

California State Archives
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

H. R. HALDEMAN

Regent, University of California, 1965-1967, 1968

June 18 and 25, 1991
Santa Barbara, 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:

H. R. Haldeman, 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

This interview is printed on acid-free paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY 1

BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY iii

SESSION 1, June 18, 1991

[Tape 1, Side A] 1

 Family background--Childhood education--Boy
 Scouts--Extracurricular activities--Interest in
 politics--Mother's community work--Military
 service.

[Tape 1, Side B] 37

 Naval assignment at University of Redlands--
 Reserve Officers Training Corps at University of
 Southern California--Marching in the navy band--
 Joanne Horton Haldeman--Devotion to
 extracurricular activities at UCLA--Managing
 student election campaign--Campus clubs and
 honorary organizations--Beginning a career in
 advertising.

[Tape 2, Side A] 75

 J. Walter Thompson Company--Television
 advertising--Early interest in Richard M. Nixon--
 Working as an advanceman for Nixon in 1956 and
 1958, campaign tour manager in 1960, and
 campaign manager in 1962--Why Nixon lost 1962
 gubernatorial election--Nixon and the media--
 Nixon's infamous farewell speech.

[Tape 2, Side B] 115

 Salvation Army and other community service--
 Republican politics in California--Involvement
 with UCLA Alumni Association and fund-raising to
 build Pauley Pavilion--Past presidents
 association.

SESSION 2, June 18, 1991

[Tape 3, Side A] 151

Escalating fund-raising drive at UCLA--Franklin D. Murphy's leadership--Becoming president of the Alumni Association--Restructuring the Alumni Association--More on raising funds to build Pauley Pavilion--Debate over on-campus football stadium.

[Tape 3, Side B] 186

Charles E. Young--Serving on the University of California Board of Regents--Relations with fellow regents and board staff--Division on board over President Clark Kerr's administration.

[Tape 4, Side A] 219

Plan to decentralize university administration--Advice to gubernatorial candidate Ronald W. Reagan's staff regarding University of California--Events leading to vote of no confidence for Kerr--Kerr's dismissal--Changing budgetary priorities.

[Tape 4, Side B] 255

Views on tuition--Disciplining students--Roles of governors on board of regents--Student rebellion and administrative response--University's in loco parentis role--University national defense work--Administrative accountability to students.

SESSION 3, June 25, 1991

[Tape 5, Side A] 288

Nixon's congressional campaigns--Veterans on campus--Nondiscrimination policies for campus organizations--John Birch Society--Republican party factions--Public relations in political campaigns--Reagan's appeal--Backlash from private schools as UCLA began to solicit private sector funds.

[Tape 5, Side B] 321

More on fund-raising--More on Kerr--More on tuition--Service on the Coordinating Council on Higher Education--Haldeman's appointment to the board of regents--Pressure to help run Nixon's 1968 presidential bid--Appeal of working in politics--More on student unrest.

[Tape 6, Side A] 355

Student's harassment of regents--Profanity and abuse of free speech--University administration and Associated Students funds--Disappointment in faculty--Affirmative action--Admission policies--Regental committee assignments.

[Tape 6, Side B] 389

Controversial faculty appointment of Herbert Marcuse--Partisanship at the university--Regents' obligation to exercise authority--Educational Policy Committee--Grounds and Buildings Committee--Regental conflicts of interest--Norton Simon and university investment policies--Nuclear science fund--On-campus speakers.

SESSION 4, June 25, 1991

[Tape 7, Side A] 425

Medical education and health sciences--Nature of bureaucracy--Management theories--Assessing individual regents--Ideological shift on board--Exaggerated reports of partisanship on board--Regental voting patterns--More on Kerr's dismissal--Decision to resign from board.

[Tape 7, Side B] 456

White House staff system--Past presidents' meetings--Writing The Ends of Power--Life in prison--Developing a career plan with the help of David Murdock--Partnership with college friends in Sizzler franchise--Realization that developing young business talent is most enjoyable kind of job for him--Setting up young entrepreneurs in various businesses.

INTERVIEW HISTORY

Interviewer:

Dale E. Treleven, Director, UCLA Oral History Program

Interview Time and Place:

June 18, 1991

Haldeman's residence in Santa Barbara, California
Session of three hours

June 18, 1991

Haldeman's residence in Santa Barbara
Session of three hours

June 25, 1991

Haldeman's residence in Santa Barbara
Session of three hours

June 25, 1991

Haldeman's residence in Santa Barbara
Session of one and one-half 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.

Haldeman 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

H. R. (Harry Robbins) Haldeman served from 1965-67 as an ex officio member of the University of California Board of Regents as president of the Alumni Association of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). In 1968 Governor Ronald W. Reagan, who had earlier named Haldeman to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, appointed him to a full-term regents' seat. However, he officially left the board in January of 1969 after becoming Assistant to the President of the United States (White House chief of staff) in the Richard M. Nixon administration.

Haldeman was born on October 27, 1926, in Los Angeles. After elementary and secondary schooling in Beverly Hills, North Hollywood, and Los Angeles, he attended the University of Redlands and the University of Southern California and, in 1948, earned his bachelor's degree in business administration at UCLA. A marketing major, Haldeman spent twenty years (1949-68) with the J. Walter Thompson Company in New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles offices, served in the Nixon administration from 1969-73, and was president of the Murdock Hotels Corporation in Los Angeles from 1979-85. Since 1985 he has been a self-employed consultant in Santa Barbara, California.

The interview focuses primarily on Haldeman's early life, education and military service, involvement in public service organizations, partisan political interests and activities, leadership in the UCLA Alumni Association, origins and development of the UCLA Foundation after a successful fund-raising effort for construction of the Edwin W. Pauley Pavilion on the Los Angeles campus, and business before the University of California regents during Haldeman's service on the board.

H. R. and Joanne Horton Haldeman, wed in 1949, are the parents of four children whose ages ranged from forty to thirty-two at the time of this interview.

[Session 1, June 18, 1991]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's June 18, 1991, and I'm here with [Harry] H. R. Haldeman at Hope Ranch. We are beginning an interview for the State Archives State Government Oral History Program. We'll be doing a little later a lot of focusing on your Alumni Association participation and membership on the [University of California] Board of Regents. But I think to begin with I'd probably like to go back to the beginning. I guess the first question I'd have is where and when were you born.

HALDEMAN: Okay. I was born in Los Angeles on October 27, 1926. And my family had. . . . My parents' families had come to Los Angeles right at the start of the century, and both my mother and father grew up in L.A. They were both born, oddly enough, in Indianapolis, although their families didn't know each other until they got to Los Angeles.

TRELEVEN: And they came west for what reason?

HALDEMAN: Well, my father's family came west. . . . He was with the Crane Company originally in Chicago and he was transferred by Crane to San Francisco. I think he came to San Francisco in 1904. And after the earthquake they moved down to Los Angeles, and he managed Crane operations out here for some time and then formed his own plumbing supply business in Los Angeles, which after his death my father took over. And in the Depression it collapsed.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And stocked Crane products?

HALDEMAN: No, it was Pacific Pipe and Supply Company, and they were an independent plumbing supplier. I suppose they stocked some Crane products. That company basically folded right after, shortly after I was born, so I was never very familiar with that business. My father then in 1932 started his own business, which was heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning manufacturers' rep--a related business, but something that he perceived as being more on the forefront of technological development. Air-conditioning was something new in those days.

TRELEVEN: Sure. Well, I suppose for the record we should get the names of your father and mother.

HALDEMAN: Okay. My father was Harry Francis Haldeman, and my mother was Katherine Elizabeth Robbins Haldeman. Her family were. . . . Her father was the original Chrysler distributor for the West Coast.

TRELEVEN: Is that right?

HALDEMAN: And then became a Chrysler Plymouth dealer and had the Greer-Robbins dealership in Beverly Hills which he founded with a partner, P. H. Greer. So they were in the automobile business, and my father's family in the plumbing and then the air-conditioning business.

TRELEVEN: So what part of town did you spend your early life in?

HALDEMAN: I was born in my grandparents' apartment in the Talmadge apartment house on Wilshire Boulevard in the mid-Wilshire area.

TRELEVEN: Oh sure, yeah.

