efforts to be opposed to the establishment, to burn down the establishment and start over. They didn't know where to start, but they wanted to start over.

TRELEVEN: Right. It started with the Bank of America building in Isla Vista, right?

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Among other things.

GRANT: Yeah, destroy it, and let's start over. Well, how do you start over? They didn't have any plan or program. It just seems like a bad dream when you think about it now. How could students be so silly? And Robert McAfee Brown, a theologian, said that academic freedom had to get out of the way for personal freedom. Well, academic freedom is a personal freedom. What's he talking about? That's silly. And he's supposed to be an educated man. Here I am without degrees and presumptuous to think he's a fool. And yet I have strong theological feelings of my own, but

here's a theologian who has made it his life work to study and understand and know theology so he knows the answers, and I'm presumptuous to say that he's silly. So everybody has a right to his own opinion.

TRELEVEN: Several times you've really seemed to have been saying that the majority of the faculty as represented in the Senate waffled badly in their defense of various things--students; in defense of. . . . In the case of Eldrige Cleaver's course at Berkeley, social problems course, and relating to other things that had to do with curriculum, which is an area that's reserved for the Academic Senate.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And bylaws and standing orders [of the regents]. What I'm wondering is whether that's the backdrop of some situations that developed where the regents appeared to want to assert more authority over such areas as appointments and promotion and so on of tenure decisions made about faculty. And I wanted to talk about a couple of the areas in particular. One had to do with Professor [Herbert] Marcuse at San Diego.

He was what was called an overage appointment, and he. . . . The chancellor at the time was [John S.] Galbraith, and he recommended that he be reappointed. And some regents didn't feel he should. Isn't that meddling in the prerogative of a chancellor and a president?

GRANT: Yes, I wrote a note down here about Marcuse, but I can't remember now what I. . . . I guess I didn't write it down. No, I didn't write it down, but it doesn't matter. I don't remember now exactly what it was he said that I took vigorous issue with about learning. I'll have to look it up again and see what it was, because I wrote it down one time. But he was completely out of line with the Academic Senate, the position of the Academic Senate and any part of the university. His ideas were. . . . Well, they were foreign to the thinking of any person who is in favor of order and against chaos and. . . . Well, I think there are some absolutes in life. He didn't seem to think so. And so I thought he was foolish in his attitude and I thought the university was better off without him. I don't remember now exactly what finally took place, but

I thought he was no good as an example for students, no good at all, because I believe in absolutes.

TRELEVEN: So you were in favor of his not being renewed?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And he was renewed as it turned out. But should a regent be meddling in this kind of administrative thing?

GRANT: Basically no. I agree with that premise. Basically no, they should not. The Academic Senate should be making those decisions and they ought to have sense enough to make them and not waffle on things of that kind. You can't have the parents handling the students when they get there. They're supposed to be. . . . Come out of this cocoon stage and get to be thinking adults of their own. And the Academic Senate is supposed to guide them to some degree, and they're supposed to begin their adult thinking. They won't all agree, but finally come to the truth of the matter, whatever the matter may be. So the regents basically should not be interfering with that, but the Academic Senate doesn't have sense enough to do it. That makes

the regents step in. Just as when you have violence, they shouldn't be doing that, but the police have to step in. And you don't want it, you don't think it's any good at all, you didn't want the atomic bomb dropped, but the alternative was to let thousands and thousands of American sailors die. And so you do what you have to do. I don't think it should be the case at all, no.

TRELEVEN: Well, in a way every time the regents do this, wouldn't it send a signal to maybe a president or a chancellor that there was not a level of confidence?

GRANT: That's correct, yes. There was not a level of confidence.

TRELEVEN: And you didn't give [Charles E.] Chuck Young a very good endorsement of confidence in the Angela Davis case either.

GRANT: No, sir. No, sir.

TRELEVEN: You caught him in his early days of succeeding to Franklin [D.] Murphy.

GRANT: Too bad.

TRELEVEN: Correct me if I'm wrong, but Chuck's position was that he was recommending a second year of lectureship for Angela Davis because of her

philosophy department recommendations. The appropriate committee of the Academic Senate passed recommendations through the chancellor on up to the president, and the regents resisted.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And all of this came about, according to William French Smith's interview,<sup>1</sup> because he, Smith, came to a regents' meeting and said, "There's a communist teaching in the University of California. We have a policy against communists being on the staff. Either we enforce the policy, or we do something about it, do something else." Does that square with your recollection of how this Angela Davis thing got . . . ?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so the first issue is that Davis is a communist. Well, there was a policy, and what were your thoughts about that policy that was created way back in the 1940s, early fifties about a member of the Communist party teaching as

---

1. William French Smith, Oral History Interview, "Evolution of the Kitchen Cabinet, 1965-1973." Conducted 1988 by Gabrielle Morris, Regional Oral History Office, University of California, Berkeley.

a faculty member?

GRANT: Well, having some knowledge about what communism has done to people throughout the world, I was inclined to agree with that old, old policy and with William French Smith that communism didn't belong in any kind of a discussion in a free country at all. That decision had already been made by the communists themselves, by their. . . . Well, I mentioned earlier that Roosevelt and Churchill agreed to turn over hundreds of thousands of people to Stalin to be slaughtered. So my attitude toward communism was about like William French Smith's probably. I don't remember talking to him about it personally, but it probably was about the same. And having had displaced persons on the ranch that I helped to escape from communism, and actually one family hid in a manure pile to get away from machine-gun fire. They got finally to where we were, and I helped enough of those people that sixteen of their children got to grow up in a free America. So I was diametrically opposed to Marxism, communism, whatever you want to call it. And so I didn't want Angela Davis there. Of course, the

action of the university was not isolated. The National Council of Churches were in favor of Angela Davis. And I heard the ambassador from Mexico speak, and he was in favor of what he called a "new world economic order called liberation theology," which is to mix Christianity and communism and have a whole lot better future for the whole world. They don't mix any more than oil and water. They're just two different philosophies. And so my attitude toward Angela Davis was she didn't belong in the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay. It turned out as I understand it the regents' policy was out of sync with some recent court decisions. I can't remember names.

GRANT: Out of sync with what?

TRELEVEN: Some recent court decisions . . .

GRANT: Oh yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . that had occurred in the sixties that you could not bar a member of the Communist party just because he or she was a member of the party. But then it became an issue that after Young, Hitch recommended that she be reappointed, the regents said no, and you were among the regents who said no.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Again, doesn't it send a signal that you don't have confidence in Hitch and Young and the Academic Senate mechanism to be able to make these decisions?

GRANT: That's correct. That is not only a signal, an actuality. The regents who voted against her continuation did not have confidence in Hitch or Young or both, and it wasn't just a signal, it was an actuality that at that point, they did not have confidence in them. And it's too bad that it had to happen that way, but in retrospect it looks to me as if the regents were right and Young and Hitch were wrong. Of course, that's again a biased opinion. I have biased opinions.

TRELEVEN: Well, the courts were going to decide who was right and wrong, and one thing led to another and there was no court judgment, of course. But ultimately the regents got sued. Is that correct? It went into the courts, and Angela Davis was involved in some other things, and it became a mute point. I can't remember the ins and outs but . . .

GRANT: She was not only a communist, but she was a

criminal. And I don't remember which court it was in, but she was also a criminal, and that was a factor also.

TRELEVEN: But in terms of university policy and governance, the issue here is the regents taking back authority over appointments . . .

GRANT: Yes, yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . promotions . . .

GRANT: And I don't agree that that's a good thing.

TRELEVEN: Well, now wait.

GRANT: I think it has to be done sometimes, and therefore it makes it good if you want to look at it that way. Don't hesitate at all to voice your opinion if you want to, because I have no . . . That doesn't make a difference to me personally at all.

TRELEVEN: No, and I'm not here to give my opinion. I'm really trying to get your . . . I want to get to the bottom of this through your attitude and opinion at the time. Isn't it in some ways dangerous for a policy board to again become enmeshed in these administrative matters of, simple promotions, tenure decisions, and so on? Because it looks to me like what happened after the Davis case is that listings were sent in the minutes

that increased your three-to-four-inch pile by another two inches, and the name of every single individual who was being recommended had to go to the regents. And it looked like that the regents were saying, "We are going to look at these carefully and we're going to exert veto power if we feel it's necessary."

GRANT: I don't think it was a good thing for them to change and send us all those that whole long list. I don't think that was good at all. I don't think it was necessary. But it seemed to them it was necessary, so they did it. I don't think I told you this, but when I became president of the American Farm Bureau, I called in sequence each one of the department heads. There were about twelve or fifteen of them, I don't remember. And one fellow came and brought his recommendations for salary increase to me, and it was \$2,000 a year increase for a certain man. I said, "Is this man worth it?" "Well, no." I said, "You're recommending a \$2,000 increase for him?" He said, "Yes." "Why?" He said, "We've always done it that way." I said, "You're not doing it that way from now on. Tell

me why he's worth the \$2,000 increase." "Well," he said, "he really isn't." I said, "Well, now tell me why he isn't." "Well," he said, "he's a chess enthusiast, and he always finds a reason to go to Louisiana or California or New York when there's a chess tournament at that place, and so he not only is not worth it as a man on the staff, but he also wastes his time." I said, "Well, Harold you know what to do." He said, "You want me to tell him that you said to let him go?" I said, "No, not me. We'll have the Fair Employment Practices people here tomorrow. I just got here. You know what to do with him." A year later the man came just to visit and said, "Well," he said, "you fired me, but I have a better job, so I just wanted to come in and thank you." I said, "I didn't fire you. Harold did." "Oh no," he said, "Harold told me you said to let him go." Well, Harold didn't have gumption enough to do it himself. And the Academic Senate and Hitch and company didn't have enough gumption to do it themselves, and so it had to be done, just as the police have to come in when you have a problem. You don't want it,

but you have to do it. And you don't like it, because it's wrong.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's a good way to possibly lose a president or a chancellor or two also, right?

GRANT: Sure. And it's also really unfair to everybody: the regents, and the Academic Senate, and the president, and the person you're talking about. It's unfair to all of them. Somebody ought to have the sense enough and gumption enough to do what is necessary to be done, and then you don't have to bring in the people that don't belong in that circle.

TRELEVEN: Now at the time that was happening according to say, well, according to Sidney Hook, say, had Academic Senates become in his mind sort of bankrupt?

GRANT: Yes, in some case it does. In some case it does. If they capitulate to unfair or wrong demands, they have become bankrupt. They are not functional at all. And what kind of an example does that set for the students? The students are there not only to learn, but to see some kind of an example set as far as department, ethics, operations are concerned, or they get entirely

the wrong picture. Whatever is the right thing to do in my mind now is the right thing to do, regardless of the ethics or anything else. I just do what seems to be important right at the moment, and that's what some of them were saying, and the Academic Senate agreed with them. That's the thing to do is to forget about us. Do what you want to do.

TRELEVEN: Well, in terms of situations that would come up in regard to professors being recommended for appointment, promotion, tenure, my generalization is that there was never any question about any right-wingers. It was always a question about left-wingers. And why is that so?

GRANT: It shouldn't be so, because if you have left-wingers doing what the left-wingers did during this period of time, and you capitulate to the left-wingers, then after a while you're going to have the right-wingers jumping in and saying, "Wait a minute here, you're all fouled up." And so then you have the same kind of violence and threat of violence from the right-wingers you capitulated to on the left-wingers. So that's where the Academic Senate put themselves right in

line of fire for the opposition to come in and raise hell at another time. And so violence breeds violence, whether it's actual fistfighting or whether it's just appropriation of university property by sit-ins and so on. It's the same thing as violence, whether you are actually in physical contact or not.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Let me state that another way. It seems to me that the regents would never get excited about an ultraright-winger, and I can't believe the university didn't have at least one or two.

GRANT: Yeah, the general populace has a few.

TRELEVEN: And always the eyebrows were raised and the questions asked by, say, a Glenn Campbell about an alleged Marxist or something. It was never the other way around.

GRANT: Well, the . . .

TRELEVEN: Left-wingers are more dangerous, I guess or something.

GRANT: They are more dangerous in actuality to the established situation. Right-wingers are not that dangerous in the minds of most people. I have a nephew who is about as near to a John Bircher [John Birch Society] as you could find

anywhere, nice guy. But his father was a flaming liberal--my mother's brother--and then when he retired he'd invested his money in properties and he then had to begin to pay a lot of tax. He said. . . . And he and I were not just uncle and nephew, we were personal friends. And we used to argue, not fight, just argue philosophy, politics, and so on. And when he retired and had to begin to pay a lot of tax, he said, "Allan, you were right the whole time. I was wrong." So a right-winger develops from his idea that he is being imposed upon by somebody. And the left-winger develops from exactly the same thing, only on the other side. So the right-winger doesn't seem to hurt anybody, but the left-winger threatens the establishment.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and the regents being members of the establishment . . .

GRANT: That's right.

TRELEVEN: . . . feel threatened also?

GRANT: Feel threatened, yes. I don't think there's any question about that. They felt threatened. Not they themselves, but the establishment was threatened, and they are part of the

establishment. So this thing that's happening is going to get out of hand if we don't do something. I think when you get right down to basics that's where it is.

TRELEVEN: Right. You mentioned the Birchers and you're a conservative Republican, but you place yourself at a distance from the John Birch Society.

GRANT: Yes, I do.

TRELEVEN: And where do you begin to migrate elsewhere when it comes to . . . ?

GRANT: I don't know that. A son-in-law of mine married our eldest daughter, nice guy, but he's been in the state park service until he retired and did very well at administration. And he feels very strongly that the money in the nation is in too few hands.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, you were mentioning that yesterday.

GRANT: Too many people don't have enough and too few people have too much of it. And there's only a certain amount of it to be distributed among the people. There ought to be a better distribution.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

GRANT: And I said, "Well, now, as I grew in my capability to farm and hired more employees and

had a higher and higher income as I did more and more farming, at what point did I become evil?" "Oh no, no," he said, "not evil." And I said, "Well then, what you're saying is I had a disproportionate share of the total wealth in the nation at some point." And so he didn't want to argue with that. I said, "Who makes that decision that I had too much? The guy that doesn't have enough or the guy that has more than I have? Somebody has got to make that decision. You're not going to make it." He says, "Oh, I can't argue with you." Well, I don't know when I got to that point there where I am in that point of division between John Birchers and the opposite end. I don't know where I am on that. I told you about my treatment of my employees, and that's not according to John Birchers, so maybe I'm a liberal, maybe I'm a John Bircher. I don't know. No, I don't think I'm a John Bircher.

TRELEVEN: I just raised that because you had . . .

GRANT: That's a good thing, a good thing to raise.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I think I'm going to pause for a minute.

[End Tape 4, Side B]

[Session 3, April 30, 1991]

[Begin Tape 5, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, it's the afternoon of April 30, and we're starting our third session. I wonder if I could wade into budgets a little bit, which will get us into other things, but how much did you have to do with regent budget making as a member of the board?

GRANT: Not any great amount personally as far as that's concerned. I participated in the regents' meetings, of course, the total meeting, but as far as the budget was concerned, I had to rely on what information was brought to the board of regents by the Budget Committee, by the president, and by the chancellors, and so on.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and you would no doubt get the draft budget  
. . .

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . and have an opportunity to examine it. But then I think the process is it goes to the

governor's office, the legislature--legislative analyst--and then it gets into the state budgetary process or budget-making process, which by California law as we know has to be done by June 30. And the legislature as we know sticks assiduously to that timetable. [Laughter]

GRANT: They try to diligently. Whether they do it or not is another matter. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: It was really your first year on the board of regents that the regents submitted a budget for somewhere in the neighborhood of \$268, \$278 million. Alan Post took a close look at it, and the governor suggested that the budget be reduced considerably back to I think as low as \$240 million, somewhere in that area. Do you recall that? You know, in the midst of trying to develop or trying to finish the job on new campuses, development of old campuses, and then all of the sudden that kind of cut being suggested, do you recall whether Reagan attempted to build a coalition amongst some of you on the regents to support that?

GRANT: I don't recall any pressure or undue influence at all. There may have been with others, but there

never was with me. I don't know why, but there never was any undue pressure brought on me to agree to the governor's budget, suggested budget or anything else. I don't know why that was, but there was not.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You are not. . . . Can you tell me why a cut was needed at that time?

GRANT: Well, I mentioned before, I think, to you that when the governor was deciding whether or not to run, I went to see him in his home. And I said, "This present governor, Governor Edmund Brown, was going to put us into bankruptcy in this state if we don't make a change." And he agreed that we did need to make a change and make some savings here and there. So that contributed measurably to his suggesting a lower budget than the university suggested for themselves. The present situation is perhaps parallel in thinking where they're laying off quite a number of teachers. And when I served on the high school board here in Visalia and we started a second high school at that time, we had a superintendent of schools and an assistant superintendent, and he had an executive assistant. Now, if one looks

at the makeup of the administration here in Tulare County, I wonder how many assistant to the assistants there are and how many there are in administrative positions where the same operation used to be handled by about three people. I wonder how many there are. I don't know that, but I do know that once you build up any bureaucracy to a certain point, the ones that are let out are those on the lower echelons. And those who are in management positions stay even though there may be sixteen of them instead of six.

TRELEVEN: So there might be some fat to squeeze out at the top?

GRANT: There might be. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Okay, ultimately several things happened. First, the legislature through Post began to demand that more of the reserve funds be used for operating costs.

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And secondly, that the state get a greater proportion of the overhead on contracts. There had been an historic understanding about how that overhead would be split between the state

government and the University of California. So it kind of opened up that box again. And then the issue seemed to develop that, well, should the regents be putting reserve money into operating costs, and if so, how much? Does this faintly ring a bell?

GRANT: Yes, I can remember some of that and I have no fault to find with the idea, because if there are funds available. . . . When I say available, somebody doesn't want them available if they want to keep that reserve fund intact. But if they're there, then it's my opinion that in a crisis such as that they need to be used and then replaced to whatever degree is necessary, but perhaps not to the same degree they were when some was taken from them.

TRELEVEN: So your position is a reserve fund is exactly that, that it's there to be used if there is kind of an emergency situation.

GRANT: Otherwise, there's no point in having a reserve. You operate with whatever comes in and don't have any reserve, and that's not sensible.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: So there is a reserve to be used at a crucial

time.

TRELEVEN: But some regents would feel that if you yielded this point to the legislature that you were going to open the door permanently to the kind of legislative fiscal interference or whatever you want to call it, and in turn that would threaten the autonomy that the regents have enjoyed because of the state constitution.

GRANT: That's a legitimate concern if they let it happen. But it's parallel to the situation we have now in the federal government, where the Congress spends more money than is taken in every single year. And no matter what the administration is, Congress still reacts to special interests and spends more money each year than they take in. So there is no reserve. There is always an extra spending for anything that comes in. And if the federal government takes in two dollars, they spend three. And that is a legitimate concern. But if the regents who are closer to the actual operation than the Congress is to the actual operation of the nation--and when I say closer that depends upon one's viewpoint--but the regents have their

fingertips on that university operation all the time once a month. The Congress seems almost divorced from the operation of the federal government, so they spend more all the time than they ever take in. It's been that way for a long, long time, and my personal feeling is it has nothing to do. . . . It's totally outside our interest on this subject, but there ought to be a line item veto by the president, and then we wouldn't have quite the same situation we have now.

TRELEVEN: Well, what was a little bit startling about this whole situation is that for the previous at least decade, there had been almost steady, steady growth of the University of California in terms of physical development in terms of budgets. And that's been beginning with the '67/'68 budget year and going on '68/'69, Reagan has been. . . . It's been interpreted that Reagan was an enemy of the university.

GRANT: Yes, it's been said.

TRELEVEN: Now, how do you assess Reagan? Do you assess him the same, or do you see things somewhat differently in terms of . . . ?

GRANT: My personal reaction is he was not an enemy of the university. If he was, so was I. I don't think I am. My children went to the University of California, some of them, and I know others there, having been interested in the university ever since I was interested in anything economic in the economy. I feel sure that he was not an enemy of the university, but he was a supporter of fiscal responsibility. I think one can be both a friend of the university and a friend of fiscal responsibility.

TRELEVEN: Now one way to punish students for being naughty is to implement tuition. I'm not saying that was the motivation, but what was the motivation is that there's a gap between what you regents want, what the legislature and the governor feel can be provided, and that gets back to the issue of tuition. The University of California had long had a tuition free history, very proud of that history. I guess it was [Senator Randolph] Randy Collier who would introduce a bill somewhat . . .

GRANT: A long time ago?

TRELEVEN: Well, I think in '64 in the legislature to implement tuition. The tuition issue amongst the

regents became quite an issue with strong partisans on I guess both sides of the issue. Where did you stand?

GRANT: I don't see anything wrong with having a cost for tuition. My brothers went to University of California. My children, some of them, went to University of California, and they had to work to earn money to go in addition to what was contributed to them by the family, but mostly they had to work to get it done. And they had to pay tuition, some of them, some of the younger ones, but I don't see anything wrong with that. I think if it's worth having, it's worth paying for. And there are many, many avenues to pursue to look for help to get throughout the university, various foundations and so on that are willing and glad to help. So for some students that can't do it otherwise, those are open.

TRELEVEN: Well, one who would argue against tuition would say this is going to prevent some needy students from getting an education, and that in particular it's going to weigh more heavily against the poorest students, the poorest potential students,

economically poor.

GRANT: Yes, that's a valid argument, except that it might take them longer to get through. If they have to work for it it takes them longer to go all the way through the university, and the program may take them six years or seven or eight years to go through. They can still do it if they're determined to get it done, because they can work their way through. I had to work to get what education I had and I don't see any reason why others can't do the same thing. At the speed I was going through, matriculating through the whole thing, it would have taken me probably six or seven years to go. But other things came about, so I didn't do that, but I would have done it had things not changed.

TRELEVEN: So your position at the time was you saw nothing wrong with tuition?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: And if the education is worthwhile to someone, they can probably come up with the money. If not, what, borrowing it through scholarship programs and so on and so forth?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: But an argument at the time was all this is going to do is open a Pandora's Box, and tuition will be raised every year as a result. And that's correct, because you've read the papers as well as I have. The regents this year have called for a 40 percent increase in tuition, which may be a little bit of political give and take going on. The governor [Peter B. Wilson] called for 20 percent, which is still hefty. So it really did open the Pandora's Box.

GRANT: Yes, no question about it. But conditions are not the same as they were when they first raised the tuition. And conditions never remain the same. And so the economy is different. The level of income dollarwise is different. Maybe the value of the dollar is not the same as it was either at that time. Nothing remains the same; change is constant. And I don't see that that precludes the young people from going to the university, from going to the university of their choice. And also, they can go to some other university if they don't like the tuition in that one. There are many universities to attend. Maybe their choice is one specific one, but they

can take the second choice. In addition to that is the opportunity to go to a two-year [community] college and then transfer and go on the rest of the way. And in the meantime during the interim do some work to raise some funds so that that tuition isn't quite a bother.

TRELEVEN: But you should want the best students to start at the University of California right away.

GRANT: Yes, in some cases they can't start right away at the University of California, but many of us have to take a second choice before we make our first choice. But the California community colleges are a tremendous opportunity for education for students who can't do it otherwise.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We'll just pause.

[Interruption]

Equal opportunity and affirmative action. Equal opportunity I think one could fairly say is something that emerged from the Civil Rights Movement.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And affirmative action is a further extension of that, similar to but not quite the same as equal opportunity. Now I think a few hours ago you

expressed for me an attitude that was not exactly favorable to affirmative action programs. Why don't you elaborate . . . ? Well, first tell me whether I'm right or wrong. Secondly then, elaborate on why you feel the way you do about that.

GRANT: Well, I feel that there ought to be always an opportunity for anybody, equal opportunity, to do what they want to do. But you can't make it exactly equal no matter what kind of legislation you have. It isn't equal for various reasons. First, capability. They may not have the capability to do what someone else does. The next thing is they may not have the background education. When my brothers went to the University of California, they had been to a two-year college here in Visalia. They found that the suggestions made to them, the recommendations made to them as to what courses to take here--and that's a long time ago; I hope it's not as bad now--they had to take courses over again at Berkeley and UCLA because they didn't have them here. So the situation is not always the same. So affirmative action, fine, equal opportunity,

fine, but we have to go back to the beginning and see what brought about the necessity for each and whether or not it does make equal opportunity.

So I have questions to raise about those kinds of things. I don't know that equal opportunity always makes equal opportunity.

**TRELEVEN:** So what was your position as a regent as the demand grew louder on various campuses successfully for ethnic studies centers, ethnic studies departments, as well as an affirmative action program to admit--I'll call nonwhites for lack of a better term--more nonwhites?

**GRANT:** I think it is a good idea to make it possible for anybody to enter who is qualified for their education, but it is wrong to single out somebody by his ethnic origin to say he should have a better opportunity to do it than somebody of another ethnic origin. I think equal opportunity ought to mean equal opportunity for everybody. And if equal opportunity means lowering the standards for one ethnic group below the standards for another ethnic group, then one is demeaning that person who has that so-called equal opportunity. I don't think that ought to

happen.

TRELEVEN: Well, what if the standards are biased in favor of whites and biased against those of minority groups?

GRANT: That's what is contended. The standards were biased against my two brothers who went to Berkeley, because they were told in Visalia that certain things were necessary and required and essential to get into Berkeley and to go on from that point. Instead, when they got to Berkeley, they found that they had to back off and start over on some courses that were recommended to them here that were not necessary, and so they had missed. So there was a bias there against somebody from the San Joaquin Valley, because they weren't the only ones that went to Berkeley from here. And so they had bad advice. So they were white, and so they did not have the opportunity they should have had that some other student from some other area who perhaps was not white did get through without going over the same steps again. So again, I say that it needs to be understood so that there is actual equal opportunity. And there isn't always equal

opportunity.

TRELEVEN: How do you . . ? In an overwhelmingly white power establishment. . . . I'm going to sound like maybe [H.] Rap Brown in the sixties.

GRANT: That's okay.

TRELEVEN: But in an overwhelmingly powerful, white establishment, how can you really get blacks, Latinos, and so on, integrated into that power structure unless there is some accommodation made for--you call it lowering standards--but some accommodation made so that they have, you know, a little better opportunity to be admitted and then succeed in the University of California?

GRANT: Well, I really don't have an answer to that, except that one needs to be as fair as we know how to be. Do not lower the standards for them, but require them that they come up to the same standard as any other student. Require them that they learn as much as any other student. Maybe it'll take them longer. But so what? Life is not all a bed of roses, and we don't all have the same opportunity. If I had inherited money, I might have had a different life than I had, but I have no quarrel with the kind of life I had. And

I had to do without an awful lot of things when I first started, because I didn't have any money to do with. But I understand without any question that people want more opportunity than they have sometimes, but the opportunity is there if they'll just take a little bit more time.

TRELEVEN: And time costs more money, because of tuition.

GRANT: Of course, time costs more money, because of the limitation on time for one thing.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Now what the regents did, what became policy was an affirmative action policy in effect that was implemented. When Bakke<sup>1</sup> came about, what was your . . . ?

GRANT: What?

TRELEVEN: Bakke v. the Board of Regents.

GRANT: Oh.

TRELEVEN: [Allan Paul] Bakke was the medical student who successfully argued a reverse discrimination case in effect. He's a white male and he had been discriminated against because of affirmative action admission policies at Davis. You were no

---

1. Regents of University of California v. Bakke 438 U.S. 98 S.Ct. 2733, 57 L.Ed.2d 750 (1978).

longer aboard as a regent. You were no longer a regent when that happened, but when you read about it, what was your attitude?

GRANT: That argument is still going on. It's going on in the Congress. The last bill put in that President [George H. W.] Bush vetoed, because he said it was setting up quotas . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah, the civil rights legislation.