HALDEMAN: And the building is still there. As a matter of fact, a friend of my mother's who is still living is presently the owner of the apartment that I was born in, so I've been back to visit it. My

family built a house in Beverly Hills, and we moved to Beverly Hills right shortly after I was born, apparently. And I grew up in the early years in Beverly Hills on Maple Drive. I went to grammar school in Beverly Hills and then when I was, let's see, fourth grade, so probably eight or nine or ten years old I guess, we moved to San Fernando Valley, to North Hollywood, Toluca Lake area. And I finished grammar school at Rio Vista Grammar School out there and then went to North Hollywood High [School], because there was no junior high in those days. Then they started North Hollywood Junior High and they transferred us out of the high school back down to junior high, which was sort of degrading.

TRELEVEN: It was sort of a four-year high school.

HALDEMAN: It was a six-year high school, North Hollywood High. Originally when I started it, I started in the seventh grade at North Hollywood High. And then they cut seventh, eighth, and ninth out of the high school when they built the junior high. I was in the eighth grade at that time when I moved to the junior high. And I was in the first graduating class of the junior high.

We were the oldest class to go down there, so we were the senior class for a year and a half. We got an extra run as the senior class of the junior high. And then I graduated from the junior high and went on up back to the high school, was there for just a short time, was not doing well academically, and my parents threatened me and then followed their threat and moved me to Harvard School on Coldwater Canyon out in the Valley, which at that time was. . . . Well, that didn't work, did it?

TRELEVEN: Let me pause.

[Interruption]

Okay, we're back on, and I think you were describing how you had begun to go to Harvard School.

HALDEMAN: Right. So I moved in the ninth grade to Harvard School and finished high school there. And in those days it was a military school, and this was in. . . . I graduated in 1944, so it was during the early part or the main part of World War II that I was at Harvard. And it was a fully accredited ROTC unit so we had full military training under an army colonel. The fellows that

graduated in the several years before I did went right out of Harvard out of high school to officers candidate school. And by the time things had gotten down to where I was, we didn't, so we were into the draft or whatever. The school was also and still is connected to the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles, and the suffragan bishop of Los Angeles was the headmaster of the school. So it was a very heavy duty church school and military school in those days. It's changed a lot now.

TRELEVEN: Was your family Episcopalian?

HALDEMAN: No. Christian Scientist. But the school was a good school academically, and I was put in there because of that, and I did well academically when I got under a little stricter regime.

TRELEVEN: You needed some discipline, huh? [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: I did, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Well, stepping back just a little bit, as you were growing up what did you find yourself interested in?

HALDEMAN: I was interested in a lot of things. I was active in North Hollywood in the Boy Scouts. We had a really good Boy Scout troop, and my father

was an assistant scoutmaster, and most of my good friends in the junior high years were active in the same Scout troop. That was sort of an all-encompassing activity. I was not an active participant in athletics and had no athletic ability, so I wasn't involved in team sports and that sort of thing. Especially in that period I wasn't much interested in the academic stuff, so the Boy Scouts was a big thing. And I really enjoyed and we had. . . . Because it was a very active one, that was my main focus other than the normal things of, you know, life as a kid growing up in the San Fernando Valley in the days when that was out in the country.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. So did that involve camp outs and jamborees and . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, the whole thing. Lot of camping trips and jamborees and camporees and camporals and all that, and it was a great life. And the Valley was very much country at that time. When the war came along my mother was very active in the American Women's Voluntary Services, which in the chapter out there Dolores Hope, Bob Hope's wife, was the chairman.

TRELEVEN: Oh, sure.

HALDEMAN: And Mother was one of her senior lieutenants. And their mission among other things was supplying coffee to the antiaircraft gun and searchlight battalions that were stashed in the hills all around the area there. Early on I got a driver's license when I was just fifteen, and I drove the coffee truck to pick up. . . . Take the coffee jugs out in the evening and pick them up in the morning and replenish and that sort of thing. So I was doing that and I was a junior air warden in the civil defense thing.

TRELEVEN: Which meant what?

HALDEMAN: We had some degree of training, and it sort of sprung out of some Scout training and the first aid training and all that. Our job when the. . . . We had air raid alerts and we'd go out with wearing our armbands and our flashlights and make sure people had their windows properly curtained and all that sort of stuff.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: It was sort of exciting stuff for a kid at that age, and it was fun. I didn't have any jobs at that time. At a point there, after I was at

Harvard School but we were still living there in the Valley and the war was going on, my folks told me I had to go to get a job in the summertime. This was my sophomore, junior, and senior years in high school, I guess. I couldn't find a job that I wanted to do. The only job I could come up with was at Ralph's grocery store as a bag boy at five cents an hour, and it didn't interest me much. And so I organized. . . . I was a good swimmer, and we had a swimming pool, which a lot of people didn't have in those days. It's not like now; everybody in the Valley practically has one.

TRELEVEN: Despite what you said about your athletic inability, you were a good swimmer.

HALDEMAN: I was a good swimmer, and I set up a thing in the summertime that we called the Junior Cadet Corps, and it was a summer. . . . A day camp I guess you'd call it at our house for kids three to. . . . I think it was three-to-eight-year age group or something like that. And among other things, we taught them how to swim, and I taught a lot of kids how to swim over several summers of running this club. It was called Junior Cadet Corps, and

we brought in military drill, and we did some camping--all at our place. We had a couple of acres, and there was land area where we could do this kind of stuff, and it worked out great. We had the whole sort of range of handicrafts and skits and all the stuff you do at a day camp, plus the main focus, though, being on the swimming program. So I did that for several years and that got me up through. . . . In high school I was coeditor actually of the school paper, and I guess I was the advertising manager or something of the yearbook, so I was involved in school activities of that kind. I was manager of the basketball team and manager of the track team, so that was my athletic participation in school. At that time Harvard School didn't have a swimming pool, so there was no swimming program at school. Now they do and they have a very active water polo and swimming thing. That wasn't available when I was there.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well, did you excel as a Scout? Did you become an Eagle Scout?

HALDEMAN: I never made Eagle. I was a Life Scout and I had. . . . I think I was only like two merit

badges short of Eagle and never got there. Actually, when I went over to Harvard School, that sort of disconnected me from the life with the guys that were in the Scout troop to some extent. Harvard was very demanding in terms of time things. Because of the ROTC program we had military training in the afternoon and we had required athletics in the afternoon that was part of the school's program. Harvard then was and I guess still is a boarding school as well as a day school. I was a day student, not a boarder. Because they had a number of boarders, they had a program that carried through the day, and my time availability got cut short.

TRELEVEN: So just one more question I guess about the Scouts. Did you become like an Explorer later?

HALDEMAN: No, no, I didn't.

TRELEVEN: I guess they had Explorers and Sea Explorers and things like that.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, they did, but that was not as active as it was both before and after, because at that time when you graduated from high school at age seventeen you were instantly subject to the draft. And everybody, all the boys at that time

either were drafted or went into as I did into one of the military training programs.

TRELEVEN: Okay, which we'll want to turn to in just a minute. Again, maybe dipping back a few years and as time progresses, what did you like to read?

HALDEMAN: From the time I was a little kid I was a voracious reader. My mother loves--loved, she's gone now--she loved to tell the story that they sent me off to Big Bear Boys Camp when I was I think five years old or something. I was very young to be going off to camp, but they thought I needed some activity.

TRELEVEN: That's up at Big Bear Lake?

HALDEMAN: It was then up at Big Bear Lake. And it was a camp run. . . . Was it Big Bear was the one? No, I forget who ran Big Bear Camp. I ultimately ended up at Catalina Island boys camp in the summers when I was a little kid, and that was run by [Willis O.] Bill Hunter and "Gloomy Gus" Henderson, a great coach at USC [University of Southern California]. So I spent some summers at Catalina at that camp. But, anyway, her big thing was that when I went off to camp I took the

Boy Scout Handbook, because I was even then fascinated with the concept of the Boy Scouts. I took the Boy Scout Handbook and the Bible with me, and that's what I apparently was absorbed in reading. What I remember reading is the Johnson-Smith catalog and stuff like that [Laughter] in those days, but I guess I read the other stuff too. But I was a good reader and I loved reading and I read novels, the current best-seller type books pretty much, and I would say then all the stuff as we got into school and you start having the required and recommended reading. I was a strong participant in reading programs. We had a good public library, and I did a lot of taking stuff out of the public library to read. And it was I would say primarily fiction and classics.

TRELEVEN: What were you becoming interested in as you were matriculating through high school?

HALDEMAN: That was my father's greatest frustration. He'd keep asking that question, and there was never any answer. I was interested in whatever was happening at the time. I didn't have any overriding apparent external interests. I got involved in photography, I had a camera and did a

fair amount of photography and then set up a darkroom, did some. . . . Gosh, you're bringing back stuff [Laughter] I had totally forgotten about.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] Good!