GRANT: Yes. So the argument still goes on and it will not be finished, because there will always be those who say that this person is not as qualified as that person is. Therefore, make an allowance for it and give him an opportunity. And so that makes the person who is qualified take a second position. It'll always be there. My position is that I am not for quotas or allowances from that. It may take somebody more time, it may cost more money, but still standards have to remain.

TRELEVEN: So you didn't read the article about Mr. Bakke and say, I told you so, I told you this would happen?

GRANT: It will happen and it still will happen the day after tomorrow.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: It won't stop.

TRELEVEN: How about other kinds of mandated requirements? Like in the sixties the regents felt that fraternities and sororities should all have requirements for nondiscrimination in membership. With the problem being that if they didn't do this and these are organizations sanctioned by the university, the university might be in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.<sup>1</sup> That kind of legislation, is that okay with you?

GRANT: I don't like that kind of legislation because I don't know any reason why we should require of a club or a fraternity or a sorority to that they must have such and such a quota of one color and another color and so on. I don't buy that at all. I think it's perfectly all right for a service club, for instance, to have all men. I think it's perfectly all right for a sorority to have all women. And so by the same reasoning, I don't think it's necessary for a club or sorority

---

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

or fraternity to be required to have certain ethnic groups in or out. I don't see any point in that.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, let me extend that a bit. You were no longer a regent when Jerry Brown really tried to get a more diverse membership on the board of regents: a Latino [Vilma Martinez] woman--a Latina I should say--a Japanese-American [Yoritada Wada], a black woman [Yvonne Brathwaite Burke], in a context where except with notable exceptions like Mrs. Chandler, Mrs. Hearst, Mrs. Heller, most or virtually all of the regents had been white males. Now was Jerry in your mind correct in trying to balance things a little better?

GRANT: I happen to disagree very much with that idea of trying to balance it forcibly, because I think they serve on the board of regents because of their knowledge, their ability, their position in the economic system, and their interest in education. Because a person happens to be black doesn't make him any more interested in the university program than it does somebody who is white or brown or red. I think people who are

qualified ought to be chosen regardless of what their ethnic background is. I don't think that's going to happen. I think there's too much separation in standards now among the general populace so that they are going to do the best they can, perhaps without quotas though, to have a mix. But I don't think that's the way to do it. I think the way to do it is to have the best possible people on the board, regardless of where they come from. But that isn't the way it's going to be.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, but by one definition you could say that the best qualified people are always going to be white males or maybe a white female here and there. Then you're really not diversifying, and it remains sort of what, if I were a dissident, I would call part of the white power establishment.

GRANT: Sure you would, and to some degree you'd be right. But it's only necessary to look around and see how many white mayors we now have of cities and how many female legislators we now have, and over time that will change, so we do have more and more a mix without trying to force the thing upon the general public. It will

happen because of the makeup of this nation. Ethnic groups of various kinds and backgrounds will put their people in the positions of influence, and that's what will happen. But I don't think it's a good idea to force it.

TRELEVEN: So your objection is certainly not integration, it's forced . . .

GRANT: Forced integration.

TRELEVEN: Forced integration.

GRANT: I don't like it at all.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, so you'd have some qualms about Martin Luther King [Jr.], the way he went about things in the South?

GRANT: Oh yes, I do have some qualms about that. Not just Martin Luther King, but many others who are trying to do the same kind of thing. And I don't think it's necessary. I think time will cure the ill. Of course, the person who wants that position doesn't agree with me. But maybe if he had a little more patience he'd find that he's going to get there because of time curing the problem.

TRELEVEN: Okay, there are several other areas where the legislature attempts to intervene in the way the

regents conduct their business, and one is this whole area of executive sessions or closed sessions, the criteria for holding them. I think up into the sixties the Brown Act<sup>1</sup> had been in the books for some time. But it still took additional legislation to really specify the situations in which the regents could meet in executive session, which means no one else is in the room, as I understand it, except, let's see . . . . Who's in the room? The regents, the secretary . . .

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: And that's it?

GRANT: That's about it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. If Reagan wouldn't get to a meeting, does that mean his representative like Sherriffs, would he stay for executive?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: No. You have to be a constitutional member of the board of regents.

GRANT: No, Sherriffs was not there.

TRELEVEN: So what do you recall about what was being done

---

1. A.B. 339, 1953 Reg. Sess., Cal. Stat., ch. 1588.

correctly or incorrectly in terms of executive or closed sessions? Poor way to ask the question. What was the flap about? [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, the flap probably was about the fact that personalities might be discussed in executive sessions. The question as to whether or not a certain individual had a personality which was not conducive to the well-being of the university. And Marcuse would have been one of those who might have been discussed because of his personality, because of his attitude. Other than that, I don't recall the matters of the executive session except where consideration of purchase of land might be considered, because if everybody knew where it was going to be, then everybody else would want to buy all the land all around there. So there were things that were absolutely essential in executive sessions, and I didn't find any executive session that was not valid when I was there. It would be from somebody else's point of view I suppose, but from my point of view as a member of the board, I didn't find any executive session invalid.

TRELEVEN: The legislature also seemed to be interested

rather consistently in conflict of interest legislation. And what that led to was a requirement that the regents file financial disclosure reports. Do you recall that?

GRANT: I recall that it happened, but I don't recall the antipathy about it or from whence it came. I think there's a valid reason for knowing where people have their money invested, because when I wrote that letter to Charles Hitch about apartheid in South Africa, it was an open letter, anybody else could read it too. But that was my position, and if somebody had known that I had money invested--I didn't have--but if somebody had known that I had money invested in South Africa, the letter would have been of no value at all. As it was it did have a certain amount of influence. We kept the investments in South Africa for quite a long time, and from my point of view, biased as I am, I think it made available jobs for blacks that were gone when we took the investments out. So I think it was right to have the investments in South Africa. Now a good many people suffer because they are taken out.

TRELEVEN: So in terms of your complying with conflict of interest or disclosure requirements, you didn't have any problem with that?

GRANT: No. I don't have any problem with that at all. It's a sensitive thing with some people, but it's not a sensitive thing to me.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, [Philip L.] Phil Boyd found it pretty sensitive.

GRANT: Yeah, he said so at that time.

TRELEVEN: Well, he resigned. [Laughter]

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Presumably because of that requirement.

GRANT: I don't know what his situation was, but that's irrelevant. I didn't need to know.

TRELEVEN: Well, ultimately of course there was passed the Political Reform Act of 1974,<sup>1</sup> but that would not have affected you since you were gone by then. Set up the Fair Political Practices Commission and that whole structure, which if you're right about bureaucracies, probably has grown to be a very large operation.

GRANT: Yeah, it always grows. Whether it's government

---

1. Proposition 9 (June 1974).

or corporation, whatever it is, bureaucracy has a tendency to grow.

TRELEVEN: In terms of issues relating to students in particular and student disruptions after you became a regent, when things like that happen, would legislators, say, in your own area here, would they get ahold of you as a regent and attempt to exert any pressure on you?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: Not at all?

GRANT: Not at all, no. I don't know why. I guess because I was well known, and they knew that it wouldn't do much good one way or another. They knew I would take a position according to my own likes and they couldn't influence me one way or the other. I don't know that, but I expect that's the case, because I was and I am known as a rather strong willed person. I don't know whether that's good or bad; that's immaterial. I think that's what they knew.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: It isn't that I didn't visit with them and so they might have brought the subject up, but they knew exactly where I was at the time. Perhaps

sometimes they'd agree with me, sometimes they didn't. But if you ask did they try to change my position, no, I don't think they did.

TRELEVEN: Well, I know with some regents, some regents were quite touchy about the area of potential legislative interference in the affairs of the regents. They were quite proud of the fact and quite adamant that the regents operated as an independent body, written into the constitution there won't be any political interference. You're smiling when I say that. [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, it is written in the constitution. They do do the best they know how to run the show, but sometimes they ran into stumbling blocks, and legislators trying to butt in didn't have much effect.

TRELEVEN: Okay. How about someone close at hand at regents' meetings like Jesse [M.] Unruh?

GRANT: What about him?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. He's close at hand. He's an ex officio member of the board. He wasn't effective in altering the . . .

GRANT: We heard very little from him.

TRELEVEN: You heard very little from him.

GRANT: Very little from him. Maybe someone else voiced his opinion for him, but direct from him, no.

TRELEVEN: Did that follow also with [Robert T.] Monagan and [Robert] Moretti?

GRANT: I would say that generally speaking, yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Leo [T.] McCarthy, who was pro tem of the senate.

GRANT: Leo McCarthy is a little more vociferous than some of the others, but otherwise there's not much influence there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: Or at least I never sensed it.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I may have some other legislation that I will want to come back to later. In terms of other organizations that you had served with, that you had led, comparing them to how the regents were organized, what would you say about the . . . ? How would you compare and contrast those organizations and the board of regents?

GRANT: Well, if you're thinking about the Farm Bureau, I think the Farm Bureau is more efficient in its regular meetings than the board of regents. The board of regents operate satisfactorily, and the chairman was always listened to and order was

kept, because of the kind of people that were on the board of regents. But I think the Farm Bureau is a little more efficient in its board meetings. Of course, they take longer, because they have such a broad interest in international as well as national as well as local and so on. Regents were only talking about one thing, one small area of the economy. The Farm Bureau was always talking about, and that's one of the faults found with the Farm Bureau. People say you're interested in too many things, too much all across the board. But I think the Farm Bureau board meetings are more efficient. In the case of local schools, that's very, very close to the people, closer than the board of regents is to the people. They are separated by a greater distance, and so the local school board meeting is operated very efficiently and very expeditiously, perhaps more so than the board of regents. And I don't mean to fault the chairman of the board of regents when they operate a meeting, but the feelings on the board of regents are diverse and voiced very, very strongly by each diverse person, the reasons for their

diversity, which makes it more difficult. So I don't know that it's fair to fault them, but the meetings closer to the people are more efficiently operated than the board of regents I think.

TRELEVEN: Because the meetings closer to the people are closer to the scrutiny of the people who are being represented?

GRANT: Yes, and how many people know what the board of regents do? They are few and far between throughout the state. Only what they read in the newspapers. A school board is right close to the people, and practically everybody knows every school board member personally. They are closer to the people, and so they can talk to that person who is on the school board and say, "Why did you do this? Why didn't you do that?" And it's pretty hard for anybody to do that with the board of regents. So that's why I say it's closer.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

[End Tape 5, Side A]

[Begin Tape 5, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on tape with a little listing of

the individual members of the board of regents with whom you served. I wonder if more or less going in alphabetical order whether you might give me any recollection you have about a particular individual's effectiveness.

GRANT: Well, with John Canaday I would know about where he was going to be before he ever said anything. I had a good rapport with John Canaday. With Edward Carter I knew about where he was going to be, but I didn't always know why he would be there.

TRELEVEN: What do you mean? [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, I didn't know quite where he came from on each subject matter. And there was little rapport with Ed Carter. He did not think of me as belonging on the board of regents. It didn't amount to anything. And Dorothy Chandler . . .

TRELEVEN: You've talked a little bit about.

GRANT: Yes, she felt that I didn't fit the board of regents. Coblentz I had no problem with. I got along with him fine, but he was like quicksilver; you never knew where he was going to be, here, there, and almost anywhere. Fred Dutton I've mentioned before, and he's the one that was

almost going to get his comeuppance from the governor physically. Forbes I knew on a positive note. And . . .

TRELEVEN: Positive . . .

GRANT: Who?

TRELEVEN: You say on a positive note?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Forbes.

GRANT: Forbes I knew on a positive note. Catherine Hearst I knew on a positive note, very friendly and very easy to know where she's going to stand on any given subject. So also with Elinor Heller. She was a good regent and tended to her job very well. And DeWitt Higgs I got along with well. Charles Hitch, I've spoken about him before.

TRELEVEN: You got along with him?

GRANT: No, not exactly. I got along with him, but I thought he was not a good administrator. And let's see, who else. Ted Meyer, yes, I got along all right with him. And Robert Monagan, I didn't see him as much as I did others. He wasn't always there. And Ed Pauley, I got along all right with him. He visited with me at some

length different times, because he was interested in agriculture as well as interested in the board of regents. I don't know where his interest stemmed from, but he was interested in what I did, how I fit into the whole picture of agriculture nationwide and internationally. And Max Rafferty, I'd get along with him, but I didn't agree with everything on his score. Ed Reinecke I didn't see very much, although I got along with him fine. [Robert O.] Bob Reynolds was I guess a positive factor on the board of regents. Bill Roth, no, I can't say that I agreed with him very often. Norton Simon was . . . . Oh, what is the word? I guess he was effervescent for one thing. And William French Smith . . .

TRELEVEN: Effervescent? [Laughter]

GRANT: Effervescent, yes. William French. . . . My wife says my adjectives are not always correct. William French Smith was I guess you'd say a cohort. I had no problem with him. Unruh, very, very seldom saw him. Dean [A.] Watkins, very capable businessman and well accepted on the board of regents. He and I got along as regents,

but we didn't have very much common interest.

[William] Bill Wilson and I seemed to have more common interest than some of the others.

TRELEVEN: And I guess we missed Phil Boyd, who was up here at the top.

GRANT: Yeah, he was there at the first.

TRELEVEN: We missed Phil.

GRANT: I got along with him fine. He was quite friendly with me.

TRELEVEN: Well . . .

GRANT: Glenn Campbell, he's very friendly with me. I think if anything, he's more conservative than I am.

TRELEVEN: Well, I want to ask how so.

GRANT: Or you might ask how could anybody think so.

TRELEVEN: How could you think so? [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, he's with the Hoover Institute [for War and Peace], and they have certain standards and certain positions, and so those are his positions. The Hoover Institute doesn't have his positions, he has the Hoover Institute's positions.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We had some regents designate who are not on that listing, but they were there a relatively

short period. I'm not sure how many of them you would remember. Anyway . . .

GRANT: Well, I don't have that list before me, I don't think. Haldeman was one of them, wasn't he?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, Haldeman was one of them.