HALDEMAN: I did have a good darkroom. I spent a lot of time doing photographic--taking pictures, blowing them up and . . .

TRELEVEN: Of both people and landscapes?

HALDEMAN: Right. People, landscapes, flowers, and stuff like that. Various sorts of things. More interest in the process than in the subject.

TRELEVEN: And this was all black and white at this time?

HALDEMAN: At that time it was absolutely all black and white. And I graduated to a 35-millimeter camera and did my own developing and did enlarging and fooling around with it. I also got interested in, gosh, out there in the Valley, in what was then a very new concept which is now called hydroponic gardening, but growing stuff just in water, not in the soil. You plant the seeds and the roots. You set up a thing so that the roots go down into a water thing and you create a chemical solution that does the water. Oh, and

also in the Valley one of my business enterprises was I started. . . . We lived on a dead-end street and with about probably twenty houses on it, a cul-de-sac. It was a private street, it was not a public. . . . It had never been dedicated as a public street, so it was private, and it was dirt. We lived right off of Valley Spring Lane, which is sort of a main artery now in that area of North Hollywood. It was also a dirt road at that time. And I started a thing called the Neighborhood News, a little weekly newspaper that I printed on a hectograph machine, which was a gelatin pad that you typed up a master and then you put the master on.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I remember that. Gosh, yes.

HALDEMAN: And then reprinted the copies. It was before photostats and Xeroxes.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, primitive.

HALDEMAN: And I mobilized some of the other kids on the street as the editorial staff of the Neighborhood News, and we printed a weekly newspaper. It conducted an editorial campaign to get our street paved, just our little cul-de-sac street, and we were successful. We got it paved. Then we got

. . . . It had a center divider down it that was just weeds with walnut trees. There were walnut trees in it, but then they just had weeds at the bottom, and we ran a campaign and got the neighborhood, the street residents, to raise a fund to clear the weeds and plant grass there and maintain a lawn in the center divider. So we did some civic improvement. And I'd sit there. . . . We'd sit there and listen to the news on the radio and then type it up and get the paper out. And our big thing was to try and beat the [Los Angeles] Herald Express with the evening news on the day that we came out. We only came out once a week. But we did from time to time. So that was. . . . I had forgotten about that. That was another activity at the time.

TRELEVEN: My god, Edward [A.] Dickson's newspaper.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. Right.

TRELEVEN: Have you maintained your interest in photography over the years?

HALDEMAN: I did for a long time. It shifted to cinematography as we started having children and I took a lot of movies of the kids, and then when I was at the White House I took voluminous movies,

because I discovered on all the outside functions I was not. . . . I had to be there, but during the public part of anything I was not. . . . I didn't have to do anything, so I could take pictures, so I did. So I've got a fantastic set of both family movies and then movies through the time I was in Washington [D.C.]. Then that shifted to videotaping for a little while and I was doing it on trips we took and all that. Then I finally realized I was spending all my time taking pictures instead of enjoying the trips, so I quit. Now my wife [Joanne Horton Haldeman] is the photo nut. She takes tons of still pictures, but also she's gotten the video bug now and she does videotaping. She's the photographer, and I don't do any of it anymore.

TRELEVEN: Well, that and your little newspaper sounds like you were becoming a community activist of sorts.

HALDEMAN: Well, I guess so.

TRELEVEN: Grass roots. Were there any . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Actually, I should say, because you were trying to follow up the Boy Scouts and all, I had forgotten, somewhere like probably in my junior year of high school--maybe even it was my senior

year; no, it must have been my junior year--my family, because of the war and the gas rationing and the distances out to the Valley, decided we ought to get in closer to town, and we moved back into Beverly Hills. So my last year and a half or so of high school I was in Beverly Hills, which was no big problem, because most of the kids at Harvard, or a lot of them came from Beverly Hills anyway, so I had a lot of friends in Beverly Hills. I had sort of lost track of my friends in the Valley, because they were going on to North Hollywood High, and I was over at Harvard.

TRELEVEN: I see.

HALDEMAN: So for the latter part I ended up there, and at that time I got the job that I really loved. I went to work, because again I had to go to work during vacations and stuff, and I went to work for a company called Martha Smith's, which was a catering company in Beverly Hills, very high level caterers. They were also a bakery, candy factory, and ice cream factory, and they had a retail store on Rodeo Drive--no, it's on Beverly Drive--that had a tea room. It was a retail shop

where they sold candy and bread and cakes and the bakery products and all that. And then they had a tea room where you could sit at booths or tables and have light food, and they had a counter, a soda counter. And I became, first of all, I was a truck driver for them. I drove the delivery truck. And the owner of it, who was Martha Smith, but her real name was McElligot.

TRELEVEN: McElligot?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, Mrs. McElligot. Martha Smith was just her trade name, but Mrs. Mac she was known as. She took an interest in me, because I was fascinated with the business. And in any event after school, weekends, holidays, and vacations I worked there in a whole range of things. I worked at the factory making ice cream and in the bakery. I worked at the store as a soda jerk, which was my favorite job. I loved working the soda fountain. I worked as a dishwasher and did a little bit of everything there, and she would only half jokingly I think say that she was training me to take over the business. I had a lot of fun there through all my latter years, latter time of high school, which seemed like a

long time, but I guess it could have only been about a year and a half or so, because as soon as I graduated I went into the navy. So that was the end of all of that.

TRELEVEN: Along the way in elementary or secondary school, were there a few teachers who were particularly influential who you . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Not in elementary school. I remember teachers from way back at Hawthorne School in Beverly Hills in the first, second, and third grade, Miss Blevins and Mrs. Kendall and people like that. But I couldn't say they were at that level particularly influential. In high school there was nobody teaching anything that particularly interested me at North Hollywood High or junior high. I was active in school activities in the junior high especially, because we were the senior class for a long time and the first graduating class. I got involved there and had some good guidance from. . . . I can't remember his name now, but the man that was the principal of the junior high. But that was more an extracurricular activity interest. When I got over to Harvard I had some outstanding

teachers. The Spanish and Latin teacher at Harvard, Mr. McCleery, was a legend who had been there for a thousand years and was a marvelous teacher. I loved Latin, and we were required to take Latin, and the Episcopal affiliation, the bishop loved Latin and wanted part of our chapel service. . . . We had a morning chapel every day and a weekly chapel service in the chapel. Part of that service in the chapel was conducted in Latin, and we all had to learn the Lord's Prayer. And this Latin teacher gave a prize every year for the one--he used a stopwatch--for the one who could say the Lord's Prayer in Latin the fastest, and I set a new record for that which stood, I think, it stood until my son got to Harvard and beat my record.

TRELEVEN: Is that right? [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: Which I had challenged him to do, and he did. And I still, much to the horror of my kids, can spout through the Lord's Prayer in Latin at a very rapid rate. But McCleery was outstanding, and his stopwatch skill was renowned, because he was the official timer at all of the track and field events, track events at the Los Angeles

Coliseum in those days, including the Olympics. And he was also the baseball coach at Harvard and was quite a guy. He was a very impressive teacher. Our English teacher, Mr. Taylor, was outstanding and made. . . . I really got into the academic stuff when I got to Harvard, because I was challenged. We were in small classes and we were really challenged and we had really good faculty and very, very strict faculty. And the math teacher--gosh, I can see him clearly and I can't come up with his name--was also outstanding. Then we got a young chemistry teacher, Mr. Miller, who came in who was very good, and I got really fascinated with chemistry because of him and won the chemistry prize among other awards I got at graduation.

TRELEVEN: My gosh. It sounds like you really became motivated when you got to Harvard.

HALDEMAN: I did. I really did. I liked the military. I liked the religious part of it, the church stuff, and I liked the academic. That was a very wise move on my parents' part. And I'm glad they did it, because I think that really helped in laying a base for a good education at the high school

level.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Now you haven't mentioned anything about history or political science, those areas.

HALDEMAN: I never had any interest in history or political science.

TRELEVEN: Is that right?

HALDEMAN: Mr. Barnes, Clarence Barnes was the math teacher. Thank goodness I thought of that or we would have been all day hung up on that one. No, I loved the chemistry, I liked math and went all the way through when I got into college, went all the way through vector analysis and differential equations and all that, and I was always fascinated with math. I had no interest in the engineering type of stuff, physics. I did not like physics, or later in the navy stuff I had to take a lot of engineering courses, which I didn't like at all. History never interested me even slightly. I had to go through the history stuff, because it was all required stuff, but I didn't. . . . It was not of interest. English really was, and I got fascinated with just the structure of the English language and proper use of it. That's funny, because I had never had a political leaning or

historic interest at all.

TRELEVEN: Well, one would have thought at that time, especially with the war on, that there would have been certainly a certain amount of patriotic fervor that drew on . . .

HALDEMAN: Well, there was that, and I was very much interested in the war.

TRELEVEN: . . . that drew on historical precedent.

HALDEMAN: Okay. My interest in the war was the ongoing war, not the historical precedent, for some reason. I mean, I didn't have the intellectual curiosity to wonder why, although I was fascinated with what was happening there with the leaders with Winston Churchill and Adolf Hitler and Mussolini and [President Franklin Delano] Roosevelt. And I read everything that I could about them, but that was really current events rather than history. It became history as all current events do, but my interest was the current event thing. I listened to the radio a lot during the war and I kept maps with the pins, you know, of where things were going in the war and that sort of thing. I was very much interested in the ongoing progress of the war and

Hitler's march into Poland and all that sort of thing that led into our involvement and Roosevelt's . . .

TRELEVEN: You heard [H. V.] Kaltenborn on the radio perhaps?

HALDEMAN: Right. And I remember that the . . .

TRELEVEN: Reports.

HALDEMAN: . . . and Gabriel Heater with "Bad news tonight." And Walter Winchell I loved, and Drew Pearson, all that stuff on the radio. I'd forgotten about that too, but that was a great interest. As in the high school years as were girls and Glenn Miller and all the big bands of the time. We were able to and I did a lot take dates to the Cocoanut Grove. And we discovered that you could go to the great nightclubs up on Sunset Boulevard, the Mocambo and the Trocadero and places like that, and kids could go. You could make a reservation, go in, order two cokes, pay the cover charge of a dollar and a half or two dollars, and order two cokes, you pay a dollar something or fifty cents I guess for a coke, and spend the whole evening dancing and listening to the band. And that became, you

know, a big deal to do when we didn't have high school activities going on. So we did do that. And I still have a fantastic collection of war posters, World War II posters.

TRELEVEN: Is that right?

HALDEMAN: All those, you know, "A slip of the lip will sink a ship," and "Shut your yap and kill a Jap" or something.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

HALDEMAN: That kind of stuff. They were those great big posters, and I don't know where they are, but I've got a huge stack of those that are probably worth a lot of money today.

TRELEVEN: Probably worth a lot.

HALDEMAN: That I should give to some collection or something.

TRELEVEN: Maybe UCLA would be interested. I don't know.

HALDEMAN: Well, they might be. I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Although I'm not quite sure what their poster collection consists of.

HALDEMAN: As related to UCLA, interestingly, there is I believe a Haldeman family collection of some memorabilia at UCLA, which has nothing to do with me, but has to do with my grandfather. My

paternal grandfather, there's where the political interest started. That's what triggered what I'm about to say. My father's father, Harry Marston Haldeman--there's all Harry Haldemans all the way--was extremely active--he was the one that was in the plumbing business--was extremely active in community affairs in Los Angeles. He was the first recipient in 1920 of what became the Los Angeles Realty Board's gold watch presentation to Los Angeles's most valuable citizen. He was the first one to get it when it was awarded in 1920. And then they've since then given it every year to somebody who is considered by them the most valuable citizen. He was active in World War I in the liberty loan drives, in the [American] Red Cross, and a lot of things of that sort. Then he was the founder of the Uplifters Club out in Rustic Canyon, which was at that time sort of an offshoot of. . . . It wasn't an offshoot, it was a copy to some degree of the Bohemian Club in San Francisco. It was a group of prominent L.A. citizens who formed this group. They had a clubhouse and stuff out in the ranch area, which was then Rustic Canyon and is

now an intensive residential area. But he founded the Uplifters and was the Grand Muscle, which was the chairman's title or president's title I think for years. And Frank Baum, the writer of the Oz books, was one of the people there. They put on shows like the Bohemian Grove does and had a lot of high jinks and low jinks and fun and games for men who wanted to get out of the straitlaced confines of their wives' homes and have some fun.

TRELEVEN: Tell me, was your grandfather then also a sort of a "good government" person too?

HALDEMAN: Yes, he was somewhat of a "good government" person, but his active interest in that area was in the Better America Federation, which he was one of the founders of and which was one of the or maybe the earliest ardent anticommunist organization or movement at least in California.

TRELEVEN: This is in the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution.

HALDEMAN: Yes. Right. And sort of inspired or instigated by the very real, in their minds, concern that the communist world domination plan was a serious threat to the American democracy and that we had

to be alert to the concern of communist violent overthrow of the U.S. government by internal subversive communist forces, and that sort of stuff. That I believe in his interest and a lot of the people at that time was a very sincere and, in their belief, well-motivated and properly executed desire to create an awareness on the part of the American people of the potential threat of communist subversion, which obviously became subverted in itself into what later became [Joseph R.] McCarthyism and got into a real problem. But it was my grandfather's leadership and my mother and father both's interest in the Better America Federation and the concern about communism and creeping socialism and that sort of stuff in the United States that led to my particular interest in Richard Nixon as one among a number of political leaders in which I could become interested. I've got to take a break if you want to hit the pause key for a minute.

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

[Interruption]

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Good, we're back on. Did it follow that your

father was also interested in that organization?

HALDEMAN: Yes, and my mother was too. My mother. . . . My dad, having started or taken over, well, started his own business, was very much concentrated on building his business. That plus the time he spent with the family, which was a lot, pretty much filled his time. He did not do much outside in the community. My mother did a lot outside in the community. She was extremely active in the Girl Scouts, she was a Girl Scout troop leader out in the Valley when we lived out there for many years and very much involved in that in the normal mother-related type activities in addition to Girl Scouts. When we moved back into Beverly Hills and then after the war, she became very much involved. She was the corporate secretary of the Hollywood Bowl on the board of the Hollywood Bowl for many years. She was a close . . .

TRELEVEN: We'll pause for a minute.

[Interruption]

Back on. I think you were talking about your mother being corporate secretary for the Hollywood Bowl.

HALDEMAN: Well, she was. Again, my grandfather had been

active in the founding of the Hollywood Bowl as well as Western Airlines and the Western Raceway, which was an auto racing track out where the Beverly Hilton [Hotel] is now.

TRELEVEN: My gosh.

HALDEMAN: So she had followed in some of those footsteps. My grandfather was also extremely active in the Salvation Army as one of the early founders of the Salvation Army Advisory Board activity, which is a civilian group that counsels the army. And my father did become active. He carried on in his father's footsteps as my brother and I did and my wife still does on Salvation Army Advisory Board activity. And my dad was the leader in founding the Red Shield Youth Center, which is the Salvation Army's youth center facility in Los Angeles. And he did get in. . . . That was one outside thing he did. But Mother from the Bowl thing. . . . Well, my dad was a very close high school buddy of Norman Chandler's. They went to Hollywood High [School] together.

TRELEVEN: Oh sure.

HALDEMAN: And they did some early real estate investments together with minute amounts of money, but

playing with trying to learn how to do that. And my grandfather was a little bit into real estate investing and bought all the wrong things and held them for the wrong lengths of time. We ended up with stuff in the dregs of Hollywood and all that instead of out in Westwood where we should have been. Anyhow, Mother was very active and became one of [Dorothy Buffum] Buff Chandler's sort of lieutenants in the days when she became active in founding the Music Center [of Los Angeles County]. Mother was very much involved in the blue ribbon campaign, the Music Center activity, and stayed on the Hollywood Bowl board for a long time.

TRELEVEN: So your mother would have been probably heavily involved in Mrs. Chandler's Save the Bowl activity in I guess that was the early fifties.

HALDEMAN: She was, right.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Before the Music Center.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: She really was. And the Chandlers were close friends of Mother and Dad's and so they. . . . She did a lot of that sort of thing and became

involved through that in some other community activities. And she got the Salvation Army Sally Award as the citizen of the year that they give out. So there was that interest. You asked if they followed up the anticommunist thing. My mother was one of the main opponents of allowing the Moiseyev Ballet to come to the Hollywood Bowl.

TRELEVEN: Really?

HALDEMAN: Yeah. There was a very sharp division on the Bowl board. Wayne Griffin, who was their closest friend and whose children my parents were the godparents of, was a leader of the Bowl activity to. . . . Wayne Griffin was a civic leader in Los Angeles, chairman of the Community Redevelopment Agency downtown.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I recognize the name.