GRANT: Haldeman was a person I had a good rapport with.

TRELEVEN: Starting right about here, Roger Petit, I don't know if any of those names will ring a bell or not. Again, they tend to be there a relatively short period.

GRANT: Bert [L.] Smith was before I was there, but they thought that. . . . I didn't hear any adverse criticism of Bert Smith. They seemed to like him. Generally speaking, they all had something good to say about him.

TRELEVEN: And this is all after you, so . . .

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I guess none of those ring too loud a bell.

GRANT: No, they don't. I think I told you that the present president of the university, [David Pierpont] Gardner, I knew when he worked for the Farm Bureau. That was the first job he had when he got out of university.

TRELEVEN: No, you didn't tell me that.

GRANT: I didn't?

TRELEVEN: No.

GRANT: Yes, his first job he got when he got out of the university, I believe, was with the Farm Bureau. And when I found out, when I had a meeting recently with the vice president of the university for Agriculture and Natural Resources, [Kenneth R.] Ken Farrell, he told me that Dave Gardner's wife was very ill and they hadn't been able to find out what it was over a period of years. So I wrote him a letter, wrote Dave Gardner a letter of sympathy. And then the next time I saw the vice president for agriculture a couple of months later I guess he told me that Mrs. Gardner had died, and so I wrote another letter to Dave Gardner and got a reply from him. But I knew him when he worked on the staff of the California Farm Bureau Federation. He's a Mormon, and he's held in extremely high regard by not only the regents but by the personnel of the university up there in that area where they see him from time to time. And Ken Farrell, vice president, said that Dave Gardner's attitude, personality, temperament, and such lead the

staff--all those with whom he works--to think very, very highly of him. And his wife was. . . . Oh, the regents named her the president's associate, which had never been done before, because they felt so much support for her because of her attitude, her being able to meet visiting dignitaries, and to be a peacemaker among the wives of professors and staff and so on. So he was a very good addition to the university.

TRELEVEN: I'm familiar with his book on the loyalty oath controversy.<sup>1</sup> I don't know if you realize he was . . .

GRANT: No, I'm not widely read, but I teased him--this is something to do to any Mormon--tell him I can buy some of the theology, because Joseph Smith's mother was a Presbyterian and his father was a Methodist. [Laughter] They don't seem to mind that. I went to a dentist a short time ago, first time I've been to him, because he's up in our area, and I mentioned Dave Gardner, because I'd sensed by some pictures on the wall and so on

---

1. Gardner, David Pierpont. The California Oath Controversy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

that this man was a Mormon. I told him that same thing, and he just grinned and he said, "Yes, I know that." I said, "Well then, part of the theology of the Mormon church is valid, isn't it?" He said, "Oh, we came later." And my wife says I don't know who to tease and who not to.

TRELEVEN: Well, I didn't know that Gardner had worked for the Farm Bureau.

GRANT: Yes, that was I think his first job out of the university. And he worked under my administrative assistant, who was Richard W. Owens, who also is a Mormon, and I think that's how come he got that job. Those people are to a degree clannish like the Dutch, but not to the degree that they shut others out. So Mormons get ahead very, very fast because of help from other Mormons. They move ahead in the economy. Also, their churchmanship, if that's what you want to call it, assists them greatly in moving ahead, because they help one another. Biased as I am, I like their churchmanship, but I think their theology smells to high heaven. That's a bias for sure. And they say so, too. But I knew. . . . What the dickens is his name? The man that was

the secretary of agriculture with Eisenhower.

TRELEVEN: Ezra Taft Benson.

GRANT: Ezra Taft Benson, I knew him personally, and he made so bold as to think I should be a Mormon. He's one of their twelve apostles.

TRELEVEN: That's right, he's very . . .

GRANT: Oh yeah.

TRELEVEN: He must be almost ninety or . . .

GRANT: Yeah, he's over ninety.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And I tease my wife and tell her that the Mormons like me so well that probably they've got a celestial wife picked out for me if I ever reach the place. She says, "I'm not worried about that at all. You're welcome to her if she wants you." [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: I'm wondering whether at this point . . .

GRANT: What's that?

TRELEVEN: I'm wondering whether at this point . . .

GRANT: Sure, it's fine with me. I'm ready to . . .

TRELEVEN: I should listen to what we've taped today and come back tomorrow morning, and I think we can maybe spend an hour or so. I need to do some reviewing and thinking about where we might go

from here.

GRANT: Fine.

TRELEVEN: So for today, thank you.

[End Tape 5, Side B]

[Session 4, May 1, 1991]

[Begin Tape 6, Side A]

TRELEVEN: It's May 1, and I'm back with Mr. Allan Grant here in Visalia at the First Presbyterian Church. We're here this morning to conclude our three-day discussion about you and your eight-year tenure on the board of regents. Listening to all the tapes--they came out wonderfully, of course--but naturally I have some follow-up questions.

GRANT: Incidentally, there was one name you asked for and I said, "I don't have it but I'll remember it," and last night I woke up and remembered the name. This morning I can't even remember who it was I was supposed to remember.

TRELEVEN: It was a Presbyterian preacher . . .

GRANT: Oh, yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . who you were not very happy with.

GRANT: That's right.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: And who was the right bower for César Chávez later. I'll have to think about it some more.

TRELEVEN: Well, there will probably be a blank space in the transcript when you get it, and we'll ask you to fill it in then.

GRANT: Okay.

TRELEVEN: You expressed disappointment in your committee assignments. How did that work, though? Did you let it be known to the nominating committee what committees you'd prefer?

GRANT: No, I did not ask to be on any specific committee, I just accepted whatever they did. And I didn't complain about it if I felt I was not on the right committee.

TRELEVEN: Was that typical, or did other regents that you know of, did they ask for . . . ?

GRANT: No, other regents wanted to be on specific committees, but I never had any desire to serve on any committee except for where they wanted to place me. I was willing to serve in whatever capacity they wished, but I didn't ask to be placed anywhere.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you were not aggressive in pursuing the committees outside of the ones you got.

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: And you also said that the committee assignments you got were the result of I think you said liberals. And come on now, when William French Smith became the chair of the committee and things were swinging more to the conservative side, certainly the nominating committee must have been controlled by conservatives as well.

GRANT: I think that's probably true, and by that time probably I had softened my feeling of antipathy toward some of them, having gotten better acquainted with them by that time.

TRELEVEN: Antipathy toward some of the . . .

GRANT: Some of the members of the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and not necessarily liberals but . . .

GRANT: No, any of them, any of them.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Softened your antipathy.

GRANT: I guess that's the right word.

TRELEVEN: Now, tell me what . . .

GRANT: Not animosity, really antipathy.

TRELEVEN: Okay, but this gets back to the idea that you felt initially pretty distant from many of these people?

GRANT: Yes. It was quite obvious that some regents felt

that anybody from agriculture was not very well versed in any subject other than agriculture, that that would be their main interest. Whereas it was my main interest to make a living, but it certainly was not my main interest in all the world affairs. But they didn't know that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You mentioned that it seemed necessary to them--in other words you were referring to the regents--necessary to them that the recommended appointments, promotions, and tenure for faculty be sent to the regents. Since you were a regent, you were one of them. Were you necessarily insistent that these lists be . . . ?

GRANT: No, I was not insistent. I only felt that in any kind of operation under our system of government, if a part of that fails, then the next layer above has to take over, just as if the Academic Senate should take its responsibility, then the board of regents has to take a responsibility to stop the chaotic situation. If the board of regents fails to take that responsibility, eventually it would have to go to government. That's the only way I felt about it.

TRELEVEN: Well, you keep coming back to the Academic

Senate, and what I'm interpreting that to mean is that you and possibly others had lost confidence in the faculty senate, the Academic Senate, to review their peers?

GRANT: Yes. To quite an extent. And as far as that's concerned, many within the Senate had lost confidence in their ability to get things done, because it seemed that there was too much inclination on the part of the Academic Senate to capitulate to the students' demands instead of making up their own minds as to what was right and what was wrong.

TRELEVEN: Okay. You base that on conversations with these conservative professors that you would talk to?

GRANT: Yes. And also in observing the students and their feeling that they were winning the battle for control of the University of California. And they felt that they were winning. I can remember though while they were trying to win, starting out to my car, and a policeman stopped me. He said, "Wait a minute, wait a minute, sir, where are you going?" I said, "I'm going out to my car." "No, no, no, don't. Don't go yet. We'll get some more regents. We'll form a cordon, and

you'll go between them to the cars, and we'll place each one of you in a car and see you off." And so as we went out of the regents' meeting, there were students and street people on both sides yelling and screaming and cursing. Of course, when they don't get their way, the next step is just to start in with profanity. That's the nearest. . . . That's the next step before actual physical violence. And I stopped. And a policeman took both of my shoulders and said, "Come on, sir, come on. Come on. It's dangerous here. Let's go." And he said, "What are you looking at?" I said, "I was looking at that young woman, just as pretty as any young woman is in her early twenties." I said, "What in the world would her mother think if she could hear what's coming out of her mouth?" He said, "Yes, but we haven't time for that, let's go." And so we went on to the car. That's the next. . . . Profanity is the next step just before violence, and it sometimes incites violence if you stay long enough.

TRELEVEN: And you heard a lot of it.

GRANT: Oh, more than I ever want to hear the rest of my

life. That woman called me everything but a pet name. She disliked me, even though she'd never seen me before.

TRELEVEN: Well, since you mentioned that, there was concern amongst the regents about the content of student newspapers also. Did that have to do with the profanity issue as well?

GRANT: Not particularly, because those who were writing at that time, those who were control of the drive to get control, were I think personally a lower strain of students than the general run of students. And they excited the others, but they were the ones that were causing the trouble.

TRELEVEN: Those writing for the newspapers.

GRANT: For the papers, yeah. Some of them, not all of them. You don't get a hundred percent usage of those kind of people, but you get a good sized percentage of those kind of people writing under those circumstances. They incite one another.

TRELEVEN: As a regent, what's your responsibility for controlling what goes into a student newspaper?

GRANT: There should be as little control as possible in order that the newspaper be factual. But if they get completely out of line and incite to

violence, then something has to be done. You can't have violence, otherwise you have anarchy. Violence brings about anarchy pretty fast.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so it was the tone of the articles that bothered you.

GRANT: Yes. Yes.

TRELEVEN: How about the language?

GRANT: Oh, I worked in the oil fields, I worked on a steam ship, I worked on the dock to get money to go to college. I've heard that language and I don't like it, but frankly under some circumstances in anger I might have used a good deal of it. But not aimed at individuals, and that's what they were doing.

TRELEVEN: Well, we seem to have landed in Berkeley, and I had not asked you about your assessment of the whole People's Park situation, which was going on when you were a regent. What in your mind was the problem, and what are the problems that your predecessors perhaps had had with that piece of property?

GRANT: Well, of course, when you invade property, then you're saying that there is no law. And they

were invading property wherever they had an opportunity. Whether it was the university, Sproul Hall, or People's Park, or whatever it is, public property is not to be invaded anymore than private property. Invasion is anarchy. And so the fact that the police were perhaps not afraid to do something, but were not supported to any degree to take care of the situation. Perhaps in retrospect maybe it worked itself out by having it die out instead of having a violent confrontation on a regular basis. But I'm no judge of that. It finally did turn out all right except when you look at what happens in that area and look at who the congressman is who has been in Congress for a long, long time and look at his record and see what he stands for . . .

TRELEVEN: You're talking about [Congressman Ronald V.] Ron Dellums.

GRANT: Congressman Dellums. And know what he stands for, then we know that there still is a pretty solid set of people in that area who are not doing much thinking as far as the welfare of this country is concerned. I have no respect for Congressman Dellums whatsoever.

TRELEVEN: Whatsoever.

GRANT: Not any. Not any.

TRELEVEN: He's not sympathetic to agriculture?

GRANT: Well, irrelevant as far as agriculture is concerned. His philosophy of government, of mankind, of anything is completely out of line with my philosophy of life and relationships with people and with government. It just doesn't fit me in any aspect whatsoever.

TRELEVEN: Okay, getting back to these listings that were sent out to the regents before you left the board in '74, if I recall Regent Carter raised a question at a meeting and asked if these lists really served any useful purpose.

GRANT: If what?

TRELEVEN: If the lists served any useful purpose. In other words, Carter wondered why these had to be continued. And if I recall correctly, Regent Campbell then said yes, he thought they were useful. You would agree with Regent Campbell that . . .

GRANT: Generally speaking I agreed with Campbell most of the time.

TRELEVEN: Most of the time. When didn't you agree with

him? [Laughter]

GRANT: I don't really have a good answer for that, because it would have been very, very seldom that I disagreed with him. But he and I visited from time to time, and in private conversations I didn't always agree with his ideas, although he's a pretty sound man or he wouldn't have stayed in the position he has so long.

TRELEVEN: He's certainly been a controversial person.

GRANT: Oh, yes, yeah. But controversy is necessary, absolutely. There has to be some controversy. We'd never get anywhere without some.

TRELEVEN: Well, the students created controversy.

GRANT: Oh, yes.

TRELEVEN: And the Academic Senate created controversy. Did some good come out of it?

GRANT: Oh, I expect so. I can't measure it at the present time, because I'm not there to see what the final result is. Well, it isn't final now, and it never will be final. You have to have controversy all the time. You have to have differences of opinion or you'll never come to a conclusion. You just always have controversy. But I think that some good probably came out of

it, because both sides made public their own opinions. And the general public began to learn just what this controversy was all about. And I think that's worthwhile.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And it's worthwhile because the public, as it began to learn this, did what?