HALDEMAN: And his wife was Elinor Remick Warren, who was the foremost woman composer of our time, classical composer. So they were sort of an outstanding couple and very close friends of Mother and Dad's. But Wayne was the leader in bringing the Russian group to the Bowl, and my mother was an ardent opponent of it, and she and

Wayne were at swords' points for a while because of that. But again, she just didn't feel that it was right to support or build ties to the Soviets. But that all changed. She saw us when I was involved in the Nixon opening of détente with the Soviets, and Mother was very supportive of all of that. She became interested and active in politics, as I did, and she was head of the volunteers for several of the Nixon campaigns in Los Angeles and mobilized huge womens' volunteer forces as campaign, you know, backer-ups. So my father died just before--during the '68 election--before I went to the White House, so he never knew about all that time. But my mother lived until just a few years ago and saw all of it, including the aftermath, which was pretty hard for her. Anyhow . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, really over the generations there's been a spirit of volunteerism.

HALDEMAN: Very much so.

TRELEVEN: Which includes you, which we're going to turn to a little bit later in our discussion. Well, that's really interesting. Now, you've begun to explain this I think in the context of what

you've said already. But if you were a typical interviewee, I'd say, "Well, as you're nearing the end of high school, what are your options?" And I think you've been hinting very strongly that, given your age at the time of war, that the options were not that great.

HALDEMAN: I didn't have any options. I was going into the military service. The option was what route to take to go in.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Whether it was better to enlist or whether to . . .

HALDEMAN: I could either enlist, I could wait and be drafted, or I could get into one of the services' college programs, and that's the route that I opted to try for. I applied for the ASTP, Armed Services Training Program, or Army Service Training Programs. I think it was ASTP. It was the army's program, and then V-12 was the navy's program. I was accepted to both and opted for the V-12, and I went in and I signed up in the navy V-12 program. And at that time the program purportedly involved two years of college on active duty. You went into active duty with the navy as an apprentice seaman.

TRELEVEN: So you signed in. You were sworn in.

HALDEMAN: You were sworn in as an apprentice seaman. You wore a navy uniform. You were under navy rule and you lived in navy quarters on a college campus, and you marched to meals in a navy mess hall on the college campus. You had morning formation out in front of. . . . The place you lived was a college dormitory, but it had been taken over by the navy on a contract basis. And some of them were in fraternity houses and things like that. The navy took various facilities. But I went into the V-12 program. The concept of V-12 at the time I went in was two years college time, in which you took a normal college course plus an accelerated navy course that involved the basics of navigation, heat power, engineering courses related to what the navy wanted. The kind of stuff you would take. . . . It was sort of a poor man's naval academy. It was a thing to give you some of the stuff that you would have gotten had you gone to Annapolis, in terms of college training, plus the navy training, plus the navy physical program, physical education or activity program. Then at the end of the two

years of college, you were sent to midshipmen's school for ninety days as a midshipmen. You had been an apprentice seaman all through college, paid twenty-one dollars a month. Great pay in those days. Then you went into the midshipmen's school for ninety days, and at the end of successful completion of midshipmen's school you were commissioned as a line officer in the navy and sent out to the fleet on active duty. That was what I thought I was signing up for. But I graduated from high school in 1944 . . .

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on.

HALDEMAN: Okay. I graduated from high school at Harvard in 1944, and graduation was June 10 or something like that, and on July 1 I reported for active duty in the navy. And that active duty assignment was at the University of Redlands.

TRELEVEN: Okay, now I have for your undergraduate education you had gone to USC.

HALDEMAN: I did, but that's later.

TRELEVEN: That's later.

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: So I've got these turned around.

HALDEMAN: They're reversed.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so . . .

HALDEMAN: I started at the University of Redlands in July of 1944 as a freshman enrolled as a regular freshman in the university curriculum and as an apprentice seaman in the navy V-12 unit at the University of Redlands.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: We were housed in a university dormitory, and there were four big dormitories that the navy had taken over, three of them for V-12 people and one of them for marine V-12 people. They were marine privates instead of navy apprentice seamen.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: But going through basically the same program that we went through. And . . .

TRELEVEN: So you're going from Episcopalianism to Presbyterianism.

HALDEMAN: Episcopalian to Presbyterian and from an army ROTC to the navy V-12. I made a jump, yeah. University of Redlands was a weird place for a navy unit, because there was not only no smoking, no swearing, or anything like that permitted on

the campus, there was no dancing permitted on the campus.

TRELEVEN: Oh my gosh.

HALDEMAN: The university commons, which was the student facility center on the university, had been taken over by the navy and operated by the navy as our That was our mess hall. All the navy units ate in there. We formed regular platoon formation in front of our dormitory for breakfast, lunch, and dinner, and then marched.

TRELEVEN: Marched over.

HALDEMAN: Over to the mess hall and then marched into the mess hall. The coeds on campus, I think they must have eaten somewhere else. I don't think they ate in the mess hall at all. We did though Because it was a navy base, it was no longer a campus. It was determined that we could have dancing there, so we did have some dances there from time to time. But . . .

TRELEVEN: But no other sins.

HALDEMAN: No other sins. Well, there were a few, but they weren't admitted. [Laughter] But that was a very intensive program. I took eighteen units of regular courses plus six units of navy courses,

so I was running a twenty-four-unit program. And at that time Redlands was on the semester system and had normally two semesters a year, the fall semester and the spring semester. In the accelerated activity during the war they added a summer semester, so there were three four-month semesters in the academic year, and they went around the clock, the program went around the clock. I worked my tail off academically, physically, and militarily through that time. I did extremely well. I got top grades.

TRELEVEN: Even in engineering?

HALDEMAN: Even in engineering. I did very well.

TRELEVEN: You didn't like it, but you really worked.

HALDEMAN: I hated it. Even in engineering drawing, which was really awful for me, because I have no manual talent for artistic expression at all. It was very difficult, but it was a required course. We had the navy. . . . That was one of the navy courses we had to take, engineering drawing, heat power, advanced physics, calculus, vector analysis, differential equations, all the higher mathematics stuff. We were doing all that sort of thing in the navy-required stuff. And then I

was taking a normal liberal arts college curriculum. You asked about teachers. I only remember there one outstanding teacher, and that was a guy named [Frederick] Fred Mayer, who was a philosophy professor. That was my first exposure to philosophy, and I was absolutely fascinated. It was a very. . . . It was that typical, you know, college freshman, exciting, opening of the world type course. I really, really got a lot of interest out of that. All the males on the campus, virtually--there were a few 4-F's that were there--but virtually all the males on the campus were navy V-12 people, navy-marine V-12 people. Then there were a lot of girls on the campus, and the normal classes we attended with the girls were regular college classes like the philosophy class. Then the navy classes were separate. We also had to take naval science and tactics or whatever it was. They were the navigation courses in navigation, and we had to learn the Morse code and all that kind of stuff that the navy required us to do. Then we had inspections every day and military drill every day and about three hours I think of physical

training. We had morning calisthenics every morning for half an hour. Then we had an afternoon physical training program, obstacle courses and all the stuff that the services used to lay on. So it was a pretty intense period. I was there for four semesters, which would be the summer of '44 and then fall, winter, and summer Fall, spring, and summer of '44 to '45. The war ended in the summer of '45, and at that point the navy had this vast army of potential officer material scattered into not just the University of Redlands but all the colleges in the country practically, I guess between the navy and the army. They were breeding their officer training units and they tried to figure out what to do with us and finally concluded that they would not discharge us from the navy, they would transfer us to the naval ROTC. But there were no naval ROTC units at Redlands. There were only four ROTC units in California: 'SC, UCLA, Stanford [University], and Cal [University of California, Berkeley]. So all of us in the Redlands unit were given the opportunity to select a college that we would like to go to when

we were transferred to the ROTC unit, which would be in the fall of '45. And at the Redlands unit everybody who selected 'SC was sent to UCLA. Everybody who selected UCLA was sent to 'SC. Everybody who selected Cal was sent to Stanford, and everybody who selected Stanford was sent to Cal without exception.

TRELEVEN: You're serious!

HALDEMAN: I am absolutely serious.

TRELEVEN: Why?

HALDEMAN: Well, I think probably because there was a yeoman enlisted man somewhere processing all these requests and applications and everything who said, "Screw these, you know, smart-ass officer candidates." There's probably, you know, a chief yeoman's mate who had been in the navy for--I don't know this, this is my suspicion--that had been in the navy for thirty years, was fed up with us, you know, these "ninety-day wonder" types, so he said, "One thing I can do is I can at least make sure they don't get to the college they wanted to go to." So that's how I got to 'SC. I had selected UCLA.

TRELEVEN: So you selected UCLA.

HALDEMAN: And got sent to USC. We were then just transferred, still on active duty in the navy, to the naval ROTC unit, which was an active duty unit at that time. All ROTC units were. All college ROTC units were active duty units. So you were in the naval reserve, but it was the active duty reserve. So I then spent the fall. . . . 'SC was also on the semester system at that time, so I spent the fall and spring semesters at 'SC in the navy unit there still on active duty. I lived in von KleinSmid Hall, but it was a navy dormitory, and it was operated the same as the V-12 dormitory. We'd form formation and march to chow and march back and had navy inspections and all that. There I discovered. . . . And the war was over, so the heat was off, and we didn't know what was going to become of us, but they wouldn't let us out of the navy at that point yet. So I had by then started to learn something about how to survive life in the navy, and I found that at 'SC if you were a member of the 'SC band, the Trojan band, you didn't have to stand Saturday morning either calisthenics or inspection. Saturday morning inspection was god-awful at 'SC,

very strict, white glove-type inspection, really overdone type of thing. So I joined the band. I had played in the navy band at Redlands. I played the accordion, because also at Redlands you could get out of some form of calisthenics. There's something you got out of if you were in the band at Redlands. And so I got in the band, and I couldn't play anything except the accordion, and so they had never heard of an accordion in a marching band, but they put one in, because they figured the more bodies, the better the band would look. So I marched along trying to play by ear "Semper Fidelis" or whatever it was on the accordion. So when I got to 'SC I knew they wouldn't put an accordion in the band, but that was a good way of getting out of some stuff, so I volunteered for the band. They said, "What do you play?" And the only thing I could think of was cymbals that I figured I could handle all right or bass drum. And I didn't want to lug a bass drum around, so I volunteered for cymbals, and I was put into the 'SC band as a cymbal player. So I got to get out of navy uniform. We went to class in navy

uniform. We stayed. . . . Because we were on active duty.

TRELEVEN: I was going to ask that.

HALDEMAN: We'd wear the uniform all the time at Redlands and all the time at 'SC.

TRELEVEN: All the time.

HALDEMAN: The ROTC uniform was the midshipman-type uniform rather than the. . . . At Redlands we wore the bell-bottom trousers and the . . .

TRELEVEN: White hats.

HALDEMAN: White hats. At 'SC we wore a black tie, coat and tie, and the blue jacket, or when we had fatigues, khaki fatigues, tie and no jacket. But the khaki, black tie and khaki pants, and black shoes.

TRELEVEN: Becoming a gentleman.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. So-called. So I went into the band there, and that got me out of whatever it was I was trying to get out of. And as a result I am able to tell my children that I played in the Rose Bowl for 'SC in 1946, which is literally true. I played the cymbals in the Trojan band, but 'SC did go to the Rose Bowl that year.

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned.

HALDEMAN: I marched and I got to wear a band uniform for that thing instead of the navy uniform. Then at the end of '46 or the middle of '46, the navy decided to forget the whole thing and get rid of all these people and stop paying them, because we were still on navy pay and navy food, and they were paying all our tuition and everything else. So they decided to dump us, so they summarily discharged us from the navy in the summer of '46. And I went through the discharge process at Long Beach Naval Station and then . . .

TRELEVEN: Could you have chosen to pursue anything so that you would get a commission had you wanted to?

HALDEMAN: Well, as it turned out, yes, and I did. You could go off to college wherever you wanted to go and you could join the naval ROTC unit in your college, which was by then back to being what it traditionally had been and is, which is a civilian unit that was a reserve training unit. And so I did. I just joined the NROTC at UCLA when I went to UCLA, and I started UCLA in the fall of '46.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Did you get GI Bill benefits?

HALDEMAN: Yes. Which was really ironic.

TRELEVEN: Wow!

HALDEMAN: Really ironic, because I had spent my whole two years of active duty in the navy in college with all of that college paid for by the navy. But it was determined that we qualified for the GI Bill, so we got our tuition and our, what was it, \$110 a month in veterans' benefit.

TRELEVEN: That was a lot of money at that time.

HALDEMAN: It sure was. To pay for your room and board and all that. But they paid for tuition and books, plus I think it was \$110 a month. A lot more than I was getting in the navy.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

HALDEMAN: But that was to cover my room and board in college, which the navy, of course, had taken care of while I was in the navy.

TRELEVEN: Why UCLA?

HALDEMAN: I'm not exactly sure. When I was still at Harvard I took the equivalent at that time of the SAT [Scholastic Aptitude Test]. There was some kind of exam you took in a general sense for college, and I also took the Stanford entrance examination. I passed Stanford and was admitted to Stanford, or qualified for admission to

Stanford, and then didn't go in because I went into the navy. And also was admitted to the University of California. And I think it was at UCLA that I had probably applied, you know, at the same time I applied to Stanford. I think I probably applied to UCLA as my southern California alternative if I didn't get into Stanford. By the time I got out of the 'SC unit, I had met the girl who was later to become my wife, and she was on her way to UCLA. I think part of it was to get the two of us in the same school together. Part of it was to stay in the Los Angeles area, and I would be able to live at home. My parents lived in Westwood by that time. They had moved from Beverly Hills to Westwood. I had been away for those two years and under the pressures of the navy college program, so I think that was basically the reason for UCLA. I'm not really sure. But because I had selected UCLA when I was at Redlands and wanting to get out also. I think it was to get closer to home and that sort of thing.

TRELEVEN: And I suppose . . .

HALDEMAN: I knew it was a good school.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Well, you've mentioned your wife-to-be and who remains your wife, and we might as well enter her name right here.

HALDEMAN: Jo. Joanne is her full name, but she has always gone by Jo.

TRELEVEN: And maiden name is?

HALDEMAN: Horton. Joanne Horton.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: She too came from a longtime Los Angeles family. Her paternal grandfather was a prominent lawyer in Los Angeles. Her father [Joseph K. Horton] is also a lawyer. Her paternal great grandfather was a surgeon in Los Angeles, and when he arrived in Los Angeles whenever it was-- but it was long before my family came, before the turn of the century--when he arrived in Los Angeles, the day or the evening that he got to town he was visited by three men who informed him that they were the surgeons practicing in Los Angeles, that there was not at that time and would never be room for a fourth surgeon in Los Angeles, and would he please move on to San Francisco or someplace else. And he said no, he opted to stay in Los Angeles. So he was really

early on in the practice of medicine in the city of Los Angeles, which wasn't much of a city.

TRELEVEN: So, UCLA, you've got a girlfriend to keep some of your interest, but what did you set out to do at UCLA? What was your goal?

HALDEMAN: My goal at UCLA was to get the benefit of what I had always heard about was the great opportunity and enjoyment of college life that I hadn't had when I was taking twenty-four units and marching to meals and totally regimented through the first. . . . Although it only occupied two calendar years, it was three full years of college, because I did two full summer sessions.

TRELEVEN: What later became called I guess a trimester.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, right. But I had done more college. . . . I had more college credits than I had college actual calendar years. So I figured I don't have a lot to do to graduate. I had gotten pretty much, it wasn't a 4.0, but I was a 3.8 or a 3.9 average or something all through the navy time. I had a very good academic standing, so I decided I had missed all the fun. I was now going to have some of the fun and activity of college, and I went into that with a vengeance, which resulted

in I joined a fraternity at UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Which one?

HALDEMAN: Beta Theta Pi.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: And dedicated myself to fraternity life and extracurricular campus activity and went to class only when absolutely necessary and often not even then. And my academic record at UCLA was abysmal. I maintained an adequate grade point average, and, fortunately, in those days they carried forward. . . . They transferred your credits. I think now the University of California I think simply transfers credits just as in effect a C average. In other words, your credits are transferred as completed courses, but your grade point average doesn't transfer with you, I don't think anymore.

TRELEVEN: No, I think that's right.

HALDEMAN: But in those days it did, so I could transfer three years in effect. And it was a lot more units. I had enough units to graduate. I had my 120 units and then some at the time I came to UCLA, but they weren't. . . . I didn't have the required course balance and all. And I didn't

want to graduate. I was only nineteen years old at that time. So I got in there and, as I said, I got into a lot of things. The fraternity required that you participate in some sort of activity as a pledge, and so I became the All-U-Sing chairman at UCLA. At that time that was a program they put on a full, like, two-hour variety show in Royce Hall once a month, and it was usually mixed student and outside professional talent. You could usually get the professional talent donated as a campus appearance-type thing. And we put on student singers and bands and . . .