GRANT: Well, generally speaking, they said to themselves, "Well now, the leftists have gone too far." And also some of those people, some of the young people, began to wake up and say, "Wait a minute, maybe we are going too far. Maybe this part of the establishment does know something, and we haven't been at it long enough. They know more about it than we do. Maybe we better listen a while and then take another tack." So both sides learned something. I don't think it was a total loss. At the time it's happening, and it's happening to you individually and you have a Black Panther on your back, you don't see very much good in it at all. But in the end result you can see some end result that may be of value. The same way with César Chávez with farmworker business [United Farm Workers]. I think that he did do some good. The crazy thing

about it is every time I appeared on a platform with César Chávez, he made it a point to tell the listening audience, "Don't pay any attention to Mr. Grant. He's a good fellow, but the people he represents are not." Which is a pretty smart thing to do. It may not be true, but it's a pretty smart thing to do with your adversary.

TRELEVEN: Back to yesterday's discussion. You stated that Governor Reagan would speak out on agenda items when they involved philosophical differences.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: That between some other regents and Reagan and . . . . Would you elaborate on that a little bit, what you meant by philosophical differences?

GRANT: Well, Reagan never sought to dominate the meeting at all. He just took part as a regent, but if there were questions about what the Academic Senate ought to do, whether or not they ought to stand fast and make up their own minds and not vacillate, he didn't hesitate to say what he thought about it. If he disagreed with the actions of the president or a specific chancellor or anything they suggested, he didn't hesitate to say so. But on the question of new campuses or

of a need for new campuses or Grounds and Buildings or Audit or anything like that, he just took part as a regent and had no particular interest to carry or argue for.

TRELEVEN: You had to fly back from New Zealand for a regents' meeting. I wish we could identify what the issue was. Maybe if we can pinpoint later when you took the trip then . . .

GRANT: I don't remember specifically, but one of the main issues that we had trouble with was Fred Dutton and some of those people wanting to lower the standards for the Chicanos and the blacks, and I think that was the specific issue that time. The reason I think that is that was an overriding issue much of the time, and that would come up sometimes when it really belonged on some other part of the agenda, because Fred Dutton was one of those who. . . . I believe Coblentz supported him too, but I don't remember specifically what the votes were. But they were pretty determined that we should lower the standards. And frankly, I have a cousin who has been a teacher all her life, and when I mentioned this once at a family gathering, she said, "Well,

I would be for that. I'd like to lower the standards for them." And I said, "Well, what would that do?" She said, "Help them to get through their course." And I said, "Then what would you do when you wanted to employ a lawyer or if you were interested in a doctor? Would you want to know that he had a lower standard given to him on his studies as he matriculated?" And she said, "Well, that's another matter entirely." So that was the only argument that Dutton or anybody else had, make it possible for them to matriculate. And I thought that was racist. So I'm inclined to think that was the issue.

TRELEVEN: Well, maybe at some point we. . . . Maybe when you get the transcript back and we make a note there that perhaps your wife will remember the year.

GRANT: I don't remember that at the moment.

TRELEVEN: She might be able to verify if that was the issue or not. But I take it that . . .

GRANT: It could have been. Excuse me, it might have been the question of taking university funds out of South Africa, because everybody's opposed to

apartheid, but I was opposed to taking the investments out because I thought it would also take out jobs. So it could have been that or the other.

TRELEVEN: Okay, okay. And you indicated that that was really an extraordinary situation that Reagan would want to rally the . . .

GRANT: Alex Sheriffs asked me if I would be at the meeting. I said, "No, I'll be in New Zealand." He said, "Well, will you call the governor before you leave?" And I said, "Certainly." So I called the governor, and he said, "You're the key vote on this matter," whichever one it was, I don't recall. And he said, "Will you think seriously about coming back?" And I said, "Yeah, I'll think about it. And if I'm there, I'm there. Otherwise I'm in New Zealand." I didn't tell him I'd be back, and he didn't ask me to come back. He just told me I was the swing vote. And so I came back. He never put pressure on. . . . Reagan never put pressure on me about making any decision. It wouldn't have done any good anyway, because I was going to decide whether I wanted to do that or whether I

didn't.

TRELEVEN: So you had to. . . . That came out of your own pocket?

GRANT: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Really! That's dedication. [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, when I got back there I think the man at the desk said, "You were just here." I said, "Yes, but I had to go back." He said, "You must be a very wealthy man." I said, "I was until I bought this ticket." [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: Mrs. Heller, in her oral history, she alludes to Reagan coming to regents' meetings with, as she put it, his entourage. Simon was quoted in the newspaper as saying regents' meetings had become "dog and pony shows." How do those characterizations square with what you remember?

GRANT: I don't remember it either one of those ways at all. They didn't know I was going to be there until they saw me.

TRELEVEN: I take it Mrs. Heller means Reagan attracted the media.

GRANT: Yes, well, if he brought his entourage, that was someone other than myself.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. No, I'm not. . . . I'm just . . .

GRANT: I'm trying to analyze what she said. If his entourage was the media, well, of course the media follows the governor if he goes to the dog fights. It doesn't matter what it is, the media is going to be there. It's as natural as breathing. They're supposed to be there. And so I wouldn't find fault with the governor because somebody followed him. But the question of whether it's a dog and pony show depends upon your viewpoint about Reagan's philosophy and the philosophy on the other side. I would say if anybody made it a dog and pony show, it would have been Fred Dutton and anybody who would follow his points. But I never thought of it as a dog and pony show. Sometimes I thought to myself, "I wish they'd get through with it, because I've got other things to do."

TRELEVEN: Well, I hope in the days ahead to ask Mr. Simon himself what he meant by that, if that quote was true. But my interpretation is possibly that he felt that it was a lot of pettiness, full of details, and that the regents should be concentrating on making policy and not . . .

GRANT: Yeah, it's probably true.

TRELEVEN: Did you get that sense that there was time wasted over petty details instead of policy matters?

GRANT: No, I didn't think it was wasted on petty details. I think it was wasted on such a difference of philosophy that it was difficult to come to an agreement. But I didn't think it was wasted on petty details.

TRELEVEN: In the context yesterday of our discussion about affirmative action, you recalled that you would argue with Roth and Dutton. You obviously had a disagreement. What more can you tell me about the substance of those arguments that you would have?

GRANT: Well, of course, we are having the same kind of arguments today that we had then, but today it's in the Congress. Affirmative action is fine, but to state categorically that this rule or that rule must be followed as far as affirmative action is concerned in hiring or employing specific groups of people is unreasonable. And we're now finding that in Congress the Democrats are coming around to the idea that, no, we don't want it. And what's the black man columnist named? [William] Raspberry, he opposes the early

Democratic attitude that the bill that they had on civil rights, he announced that it wasn't any good, because it did ask for quotas. And if you have quotas, this many black people and that many white people, that's contrary, exactly contrary, to the kind of philosophy that we have for this country, that the best people ought to be the ones you use for whatever you want to get done, regardless of whatever color they may be. And the progress that has been made by blacks over a long period of time, whatever time it was, maybe thirty, forty years, is tremendous. When I think of the Irish that came here, they couldn't do anything but pick and shovel work for a long, long time. Now they're in the legislature and everywhere else, but it takes time for those kind of things to be over with. The Irish were looked down upon for a long, long time as not having brains enough to do anything but use a pick and shovel. That isn't true anymore. And the Negroes aren't going to have that title. . . . They've already got quite a number of their people in pretty high places. But they're not going to have lots of them until lots of them are

capable.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so I am Roth or Dutton, and you are telling me that. What would I say in response if I were a Dutton or a Roth?

GRANT: Well, they would just say that my arguments don't hold water, that we need to do it now. Let's don't wait twenty or thirty years. And that's a good argument. We need to be fair today instead of being fair thirty years from now. But it is impossible to be fair unless you have standards to which you adhere in order to be fair. And so I couldn't win and neither could they unless I had the greatest number, because nobody could win the argument.

TRELEVEN: Well, affirmative action and equal opportunity involve not only the issue of student enrollment. One area I thought you might remember as a member and also a chair of the Grounds and Buildings had to do with architects and what more might be done to see to it that architects who are minorities begin to get some of this lucrative work that is available through the university. I noticed in the minutes that work does come to a few black architects like

Robert [A.] Kennard as well as [Ronald J.] Delahousie and [Jeffrey M.] Gault, another firm in Los Angeles. Do you recall anything about the impetus to hire or to look more closely at the designs of minority architects?

GRANT: The Grounds and Buildings Committee always looked as closely as they knew how at the question as to which architect ought to have the job. But there's a built-in psychological fact that if you've had a good architect and you were satisfied with him, he probably has a little bit the edge on the next building too. And somebody, whether black or white, has to be able to clearly show you that he has some better ideas than the one who has had the contracts in the past. So I don't remember any time that we were saying, "Well, maybe we better give a break to this guy because he's of a different color." I think in every single instance, we looked at the work to be done and the record of what had been done by this particular architect to see whether or not he fit the qualifications that we were setting up. I don't remember ever anyone on the committee saying, "Well, we've had this man a

long time, and now this man is black, so shouldn't we give him a break?" I don't remember that at all. I wouldn't have been for that. I would have been for looking at it from a monetary and a quality point of view, and that's all.

TRELEVEN: Well, both of these firms that I mentioned, Kennard and Delahousie, they are very well respected firms even today.

GRANT: Surely. And so they would have an equal opportunity, except that the committee would look and say, "Well, this one we had last time, we didn't have any question at all, we never had any problem with him, so this man has to be a little bit better or we're never going to change." His history, whatever he's done has to be better. Otherwise there's no reason to change.

TRELEVEN: Okay. The view you expressed yesterday I think is that because of what you called a small minority of students politicized the university. By the same token, unlike Pat Brown, who would name Republicans as well as Democrats to the board of regents, Reagan named strictly Republicans.

GRANT: To the board of regents. He may have done so on

the board of regents, but I remember when I first went on the board of agriculture, Reagan called me and said, "Who is the most qualified man you know of to take care of water matters in this administration?" I said, "Well, the best one I know of, and he's been at this and well known throughout the state, is a man in Visalia." But I said, "Maybe you don't want him. He's a Democrat." He said, "I don't care who he is if he's the best man you know." I said, "That's right. [Ira] Jack Chrisman." He's dead now, he died with Alzheimer's. But Reagan named him, and he was a lifelong Democrat. And because Reagan named him, his son then became a Republican. I suppose that's why, I don't know. But anyway, his son became very active in Republican circles, and his son now is on the board of directors of the California Farm Bureau Federation, I believe. I know he was president of the Tulare County Farm Bureau and he was a delegate, and I think he now is on the board of directors of the California Farm Bureau.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so the person named was Jack Chrisman?

GRANT: Chrisman. Chris man. But he's dead now.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and Jack. His first name was John, or . . . ?

GRANT: Well, they always called him Jack, but his first name was Ira, but his nickname was Jack.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I'll get that from you today. What I was leading up to though is that when it came to the regents, I think the record is clear that Reagan did not appoint any Democrats. They were all Republicans.

GRANT: Probably you'd know that. I don't.

TRELEVEN: So, if the small minority of troublemakers politicized the university, didn't Reagan politicize the regents?

GRANT: Oh, I guess one could say that if he were so inclined and had a quarrel with Reagan, I'm sure he'd say that.

TRELEVEN: Well, counter that.

GRANT: Well, I can say the only one he ever appointed to head up the water activity was a Democrat, and a lifelong Democrat, but a conservative Democrat.

TRELEVEN: Well, how do you interpret that? Okay, I mean, appointing somebody to water is one thing. But really, when you look at Reagan contrasted with the way Pat Brown appointed people, there seems to be. . . . It seems . . .

GRANT: Well, I'll tell you another story that tells you something about Pat Brown. There's another man that I knew. . . . Well, he was the vice president of the California Farm Bureau. And Pat Brown asked him to be director of agriculture. He was a Democrat. And then when he went to see Pat Brown to discuss the activity that Pat Brown expected for the director of agriculture, Pat Brown said, well. . . . Or this candidate said, "Well, I would like to have so-and-so, and so-and-so, and so-and-so to assist me in this in their respective positions, which are positions open in the department." Pat Brown said, "Oh no, I'll name all of them. You'll be the director of agriculture, but I'll name all those that will be in charge of various departments." He said, "No, I won't take the job then." So he did not take the job as director of agriculture, even though it was offered to him, because Pat Brown wanted all his own people under him, directly responsible to Brown, not to the director of agriculture. So it's just a matter of measure. You see what each man did, whether it was Pat Brown or Reagan, and see what he did in this area

or that area or the other area. It usually balances out. All Republicans on the board of regents, all the Democrats in some other place. So I think it's difficult to measure, to indict, or acquit a man for this, that, and the other.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, this is not my particular view or axe to grind or anything.

GRANT: I understand that.

TRELEVEN: But one person I've interviewed dismisses the whole issue on the regents of the, you know, left-right disagreements, dismisses it as being more an invention of the media than anything else. That really especially the major newspapers, that the board was really not that split ideologically or philosophically. And what's your opinion of that?

GRANT: Well, I think the media does, and I don't condemn them for it at all, but what they do is to measure what's happening to the best of their ability and report it to the reading public in that manner. And so the media did make more of it than really was necessary from time to time, but there actually was a split in philosophy. There was no question about that. All one had to

do was attend one meeting or two meetings and he'd know exactly, explicitly, who was where in this philosophical division. It was there. I don't know who that was and I don't need to know that said this, but either they were not telling you exactly what they thought, or else they were oblivious of what was going on. That's pretty hard for me to think that they could be oblivious to the opinions expressed by that many people. Some people are inclined to gloss over things in order to make it. . . . In order sometimes not to do any harm to the university or whatever the subject matter is. So their objective may be all right, although I don't agree with that point directly.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you're saying there was definitely a split.

GRANT: Definitely.

TRELEVEN: Was the split necessarily harmful?

GRANT: No, not harmful. Again, I say controversy is absolutely essential. I told you about a man I mentioned as the most valuable man on the Farm Bureau Board because he was always wrong. He doesn't. . . . He said that's damning him with

faint praise, but that's one of the valuable things about our kind of a system. You've got to have both sides. I didn't want them to follow me, I wanted them to think and make up their own minds. And the controversy made these regents think. Sometimes, from time to time, one side or the other would modify their position. It's bound to happen if you have adequate discussion, because nobody is always right on everything. I've never known anybody like that. There was one I guess two thousand years ago, but not now.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so the pro-Reagan, anti-Reagan split that the media identifies, the major newspapers in particular, that was a fact.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: That was definitely there.