TRELEVEN: Big productions.

HALDEMAN: Big productions. We had full. . . . One of my fraternity brothers was Jimmy Higson, who was the leader of the Starlighters Band on the Hoagy Carmichael radio show, and Jimmy assembled a Starlighters Band. We had a full-on stage band, orchestra, probably twenty, twenty-five pieces and comedians and singers and the whole thing.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Let's pause for a minute.

[Interruption]

Okay, we're back on, and you were involved with

what's it called? You All Sing?

HALDEMAN: Oh, All-U-Sing. At that time Gaylord Carter. . . . The reason it was called All-U-Sing is that Gaylord Carter, the great organist, was the resident organist on the Royce Hall organ. And the inception of this All-U-Sing was that they would gather the university community for a community sing. Carter would play the organ, and everybody would sing along, sing along with Gaylord Carter type stuff. He performed his thing, but the show had become much more sophisticated and expanded into quite a lavish production. The biggest accomplishment of that is we put on one show that was almost all professional, and we had the Esquire magazine all-star jazz band of the year. We assembled all of them, which was "Bix" Beiderbecke and all kinds of greats, and put on an incredible show. And the vocalist for the show was Peggy Lee.

TRELEVEN: Oh my gosh.

HALDEMAN: And it was really something. We had a lot of fun. So I was involved in that.

TRELEVEN: Was this a fund-raiser then?

HALDEMAN: No. I think we charged something for it like a

dollar and a half or something.

TRELEVEN: You tried to break even.

HALDEMAN: But it was just to cover the staging expenses and all that, and we didn't pay the talent. I don't think we ever paid.

TRELEVEN: Was this a fraternity function or an associated students function?

HALDEMAN: No, ASUCLA [Associated Students, UCLA].

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: All-U-Sing chairman was a specific role in the ASUCLA, and the job was to put on this monthly show.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: And we did. And out of that activity I got onto the music and service board, which was one of the ASUCLA boards, and the theater activities board. And I became homecoming chairman. I was homecoming chairman for the '47 homecoming. That was the last big bonfire homecoming, I think, until now they've resumed the bonfire I guess, or they did at some point.

TRELEVEN: I don't think there was one last year.

HALDEMAN: I think there was one some fairly recent year. They had a bonfire and then maybe they dropped it

again. But anyhow, at that time we had the big float parade and then the bonfire out on the athletic field.

TRELEVEN: Float parade through Westwood.

HALDEMAN: Float parade through Westwood, right. It was a very big, high visibility-type thing. That was a big activity, and I got somewhat involved in campus politics. I had a little bit at Redlands also, because my roommate. . . . We were berthed by the navy in alphabetical order, and one of my roommates was a guy named Bob Hamill.

TRELEVEN: At Redlands?

HALDEMAN: At Redlands. And Bob had decided to run for student body president, and I managed his campaign for student body president just because I was his roommate, and he said, "Would you do it?"

TRELEVEN: You could be a V-12er and run for student body president?

HALDEMAN: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, you could, and he did and he won. So that was one little flurry in campus politics. One of my other roommates was a guy named Lyman

Hamilton. Haldeman, Hamill, and Hamilton.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, right.

HALDEMAN: He had gone to college in the east before he had gone into the navy. He was a little older than I was and had been to college a couple of years and was an avid political interest-type guy. He and I used to have great arguments, my argument being, what's the use of wasting time being interested in politics? You can't do anything about it. And his argument was if everybody took that view, things would be. . . . He was a very highly motivated, sincere guy, interested in political stuff, so some of that rubbed off I think, some of Lyman Hamilton's things. He later became chairman of the board of IT and T [International Telephone and Telegraph] and was. . . . Is that right? It was a huge conglomerate. I think it was IT and T. But anyway, it's kind of interesting where people end up.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. But at UCLA . . .

HALDEMAN: Whatever he was chairman of the board of was one huge conglomerate at the same time that I was chief of staff at the White House. And Bob Hamill was a very small businessman. I forget

where he ended up, but pretty obscure. But he was the student body president at Redlands.

TRELEVEN: I think you got into that, going back to Redlands, by saying you dabbled somewhat in politics at UCLA.

HALDEMAN: Because of the homecoming chairman job I had acquired some visibility on campus, because of those things. And I was on the elections board. I guess I just volunteered for it, I don't know why, but that was another ASUCLA thing. As a result a gal named Jane Wilder asked me to manage her campaign for rep [representative] at large, which was a major post in the student government thing at that time. And she was an independent, a "non-org," and she wanted a fraternity person, because they needed. . . . The fraternity vote, the fraternity-sorority vote was sort of the controlling vote in those days. So she wanted a fraternity person, so she asked me to manage her campaign, and I felt it would be great to get into campus politics, be kind of fun, so I would do it. Well, Jane Wilder was a member. . . . She was the chairman of the SDA, which was the communist student organization on campus,

Students for Democratic Action, which was an avowed. . . . No, Youth for Democracy. Young Americans for Democracy? YAD? Now what was it? AYD, American Youth for Democracy. AYD was the official communist organization on. . . . It was an avowed communist organization. SDA was way to the left of SDS, the Students for a Democratic Society that came out in the Vietnam era, but was the Students for Democratic Action and was. . . . It wasn't communist. It was highly sympathetic. And here I am the great heir of anticommunism managing Jane Wilder's campaign, and people thought I was crazy. But anyway, Jane won, and her opponent interestingly enough was a sorority candidate from the Delta Gamma house who later became the wife of John [D.] Ehrlichman.

TRELEVEN: You're kidding.

HALDEMAN: Jeannie Ehrlichman. She was Jeannie Fisher in those days.

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: She later became vice president of the student body at UCLA. But anyhow, small world. A lot of things.

TRELEVEN: I remember that context a little bit from your

book.¹ You mentioned Clancy Sigal, who I guess was . . .

HALDEMAN: He was editor of the [Daily] Bruin.

TRELEVEN: . . . editor of the Bruin at that time. So you got to know him a bit.

HALDEMAN: Got to know him, got to know Hugo Morris, who was head of the AYD. Hugo was a card-carrying communist and was there to organize the communist function on the campus. My wife, then girlfriend, was all excited one day and told me she was going to join AYD. And I said, "Why?" And she said, "Because they have such a nice badge. This badge, it shows a white girl and a black man and an Oriental man or something." She said, "I think that's a very worthy kind of cause and I think I'll join." I tried to explain to her--I did explain to her and she didn't join--that it was not exactly what it seemed. But anyhow, whatever, I got involved in campus politics as a result of all that, and that was about as deep as I got. I actually toyed with

1. Haldeman, Harry R. The Ends of Power. New York: Times Books, 1978.

the thought in '48, in the spring of '48, of staying on another year in school. I had already done by then two years, because I started in the fall of '46 at UCLA. So I had done '46-'47 and then '47-'48. Then I was going to graduate in '48. But I was toying with the idea of staying on another year and in the spring of '48 running for rep at large, which would put me on the student council in the '48-'49 year. And then I would stay on and do that, it would be fun. At that point fun was the important thing. But by an ironic twist, Jane Wilder, the girl who I had managed her campaign for rep at large and got her elected rep at large, did an ASUCLA constitutional. . . . She headed a constitutional revision committee, and they revised the constitution, and one of the provisions in the new constitution was that the homecoming chairman could not run for campus office in the following semester, because he had achieved unfair visibility as homecoming chairman. And this was passed before I was homecoming chairman. I didn't know it was in the constitution, but it was what Jane Wilder wrote and put in the

constitution. Well, she testified to the student legislative board or whatever it was that the intent was not to prohibit him from holding office in the next year, it was to prohibit him from moving right as homecoming chairman into an office, and that I was therefore eligible. But the legislative board ruled that I wasn't, so I couldn't run, so I didn't, and I went ahead and graduated in '48.

TRELEVEN: Am I recalling correctly from your book that you were also involved in, was it, rally activity, rally committee?

HALDEMAN: No. I listed that stuff in my . . .

TRELEVEN: No, I meant at UCLA.