GRANT: Yes, I am absolutely certain that was a fact. I'm as certain of that as I am that I was there.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: But sometimes people would move over to the other side a little bit, and so we made progress.

TRELEVEN: So these would be the so-called swing votes?

GRANT: I guess to some degree, not thoroughly

conservative, not thoroughly liberal, and so they would move over. And that's a good thing. They are valuable, just as valuable as the man who's always wrong.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Yesterday also you mentioned Charles Hitch briefly, and tell me again why you felt he didn't quite measure up to what you felt he should be doing as university president.

GRANT: Well, partly I felt that he was not a very strong man as far as his precepts, his concepts of what should be done. He was willing to vacillate, to compromise too easily. I like for people to have strong opinions, whether with me or against me. And he did not seem to have strong opinions one way or another. He was there it seemed to me to be kind of a mediator or something of the kind instead of being a leader.

TRELEVEN: Mediating between . . . ?

GRANT: Between the left and the right, between the students and the Academic Senate. Wherever there was a controversy he seemed to be wondering where he ought to be.

TRELEVEN: Was he that way at regents' meetings then, too?

GRANT: He didn't say much at regents' meetings.

TRELEVEN: Didn't say much?

GRANT: No, didn't say much. Didn't speak very much.

And when I wrote to him in opposition to the idea of taking regents' funds out of South Africa, he talked to me about the letter, because it was a long letter outlining the whole thing that we had to contend with in South Africa. And he talked with me at length about the letter, but he did commit himself one way or the other, so I don't know where he stood. And that's another reason I say he was there as kind of a weather vane or something of the kind rather than as a leader.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And in the early seventies--it could have been as early as 1970, '70, '71, right in that period--it was rumored in the press that the conservative regents wanted to fire Hitch. Do you have any recollection of that?

GRANT: I don't know what the conservative regents thought, but I do remember saying, "I move as of today that the tenure of Charles Hitch finish today."

TRELEVEN: You said that?

GRANT: I said that. It was in the newspapers, not in the minutes. Two regents said, "Well, wait a minute,

we can't let a brand new regent do what we should have done already. . . ." "Two years before," I think they said. Anyway, "Already, we should have done already."

TRELEVEN: Yeah, Hitch started in I think about '68, '69.

GRANT: Well, they said, "Two years before." "We can't let a brand new regent do what we should have done two years ago." And so my motion didn't have a second, so it's not in the minutes.

TRELEVEN: So you felt that strongly against Hitch?

GRANT: Yes, absolutely, or I wouldn't have done that. I don't want to hurt anybody. If there's anyway to save them, I'd rather save them. But he couldn't be saved.

TRELEVEN: Well, he hung in there until '74.

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: When you left, I guess he decided to leave, too. [Laughter]

GRANT: When I had two brothers come to see me last fall, both of them worked for me on the ranch when they were maybe eighteen and nineteen years of age, and one of them reminded me when he was visiting with me last fall. . . . Well, both of them said how pleased they had been to work for me on the

ranch when they were kids. And they are way up in their seventies now. And one of them said, "I read the paper and I read that you said, 'Let's fire Hitch today.'" But he said, "Nothing ever happened. What happened?" I said, "Well, the other regents said, 'No, we shouldn't let a new regent do what we should have done.'" But they didn't do it either, not right then.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so your suggestion was not even . . .

GRANT: Well, I don't think Reagan wanted it done, either.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

GRANT: He was shocked when he heard the motion, because I hadn't talked to him about it at all.

TRELEVEN: What were you so angry about? It sounds like you were angry.

GRANT: I didn't like what was going on and I thought there was a better way to handle it than just to be a wind vane and watch what is happening and wonder what somebody is going to do next and try to offset them a little bit by moving the chessman another notch or two. That seemed to me what he was doing. I thought he was just a weather vane, and that's not good enough.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so if you were in a position of. . . . You were on a selection committee for a new president for the University of California, what would you want as a president, as opposed to the kind of weather vane?

GRANT: I'd rather have a strong man.

TRELEVEN: Strong meaning . . .

GRANT: Strong meaning a man that with his own principles, whether they agreed with mine or not, I'd want him to be a strong man in favor of what he thought ought to be done. And in discussing it with him ahead of time, I'd say, "What do you think we ought to do? Do you think we ought to have order, or do you think we ought to allow them to be in Sproul Hall and keep everybody out? Are you for that or against it? And if he's a strong enough man to say, "No, we can't have that, that's anarchy," then I'd be for him. But that didn't happen right at the time.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, but not everyone on the regents shared your point of view.

GRANT: No. No.

TRELEVEN: And here's Hitch in a sense in the middle. I mean, we've identified that there are these

factions.

GRANT: Almost an impossible job at that time. How is he going to handle it other than being a weather vane? And yet being a weather vane wasn't solving the problem. And so if you have a strong enough man in there, well, then he will at least try to solve it rather than weather vaning it. And there were things that could be done. I think a strong man would have convinced the Academic Senate that they ought not to allow these kinds of things to happen and get some support from the Academic Senate. He couldn't do it without support, but he didn't really have much support from the Academic Senate.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I'm going to turn the tape over.

GRANT: Okay.

[End Tape 6, Side A]

[Begin Tape 6, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on, and you had just talked about the relationship between the president and the Academic Senate. What you're saying is that you would have expected Hitch to talk to each of the chancellors on the respective campuses where the Academic Senate divisions were and to try to

be more persuasive, more aggressive in dealing with their campus Academic Senates?

GRANT: I think that if a man appears to the regents in the like of a weather vane, he will appear that way to anybody who had anything to do with him, because these regents are all strongly. . . . Men of strong inclination, whether it's one side or the other, men of strong inclination. And they want the president to be strong and be a leader. He did not appear to the regents to be a strong man, he did not appear to the regents to be anything more than a weather vane. Therefore, he appeared to each one of the campuses as a weather vane. The present president of the university, Dave Gardner, is thoroughly liked by the whole university. The professors and the chancellors, everybody likes him. I don't think people liked Charley Hitch. I don't know because I never asked them. I wouldn't do that. But he was not really a likable person. And this present president's wife just died and she was honored by the university and called associate to the president.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I remember you saying that.

GRANT: Well, that's quite a compliment. That hasn't been done to my knowledge. So there's a strong man to whom the chancellors and the press look up to. That's the kind of man that was needed at that time. We didn't have him. The fact that he's a strong man characterwise and so on causes them to look up to him and like him. But if Hitch was not a strong man, people don't like that. I don't care who they are, they don't like it. Even if he's of an opposing view I like him if he's a strong man. And I don't have to agree with everybody to like them. I like people, and if they are weaklings, then I'm inclined just to pass by and say, "Well, I'll get acquainted with somebody else."

TRELEVEN: Kind of interesting you mention that, because there's one theory about Clark Kerr and that is Kerr began to get in trouble because he couldn't keep his hands out of the Berkeley situation. He should have let his chancellor take care of it, at the time take care of it. I mean, the Free Speech Movement and things that were going on before you were on the regents, and that Kerr was too aggressive as a president, got in hot water

in part because of that. So it's kind of interesting.

GRANT: Well, it depends on what kind of a strength a man evidences. And Kerr's strength was different from Gardner's, and who am I to judge the two of them? I'm not the right judge for that. But I understand what you're saying about Kerr, but also I can't think what the name of the man was who was chancellor at that time. And he was not evidencing any real strength in handling the situation.

TRELEVEN: Strength, his name was [Edward W.] Strong.

GRANT: Yes, then there was another that followed him.

TRELEVEN: And then there was [Roger] Heyns, Heyns followed him.

GRANT: Heyns, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Roger Heyns.

GRANT: Roger Heyns. And I didn't think he fit very well.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I thought there was a little coolness in your voice yesterday when the name Charles Young came up.

GRANT: You are very perceptive.

TRELEVEN: At the time you joined the regents, he had just

become chancellor of UCLA at age thirty-five or thirty-six. He was called the boy chancellor by Time magazine.

GRANT: He's a big boy, though.

TRELEVEN: And I guess he's had about twenty-five years now as chancellor at UCLA.

GRANT: A long, long time.

TRELEVEN: But it sounded like had you had your druthers at the time, he wouldn't have lived to have seen his being in his third decade of chancellorship.

GRANT: I don't remember the occasions, but there were quite a number of things he did or said which were not to my liking. But I have an inclination--I don't know why it is--but I have an inclination if I don't like what somebody says or does, I make a specific effort to forget it. I don't like to remember adverse things about anybody.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: And so I can't recall what it was I wasn't pleased with with that chancellor, but there were quite a number of things he said or did that I wasn't in agreement with, and I just dismissed it and forgot it. I didn't feel strongly that he

ought not to be chancellor, but I felt that he ought to be a better man than he was. And by that I mean characterwise. I just didn't agree with some of his views, but I don't remember what they were.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, as we talked about yesterday, he did support his Academic Senate and philosophy department in the Angela Davis situation.

GRANT: Yeah, that was one of the things.

TRELEVEN: I doubt if . . .

GRANT: But I think of Angela Davis, I don't think of Young when I think of that.

TRELEVEN: So what kind of an interaction would you have with Young personally?

GRANT: None.

TRELEVEN: None at all?

GRANT: None. Oh, I'd say hello to him.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: That's all. That's the end of it.

TRELEVEN: Neither of you seemed to be interested in talking.

GRANT: Neither one of us was interested in the other one. And he had a perfect right to feel as he did. Everybody has that right. You choose your

own associates, and he was not interested in me, and I was not interested in him. And it's a free country and that's all right for both of us.

TRELEVEN: Speaking of UCLA, had you known Franklin Murphy at all?

GRANT: A little bit, not very much. Just a little bit.

TRELEVEN: I think he was still chancellor when you became a regent.

GRANT: Yes, that's correct. And I had no feeling against him at all.

TRELEVEN: Right, well, he's a Republican. [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, I didn't know that. You're very appreciative of the fact that I am a Republican. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: But no close interaction with Murphy?

GRANT: No, no.

TRELEVEN: Okay. One other chancellor that I thought of, because he has an agricultural background, I thought, did you have interaction with [Daniel G.] Dan Aldrich [Jr.] at Irvine?

GRANT: Yes, quite a lot.

TRELEVEN: Tell me a little more about that.

GRANT: Well, I knew him personally, in a friendly way,

and we talked about different things. For one thing he told me that his wife entered the women's Olympics footrace. I don't remember what they called it. And I said, "How did that come about?" Well, he said, "She used to exercise the dog and herself at the same time, take the dog on the leash and go for a jaunt every morning. And her son said to her, 'Why don't you enter the Olympics?' And she said, 'Oh, I'm not in training, I'm not ready.' He said, 'You train every day.'" And so Dan Aldrich said she entered and she did fairly well. I don't know what she accomplished, but that was one of the conversations we had. It was a friendly relationship. And also I know people who are in research at Riverside, and they liked him and they wanted to know what I knew about him. And I said, "Well, he's about as tall a man as you'll ever find and he's pretty tall as far as my knowledge of his administration is concerned." They said, "Yes, he is." So they liked him there. And I think. . . . Did he die?

TRELEVEN: Yes, he passed away within the past year or two.

GRANT: I think a man that I know who was retired from agricultural research had told me that. I didn't know his wife. I met her, but I didn't really know her. But I knew him fairly well.

TRELEVEN: Anything else? When he talked to you did he retain his interest in agriculture?

GRANT: Oh yes, he was always interested in agriculture and avowedly interested to try to encourage research and things of that kind and spoke of agriculture frequently. When he'd speak on some other subject, he'd mention agriculture as one of his interests. He continued to be interested in it. And he's well respected by his contemporaries that were with him in the university at the time. And that was one thing about Chuck Young. It seemed that he didn't have a very good relationship with numbers of other chancellors. I don't know that, I just felt that he didn't, and that may have been a bias. I don't know that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Yesterday you let me know what you thought of the whole investment in South Africa. At the same time--mainly this was Norton Simon through the years, including the time when you were a

regent--Simon would complain that the Investments Committee and the treasurer's office was not wisely investing the regents' money.

GRANT: Yes, I remember him complaining about that frequently.

TRELEVEN: And therefore the university was losing millions of dollars a year. I'm sorry, it wasn't millions, it was maybe half a million a year, because the investments were being made too conservatively. What was your position on that matter?

GRANT: Well, I think he was wrong. I think the university has to be more conservative than most investment activities, more so than some other group charged with investing public monies. The university is a conservative activity. It isn't supposed to be liberal. It's supposed to be in the middle. And so I think that he was perhaps to a degree right, but I didn't agree with him. Conservative investments have. . . . Well, just look at what's happened with the savings and loan thing. Those were not conservative investments and . . .

TRELEVEN: That's right.

- GRANT: And maybe he would have had university funds in some of those things, because they did look good. I didn't like them when it was going on. I like them even less now. And so I don't think he was right. I didn't think so then.
- TRELEVEN: Okay, it seemed the majority of the regents did not agree with him.
- GRANT: No, most of them felt, conservative or liberal, they felt that we ought to be careful with the university funds, more careful than if it was some other group other than the university.
- TRELEVEN: Even though you were not on the Investments Committee, would you attend Investments Committee meetings?
- GRANT: Not the Investment Committee meetings, but I was vocal about my opinions in the board of regents' investments, yes. I didn't want us to become too liberal in investments.
- TRELEVEN: Right. No junk bonds.
- GRANT: No sir.
- TRELEVEN: In fact, I don't think the phrase junk bond was even being used back in those days.
- GRANT: No, it wasn't.
- TRELEVEN: It's a more recent phenomenon.

- GRANT: But the idea of those kind of investments are pretty risky. Everybody knows it now. Too bad they didn't know it then.
- TRELEVEN: One thing the regents did invest in heavily was medical education and health sciences facilities. I think during the time of your regency, and it may continue today, I think that perhaps 25 percent of the operating costs of the university were related to medical education. Why should the University of California invest so much in medical education and health facilities?
- GRANT: Well, look at the demand for health education now and for. . . . Well, the problem we have with health at the present time. It's a never-ending thing. I think that the medical part of the University of San Francisco campus is extremely valuable. Just look at the demand for nurses worldwide at the present time. And the demand for new medicines worldwide, the demand for cures for this, that, and the other disease. I think it's pretty legitimate. I don't find any fault with that.
- TRELEVEN: But doesn't that proportion of money take funds away from other worthwhile things?

GRANT: Oh, yes, yes, it certainly does, because there's only a certain amount of money to spend, and if you spend some of it in one place you don't have it to spend in another. But I still think it's necessary to go ahead as much as possible. We need to have that ongoing activity, just the same as we need the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Part of the effort, and this took the form of some state legislation [Song-Brown Family Physician Training Act],<sup>1</sup> in fact, was to train more family physicians, three-year residencies in family medicine, to take the place of the old family doctors as we had known them. To increase the numbers of those kinds of physicians so that they would practice, hopefully a number of them in the state of California in medically underserved areas. Has that made an impact, say, in the rural area that you're acquainted with in terms of reducing the problem of physician shortage?

GRANT: Yes, I think it has, but also I told you the

---

1. S.B. 1224, 1973-1974 Reg. Sess., Cal Stat., ch. 1176 (1973).

other day about going to San Francisco to testify against the IRS, because they claimed that the Farm Bureau in developing health insurance program for our farmers, or rural people rather, and for compensation insurance for workers was purely to make a profit. We won on all three charges that the IRS had against us, but we did get a bill through by Senator [Frank L.] Gordon up in Yolo County back in 1941 to make it possible for us to have health and hospitalization insurance groups. Finally, we ended up with one whole group, overall group, because it was difficult to do it by individual groups within the state. But we did encourage physicians and other medical personnel to go out into rural areas. Now we don't have near as much rural area, but we do have medical services for rural people now, and we didn't have before the Farm Bureau got with it, and of course the university was interested too. But it took work from outside the university to get it done as well as work within the university to get it done.

TRELEVEN: Right, well, the university's job became to train

physicians.

GRANT: Yes, and encourage them to go into rural areas.

TRELEVEN: Hopefully.

GRANT: Yeah, hopefully.

TRELEVEN: And what I'm asking is that, say, in the Kings County-Tulare County area, have the results paid off?

GRANT: Yes, they have.

TRELEVEN: Are there physicians who have wanted to practice here and . . . ?

GRANT: And there's. . . . We do have better service by far now than we had when I came here in 1929, way, way better. And we do have compensation insurance for farmworkers--or not just farmworkers, but any workers as long as it's a group--through the state compensation insurance fund in California. And there's no profit in it. So what they were trying to get done did get done.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, as the university is getting very much into expanding medical education at San Francisco, UCLA, Irvine, Davis . . .

GRANT: Yeah?

TRELEVEN: . . . there was the need for facilities in which

to train the doctors. And suddenly, the regents were saddled with millions of dollars of debt in unpaid bills. Do you remember that?

GRANT: No, I don't remember that.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, I can't ask you about it then. I'm going to save that area I guess for William Wilson, who was. . . . You might remember there was a Hospital Governance Committee finally set up . . .

GRANT: Right. I wasn't on it.

TRELEVEN: . . . to try and deal with the huge debt problem, which ties into caring for indigent people that county hospitals had cared for in Orange County and San Diego County and Sacramento County. But you can't shed any light on that?

GRANT: No, I can't shed any light on that at all.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: Bill Wilson probably will be able to help.

TRELEVEN: One of these broad areas has to do with the university, the regents' decision to rather regularly use [ballot] initiatives for bonding as a way to pay for facilities. How adequate did that turn out to be as a mechanism for funds?

GRANT: Well, initially, it turned out to be useful in

many different areas, not just the university. But the general public are getting sick of the fact that the legislature doesn't take care of things, and that's why the initiative had made such leaps and bounds in the last several years. But there's beginning to be a backlash against that now in the state of California. And of course, the backlash has been vocal in the legislature. They don't like it at all, especially when the initiative says, "Don't pay them any more money than they've been getting," and things of that kind, they can't like that. But the initiative was helpful, and at the time it was used it didn't have the connotation of the bad name that it's begun to have now. I think it was useful.

TRELEVEN: Now when there would be an initiative on the ballot when you were a regent, would you do anything actively to support the initiative?

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: No?

GRANT: No, I'd tell people what it was about and why we needed it. If I happened to be speaking to a Rotary Club or something of that kind, they might

very well ask me what did I think about that, because I was active throughout the state. So they might ask me, and I'd tell them yes, I'm for it, and why. But I didn't overtly go out and have a private drive in favor of it, no. But I did support it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And you favored these kinds of initiatives as a way to . . .

GRANT: Yes, it was almost a have-to situation.

TRELEVEN: Well, the option was to raise taxes.

GRANT: Well, the option was to ask the legislature to do something, and the legislature didn't do much.

TRELEVEN: Why not? [Laughter]

GRANT: Well, because they want to get elected next time, and they're afraid to.

TRELEVEN: But let's say theoretically Governor Reagan had the option of asking for a tax increase.

GRANT: But he's a politician also, and it's easier if you do it the other way.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

GRANT: Why do something the hard way if it's easier to do it the other way? That's just a politician's regular. . . . That's in his book of rules.

TRELEVEN: Well, yesterday you were talking about fiscal

responsibility and the fiscal responsibility that came about because of the Reagan administration.

GRANT: Yes?

TRELEVEN: And because of regents like you who supported that. Is it fiscally responsible to pass on the cost of construction to our grandchildren instead of going out and trying to raise revenue in other ways?

GRANT: It depends upon the circumstances. I think it's fiscally responsible if the circumstances at the present moment don't allow us to pay for it. When I bought a ranch I bought it over a period of time, because the situation today didn't allow me to have enough money to pay for it. So I paid interest and paid for it over a period of ten, twenty years. And knowing that history shows you, what demographics show you, what California has been doing, what it's going to do, what the gross income of the state will be, and therefore with that in mind, you take a look at it and see, do we pay for it now or do we pay five years from now, or over a period of ten years? Fiscal responsibility isn't just buying your ice cream in a carton today and paying the full cost. It's

saying, "Do I need the ice cream now, or do I need it five years from now? If I need it over a period of time, I'll buy a little of it now and a little bit of it later." That's fiscal responsibility, using the money to the best advantage and using the money to its fullest capacity. You don't pay for everything today if the situation will say to you. . . . The prognosis will say to you, "It's going to be easier to pay for it if we do it this way over time." So fiscal responsibility can be interpreted different ways by different people.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's your phrase. [Laughter]

GRANT: Yes. Well, my appreciation of fiscal responsibility is to pay for it as you can, and if you need it today and are going to be needing it worse tomorrow, let's pay for it over a period of time as those who are able to pay for it are going to be coming along in their ability as time goes on. But if we need it today and aren't going to need it tomorrow, we pay for it today.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so concretely though that means the assumption is that the state of California is going to continue to boom and grow and so on,

which we've had to give second thought to in about the last year or two.

GRANT: And there are some second thoughts, too. What are they going to do in Los Angeles and the problems Los Angeles has with smog? But they haven't answered that question yet. And so it's going to continue to grow just as it has in the past until people decide, "There is something I have to do about it."

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, big government is doing things, and an example is UCLA. The [Southern California] Air Quality Management District requiring UCLA as one of the biggest industries in Los Angeles to survey every single employee on driving habits. Do they van pool? Do they take busses? And there are targets that are being set by big brother government for industry, for individuals.

GRANT: Well, that's what I said a while ago. If this level doesn't take care of it, the next level has to. If that one doesn't, then the top level has to. It has to be taken care of one way or another. And since we've had subventions of tax money from the federal government back to the state, then the state subventions to the county,

and the county overspends, those subventions are causing trouble. But they began when the federal government began to subvent it back to the states. And they became less than responsible in their spending. So now UCLA has to take their part in it to see what do we do about this thing. I think I told you about--and this does pertain to this specific thing--seventy years ago last year when I came down the grapevine grade, my uncle, driving a model-T, said, "Allan, will you get out and drive the cows off the pavement so we can go on?" Well, I did get out and drive the cows off the pavement. There wasn't any car behind us and no car coming the other way on 99 highway. Well, what's going to be seventy years from now? We can't have all these cars, and so you're correct in saying that UCLA is making a survey to see who's going to do what and what is our responsibility in it and how do we get transportation in some other mode rather than tens of thousands of cars taking an hour and forty minutes to go twenty miles or something.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: We can't continue that. There's no question

about it, but who's going to make that decision? If the people won't make it themselves, then a level of government has to make it. If they don't make it, then you go on to the next.

TRELEVEN: Right. Let's pause for a minute.

[Interruption]

GRANT: . . . transportation business.

TRELEVEN: Okay, a critical element in any university is a library, and somewhere in the midst of '71, '72 budget deliberations the suggestion was made that if libraries of the university do not have enough money, they've got all these rare books. Why don't they sell their rare books? How do you feel about that?

GRANT: I think it's all right to sell the rare books depending on to whom you sell them. If they're going to have a library of rare books available to other people, that's one thing. If they're going to sell them to private holders to make a profit on them or their heirs to make a profit on them two hundred years from now, that's another matter. I don't know what they had in mind. But it certainly depends on what you're going to do

with them. Will they still let them be available to others? We owe a lot to the priests and the monks that preserved the papyrus years and years and years ago. We wouldn't have them if they hadn't been preserved, so I don't believe in getting rid of them. They ought to be available, but that would depend to whom they were going to go.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, the context was the libraries were having . . . . Well, their budgets were getting cut, and so it has to do with operating expenses for the libraries, cutting back hours when the students can use them. So someone had the brilliant suggestion, "Well, why don't we sell the rare books and use that for . . . ?"

GRANT: Well, when we come to that question then we have to come to the second question, and that is you're having trouble with monetary problems of operating the library or teaching school or taking care of all the students or whatever, how do you conserve? How do you save money? And I mentioned already, I'll reiterate it, and that is when I was on the high school board here we had a superintendent, assistant superintendent, and

executive secretary. Now we've got I would guess at least seven or eight assistants. And there are more students, yes, and there are a few more schools. But when you lay off teachers then the teachers ought to say, "How much of this top layer are you going to lay off? Where are you going to have all this savings?"

TRELEVEN: Yeah, well, that's happened in Los Angeles. The teachers union has particularly been asking that question about it.

GRANT: Well, the teachers union from my way of thinking is frequently wrong, but nobody is wrong all the time. And so they may be right on this one.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I think we're kind of winding down here. I'm running out of questions, believe it or not. Let me just ask a few general things, though.

GRANT: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Was it a better board of regents when you left than when you came?

GRANT: Yes, I'd say so, even if you didn't change personnel. I think it was better, because there was a better understanding between them. When I first went on the board of regents, there was the

attitude on the part of those who were already there who had been there for a while, "Wait a minute. What's going to happen now? This is going to be awful." Well, it didn't turn out to be quite that awful. And so they began to think, "Well now, it isn't as bad as I thought it would be," so that in itself would make it a better board of regents, more willing to listen. The hair on the back of their neck was down, and so there wasn't the animosity that was felt right to begin with. So I'd say yes, it was better, if that were the only reason. But another reason was that there was a kind of diminution of the loud voice of the students by that time.

TRELEVEN: You stated yesterday that overall--you made this clear--you didn't necessarily enjoy your time on the board.

GRANT: No, I . . .

TRELEVEN: Wasn't there an aspect or two that you did like?

GRANT: Yes, I liked the idea of service. That's been my philosophy all my life is service to others, and so I liked that, yes. I felt that I was doing something worthwhile. The university is worthwhile, and I was associated with it. So

wherever there was a positive way to affect the university, I felt that I was doing a service and was pleased with it. But the idea of serving on the board of regents as a prestige situation was totally negative as far as I'm concerned. I don't think there's any prestige to it. There's no more prestige in serving on the board of regents than there is in serving as a county supervisor or on a city council or anything. It's just serving a group of people. So frankly, I don't think of it as anything. So when I meet people in conversation, they find out I served on the board of regents, "Oh, that's pretty important. You're quite an important person." No, that's a bunch of hogwash. You just do what you're asked to do wherever you are, whether it's the board of regents or on the Farm Bureau or at church or wherever it is. I don't think there's any prestige to it from my own viewpoint, none at all.

TRELEVEN: Well, that's interesting, because it's seen as one of the most prestigious appointments a governor can make.

GRANT: Yes, and people feel that way. But that's

because they want to feel that way, and I don't have that feeling at all. I don't demean it. The university is one of the most important parts of the state of California. And so to serve on the board of regents is an important job that needs to be done, but that doesn't make me any more important than I was before I got on the board of regents. It's only because a certain man asked me to serve on that. That's the only reason I'm there. So I can't buy the idea that it's a prestige position.

TRELEVEN: So there was the service aspect. Anything else you liked about serving?

GRANT: Oh yes, there were certain people on the board of regents with whom I have good rapport, and it was a pleasure to visit with them and not so much to talk about the university as to talk about other things that we had in common interest.

TRELEVEN: But overall, outside of I think you've mentioned a few times Mrs. Hearst and Glenn Campbell . . .

GRANT: And William French Smith, and Boyd, and I got well acquainted with Lawrence, John [H.] Lawrence.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

GRANT: And quite a number of other professors of middle-of-the-road or conservative bent. Also, I got acquainted with people who were interested in the fact that I had had refugees from communism of the Second World War from the Ukraine, so there were some Ukrainians there that I got acquainted with. We had a common interest because of our interest in the problems of the Ukraine.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: So there were other interests too, international interests. I was interested in the plight of South Africa and how they're going to cure it; about the same way we've cured ours, which was a similar situation. Not the way they've tried to cure it in other parts of the world, but it needed some assistance.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, getting back to the board, though, do I interpret you correctly when I think that what you're saying is there was kind of a lack of camaraderie overall amongst members of the board?

GRANT: Yes.

TRELEVEN: What do you feel was chiefly accountable for that?

GRANT: Chiefly accountable was a strong philosophical

attitudes of each separate member of the board. And they weren't all the same. Roth was not the same as Dutton. Dutton is not the same as anybody else I know. Coblenz is quicksilver all over the lot. I never knew exactly where he was. So everybody was different, and they were so different that the camaraderie that you might expect in that group of people did not exist. Frankly, I don't think Mrs. Heller thought much of Mrs. Hearst. I think that the feeling was mutual. And frankly, I'm not opposed to women, but very frequently women who serve in that kind of capacity have that problem. Women don't like women. And married women don't like widows. It's just a . . . There were a couple of dozen different personalities on the board, and there seemed to be no real common interest. They tried to come together in an interest in the university, and they did fairly well, but that's all. It seemed to be very little other camaraderie in that group. I've been in many, many other groups where there was a lot of camaraderie, but there seemed to be almost none there. That doesn't bode well for the university

to have that much antipathy. I guess that's a good word for the way they felt. Disinterest in one another. I don't think that's good, but that's the way it was from my viewpoint.

TRELEVEN: Right, right. From the time you came to the board in '67 to '74, were you to make out a report card on the performance of the regents during those eight years, how would it read?

GRANT: They'd pass, but that's about all.

TRELEVEN: Really?

GRANT: That's about all. Yeah, they'd pass.

TRELEVEN: You're talking about your fellow conservatives as well when you say that?

GRANT: Yes, it would be a passing grade from my point of view, but nothing to be proud of or to write home about or to leave for posterity. It's just kind of a marking time, not exactly marking time, making some progress, but not anything like what had happened in the past in the university as it was growing from the beginning, or not like what I hope will happen in the future. We were just getting along against handicaps.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you're measuring that against the kind of explosive building activities that were going

on in the earlier sixties.

GRANT: Yes. And it will come again. I think the University of California is almost without peer or equal. I think it's excellent, and it's so recognized throughout the world, particularly Berkeley, except they don't really know the surroundings around Berkeley. They wouldn't like that, most of them. But intellectually, educationally, California is recognized everywhere.

TRELEVEN: And your assessment of what Ronald Reagan did for the university during his tenure as governor, especially during your regency, would be what?

GRANT: I think it was satisfactory. I don't think it's outstanding. And Ronald Reagan I think was a good governor, I think he was a good president, or I wouldn't have supported him. But he has human frailties just the same as everybody else. One of them is he's not effervescent, but he's explosive sometimes. And that doesn't draw others to him to get something done if they feel some enmity to begin with. He is . . .

TRELEVEN: You mean he can have a short fuse?

GRANT: Yes. And so with that short fuse, he's explosive

sometimes in a discussion. But I still think that because everybody has some frailty that he was a good governor and a good president. That doesn't mean that he's without fault at all. But some of the things he did as president I didn't agree with. But you can't agree with everything, because maybe I'm wrong part of the time too. It does seem possible. But I think he did as well as could be done for the university during the time he was governor.

TRELEVEN: Why in your mind is the university important to the state of California?

GRANT: Why is it important?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

GRANT: Well, education is important in the first place. Every increment of knowledge is important to the world, not just to California, not just to the University of California. But every increment of knowledge which is added just makes the world that much better, providing it's distributed. And the University of California does distribute it about as well as any university in the nation. When you say any university in the nation, America has become I

guess the key to growing knowledge throughout the world. And not just for one or two or three different disciplines, but all over the lot. And so the university is tremendously important not just to me, not to you, not to the state of California, but to the world. I don't think there's any question about its prestige or its ability or its contribution. It's all there.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were I to ask what's your most satisfactory personal accomplishment that you felt you made as a regent, what would it be?

GRANT: I don't know that I personally contributed anything except to be there and help make decisions about all the questions that arose on any agenda, because I didn't sit back and ignore part of it. I participated in everything that came up. So I would only be able to say that I contributed whatever measure of intellectual capability I have on every question that arose, and that's about the best I can do for you.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and conversely, your biggest disappointment?

GRANT: My biggest disappointment about the university is it took so long for it to calm down, for the

students to calm down and wake up to the fact that you have to have some historical background in a subject before you can make any logical kind of contribution to a change or addition or subtraction from that discipline. They learned that I think after a while. It took them a while.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I was going to talk a little about your trips abroad. And . . .

GRANT: I should have brought an album that the staff of the California Farm Bureau gave me. It's about this wide, about this high, and I loaned it to a group of Japanese. I thought they'd have it back by this time, but they didn't. And it has pictures of sometimes my wife and me, sometimes not her, because she wasn't with me all the time, in Israel. And I mentioned to you that I was instrumental in getting a program started with them. Israel and China and Taiwan and Hong Kong and Philippines and South America and Central America and Germany, everywhere.

TRELEVEN: The book you loaned me was on India.

GRANT: Yeah, but this one was everything.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see. It was kind of a composite of your

. . .

GRANT: It's about so thick and this big and it tells about, well. . . . It was in my honor that the staff set it up. One of the. . . . And they signed some cards and so on. This is kind of self-serving, but one of the things said, "How are we going to get along without the most kindly man we've ever known?" [Laughter] And I said to my wife, "Now don't forget that, that's what I am." She said, "Oh no, they don't know you as well as I do." But it was a privilege to be able to see so much of the world. I think I told you I was in nine countries and twenty-eight states in one year the last year I was president of the [American] Farm Bureau.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I want to pick this up, but I have to change the tape.

GRANT: Sure.

[End Tape 6, Side B]

[Begin Tape 7, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. Just give me a little idea for the historical record about the circumstances under which you began to make these travels that you did.

GRANT: Well, one of the initial reasons was that the Farm Bureau, but particularly I, was interested in foreign trade. And so I went to different parts of the world in order to encourage them in that part of the world, those parts of the world, to buy American products. And . . .

TRELEVEN: So this went back to the time that you were the president of the California Farm Bureau Federation? Okay.

GRANT: That was the beginning of my contacts. Different people have said to me that at least a large part of my contribution to the American Farm Bureau was my broadening the American farmer's viewpoint to recognize that he really did have a world market, not just a United States market. And that purchasing products from other countries was absolutely essential if you are going to sell the products to other parts of the world. And so I did travel. Then when I was named by President Ford to the Advisory Committee to the President on Foreign Trade, that caused me to travel perhaps even more than I had prior to that. And then Carter named me the same Advisory Committee on Foreign Trade, and Reagan did the same. I

only stayed four years with Reagan instead of eight, because I thought somebody else might well do some of it and let me stay at home for a while. But it was I think the beginnings of our international understanding--not that I take credit for it, because I contributed something to it, but I don't take credit for it--but our American farmers began to realize that there were markets elsewhere other than the United States, and so there's been a tremendous growth in the sale of various specialties, especially in California, specialty crops in other parts of the world. But also, increase in the sales of feed and grains and such things as that, soy beans. And those are the things I wanted to get done, and some people think I got them done. I got to show the way so that other people would do the same. Then I was instrumental in helping to get the program started of cooperation between Israel and California on using drip irrigation and research, so on.

TRELEVEN: Right.

GRANT: And each of the two nations put in \$40 million. That's grown to \$120 million now I believe. And

not to take away any credit from the university in United States or American research, that group of people claimed to be more efficient and effective than any of the research universities in the United States. And they can do a pretty good job of documenting that fact. They're using brackish water to grow certain things and they're using less water than they used to. And California has got to do the same thing, because we don't have enough water for the number of people we add. So those are some of the things that I take a great deal of satisfaction in. But also there's a program "Agriculture USA," which is on television every morning at six o'clock on Sunday. So lots of people don't see it, but lots of farmers do. "Agriculture USA," which was started with my encouragement, and the man in charge of it gives me credit for having encouraged him to start the program. It's been going for twenty years I guess. It's a pretty good program for people especially who are not in agriculture at all. It gives them a pretty clear picture of what different aspects of agriculture are--packing and packaging and even horse

interests. And the horse business in the United States is tremendous now, perhaps even more than when they used draft horses. So there are certain things that I feel thankful I had a part in.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. It's too bad that program is on at six o'clock in the morning, because those who might benefit most, mainly food store consumers in Los Angeles, are not going to get up at six o'clock and watch it.

GRANT: No, they don't see it at all.

TRELEVEN: That's really too bad. What's going to happen though--you alluded to this yesterday--what's going to happen as governments, say, in European countries, South American countries continue to heavily subsidize agriculture and really use increasingly the U.S. as a dumping ground for its commodities? What will happen to U.S. agriculture as a result of that?

GRANT: If that continued, the result would be bad, but they won't continue that. They will begin to back off from that as time goes on, as the United States is backing off from subsidies to agriculture, and we allow the marketplace to

determine the pricing for commodities. It will take a long, long time to get it all done, but eventually it will be done, because the people who sell those products have got to buy also, and they know it. Intrinsically, they have to know it. When they do that then their level of living gradually increases, their level of income per capita increases. So a free trade or a freer trade is going to help those countries better than the subsidies they now have.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and this is the kind of issue, this is one of the issues you would address as a member of the presidential committee.

GRANT: Yes, absolutely. When I went as adviser to Secretary [Earl L.] Butz during Ford's administration to six eastern countries, this is one of the things we stressed, that they needed to understand that we couldn't always have this business of the government subsidizing the crops, because that would cause a counter move on the part of the recipient country. And those things then could cause the protectionist attitude which we had in the thirties, which made a worldwide depression. We have to wake up to the fact that

we don't want. . . . Don't need another 1930s. They seem to understand that, and yet they couldn't quite bring themselves to come to an understanding that they wanted a freer trade than they had. They're coming to it, though. And they'll get there after a while.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Were you involved in a . . . ? Well, maybe you had left by then, but I assume that talks with Canada had been going on for some years.

GRANT: Yes. They'd been talking about it for about five years, I guess.

TRELEVEN: In terms of reducing tariffs.

GRANT: Seriously for about five years. And that's going to come to pass. Now the question is is it possible to have a free trade agreement with Mexico? And there's lots of fear of that. But we buy tremendous amounts of vegetables and fruits from Mexico at the present time, and if they have to have the same kind of rules of the game that we have here and use the same amounts of chemicals on their crops and have the same kind of sanitation standards we have here, if we can bring that about, then they are better off. We were already buying what they have, so let's

have those restrictions on their use of certain things and be happier than we are at the present time. I know Mexican farmers, quite a number of them just across the border in Hermosillo and well clear down next to Mexico City, and they were educated in Texas A & M or Davis or Cal Poly here in California. They're just as intelligent as the farmers we have on this side of the border, and so they'll be willing to modify their activity to make it similar to what we have here. It'll just take time.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so it's not just a matter of accepting any standard of import.

GRANT: No.

TRELEVEN: They are going to have to be . . .

GRANT: They have to be regulated as far as use of chemicals are concerned and sanitation and packaging and all those kind of things. A restriction wherever there may be an insect that may cause drastic damage in California, we have to watch out for it. Just as we have to watch out for anything that comes from Hawaii, our own country, because we get things from there that would cause a devastation here in the San Joaquin

Valley, so we have to be careful about those things, just the same as we have to be careful in our own country from state to state. There are citrus problems we have in Florida we don't have here. We have citrus problems in Texas we don't have here in California. And so it's a similar problem country to country as it is state to state.

TRELEVEN: Well, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but in the context of your having done lots of travel by the time you joined the board of regents and having discussions with all kinds of people in numerous countries, which in turn I suppose gave you kind of a global perspective, more of an international perspective, did the board of regents seem somewhat like small potatoes in that world context?

GRANT: Yes. It's not my inclination to judge other people compared to myself, but I was surprised sometimes at the lack of knowledge of some of the regents. They probably had knowledge that I didn't have, but when I would make a remark about something or other in some other country, they had no knowledge of that at all. They hadn't

even thought of it. It didn't even occur to them that there was any interest between America and this other country. So I guess your connotation of small potatoes is not quite correct, but they did not know a whole lot of the things I knew. By the same reasoning, I guess they knew a lot of things I didn't know. But having traveled as much as I did in other countries and been involved in as many different disciplines as I was and having been interested in education from the time of Eisenhower, way ahead of Eisenhower, I was more knowledgeable than some of the other regents. And they didn't know that.

TRELEVEN: Well, believe it or not, I don't think I have any more questions. Just before we conclude I wanted to know if you have anything that you can think of that you'd like to add.

GRANT: I don't think so. I don't think so. When my wife was here I should have asked her the name of that minister [Chris Hartmire].

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

GRANT: She would remember it.

TRELEVEN: Well . . .

GRANT: Chris is his first name. I told you about

meeting with him in the Northern California Council of Churches. I don't know that I mentioned that I went to Los Angeles and debated him before a Presbytery, and that was about two hundred, two hundred and fifty elders and ministers, and he lost. I wanted to say goodbye to him, and he was sitting in the choir loft with his head in his hands and he wouldn't look up, so I didn't get the chance to say hello.

TRELEVEN: Well, we can get that name filled in. You've been more than generous with your time over the last three days.

GRANT: That's all right.

TRELEVEN: I have certainly enjoyed this. I have not interviewed a farmer since I left Wisconsin nearly ten years ago, and it's been thoroughly enjoyable.

GRANT: Well, thank you.

TRELEVEN: Again, I appreciate your time. On behalf of the [California] State Archives, which is sponsoring the project, and certainly on behalf of UCLA.

GRANT: Well, frankly I've been. . . . I've appreciated getting to know you. It's a real pleasure, and I don't just say that, I've enjoyed it. I like

people, always have.

TRELEVEN: Good.

GRANT: The fellow that leases the ranch from me up in the hills said, "I don't quite understand your philosophy." Although he said, "I like it. We both of us know a certain man." He said, "I don't like him. You don't like what he does, but you like him." [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Good characterization. So again, thank you very much.

GRANT: Well, yes.

[End Tape 7, Side A]