HALDEMAN: I was. . . . Yeah, I've got a thing where I listed all that stuff, that I did some research on it. I was a member of Beta Theta Pi, Pi Delta Epsilon, which is a journalism honorary. The way I got onto that was that I was the business manager of Southern Campus one year, or the advertising manager of Southern Campus one year. I belonged to the order of the Golden Bruin, which was a supposedly secret organization then and I think. . . . I don't know if it still

even exists, but it was a thing [Robert Gordon] Bob Sproul set up as a secret student organization to personally advise the president of the university on student university matters. And it had a secret initiation, candlelit march, candlelit march, we met at the Founders' Rock one night, and we were blindfolded and went through all this. It was worse than the Beta initiation. And I always wondered about that, that wasn't there something subversive about the president of the university having a secret organization, a cabal of students under the Order of the Golden Bruin?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, going way back into the twenties something called Thanic Shield.

HALDEMAN: Really? I'll be darned.

TRELEVEN: Going way back to the Vermont campus which several people we've interviewed for another project . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . belonged to that?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. And it was like a group of student leaders who would advise Ernest Carroll Moore, presumably advise him. I don't know if it was sort of a way of Moore finding out really what was going on on

campus or what the situation was.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, I never quite figured out what Golden Bruin meant. All of this happened so fast. I mean, I wasn't really there for the full four years, so I sort of hypered it. I belonged to Gold Key, which was sort of a rally type of thing.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: I was president of Scabbard and Blade at 'SC. That was a national military honorary fraternity.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: And I was on the [University] Religious Conference board at UCLA. I was president of the Christian Science organization at USC. I was on the California Club council, which was the known intercampus organization that the president sponsored, and Cal Club was not a secret thing at all. People knew you belonged to it, and it was an honor to belong, and all that. We used to have Cal Club conventions at the various campuses, and Bob Sproul would be there, and we'd sing, "Here's to old Bob Sproul, he's a jolly good soul," or something, and all that stuff. But anyhow. Oh yeah, I was on the executive committee of the Trojan band when I played in

it. Because after being in the Trojan marching band I stayed on and played in the Trojan concert band, because by then I'd become an accomplished percussionist [Laughter] and learned how to read cymbal music. I was on the music and service board, the theater activities board, the elections board, advertising manager of Southern Campus, All-U-Sing chairman, and homecoming chairman. Those were all the things. I was not. . . . I was trying to think what rally thing it would have been.

TRELEVEN: Well, I maybe mis . . .

HALDEMAN: I don't think I was.

TRELEVEN: My memory may be faulty there. So you did have fun. You attended the athletic contests.

HALDEMAN: I had a lot of fun, very active in the fraternity stuff and campus activities. I quite in fairly short order got put on probation, academic probation, and then I petitioned for credits in my courses that I hadn't attended and got credits in some and didn't get them in others and all that kind of stuff. By the spring of '48 I was on subject to dismissal status, had graduated from probation to subject to dismissal status.

So given all of those things, I had all of these petitions that I had to put in to get all the necessary credits and get all the paperwork wrapped up to graduate, and instead I filed a petition that all petitions be granted and I be granted permission to graduate or whatever it was, something like that. And somehow that petition was granted. I think they decided they better get me out of there. So anyway, I was given permission to graduate. The irony of it was I was still on subject to dismissal status when I graduated, because they never lifted that. But for some reason within the naval ROTC unit, and the graduation also coincided with our commissioning in the navy, the commander of the graduating unit was automatically the person who had the highest grade point average in the unit. And it turned out to be me, because of my record at Redlands and 'SC. So I was the commanding officer of the graduating unit of the naval ROTC and I marched the unit in at commencement. They had the academic procession and then they had the military group come in as a separate unit. And I was commissioned an ensign

in the navy by [General] Omar [N.] Bradley, who was the commencement speaker at our commencement. And so that was the end of my career at UCLA.

TRELEVEN: So it turned out that you did not have the option to continue at UCLA?

HALDEMAN: Oh yeah, I could have.

TRELEVEN: Had you wanted to you could have?

HALDEMAN: I think I could have. I think I could have gotten through the. . . . I petitioned to graduate instead of petitioning to lift the dismissal status. I tried to end run it and succeeded. No, I could have continued.

TRELEVEN: Maybe it's a frivolous question to ask. Are there any professors at UCLA who made any kind of mark on you?

HALDEMAN: It's not a. . . . I'm ashamed to say that it's a very valid question, but the answer is fairly frivolous, which is no, there weren't. I was taking classes at UCLA as a necessary concomitant to my being on campus, being involved on the campus. I didn't attend classes very regularly, and I basically was taking courses that I needed to take for the proper balance of credits, you

know the stuff that you had to have. And I don't even remember the courses I took at UCLA, let alone the professors.

TRELEVEN: Or who taught them.

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: But you got to know [William C.] Bill Ackerman I suppose a bit.

HALDEMAN: I got to know Bill Ackerman very well and, oh, the people at the alumni office, and Jack Morrison, who was the director of the theater arts activities.

TRELEVEN: You still see him on campus.

HALDEMAN: And Klain [James M. Klain]? The guy that was the manager. Oh gosh, I shouldn't try to remember names, because if I forget them it's going to bother me. The guy that managed Royce Hall. I got to know him very well, because we put all those shows on in Royce Hall. And I think he's still there. The last I knew, he was still there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: And all those guys, Stan Troutman and all the old-timers, Johnny Johnson.

TRELEVEN: [John B.] Jackson.

HALDEMAN: Johnny Jackson, I mean, who was the alumni secretary.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: And lots of those people.

TRELEVEN: So you came in contact with those people because of your . . .

HALDEMAN: Right, all the campus activities.

TRELEVEN: . . . involvement in student government and so on.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: All right. You're an ensign. What happened?

HALDEMAN: Ensign in the navy, but I'm on inactive duty in the reserve. No requirements. See, I was a civilian all through UCLA. I was in the ROTC, but as a civilian.

TRELEVEN: But what happened . . . ?

HALDEMAN: I was commissioned in the navy, but in the navy reserve, and was on inactive duty.

TRELEVEN: Okay, what happened after Korea [Korean conflict]?

HALDEMAN: Well, there was another ironic thing. Most of the people that I was in V-12 with were called back to active duty in Korea. I wasn't, and I don't know why. But through some technicality,

although they considered us World War II veterans for the GI Bill, they did not consider us World War II veterans for the Korea recall, so we were not immune from the Korea recall. But I was never recalled. A lot of my compatriots were. I did not go into Korea. I was still in the naval reserve at the time, but was never called up, maybe because I was in the reserve.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So I guess what does that mean? You have to go out and get a job?

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: The first thing I've seen in terms of your bio information is J. Walter Thompson in New York, but is that accurate?

HALDEMAN: Well, that was the first full-time job. That's why it shows as that. The summer of '48 I worked for Foote, Cone, and Belding in Los Angeles as a market research interviewer, and I went around doing consumer surveys. I also, because they didn't always have something going, also worked for Ford Sammis, who was a marketing consultant who also did surveys, and I did survey work for him too. And that's what I did through that summer and fall. Then we decided to get married,

and we were married in February of '49. And I had decided I wanted to get into the advertising agency business, because I didn't know what business I did want to get into. That was my father's frustration, I could never decide what I wanted to do. So his advice was, if you can't decide, go into something like law or accounting or advertising that services a wide range of businesses and you'll get exposure to a wide range. Either law or accounting required more school, and at that point I had had enough school. So I figured I could go into advertising, and so I just sort of backed into advertising as a career.

TRELEVEN: So your interest wasn't piqued by the kind of interviewing market research you'd been doing?

HALDEMAN: No, no. It wasn't. I was doing that because I knew I was aiming to get into advertising, but in those days it was very hard to get a job in advertising. And most immediate college graduates going into advertising went in to work for nothing for the privilege of getting a start in the business. Then eventually, if you panned out, they'd start paying you. And I ended up. . . .

We decided to get married, I decided to go into advertising, and I decided to go to New York, which was where advertising was headed, headquartered, and all that, and that was where the action was. And I was advised that that was the right place to go to start in the business. So we got married and then we got on the train and went to New York, and I spent a while pounding the pavements trying to get a job and finally did get a job with the J. Walter Thompson Company. And I started in the market research area there working on their consumer panel market research project. And that was the start of twenty years with J. Walter Thompson. I just banged my way up from there within the company.

TRELEVEN: Well, just elaborate a little more on what you did, because I don't know that much about what an advertising agency does.

HALDEMAN: With Thompson?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, but I don't care so much about Thompson as what you were doing personally.

HALDEMAN: What I did, okay. Well, Thompson was and is--it was then and was for a long time before that and after that, although no longer--the largest

advertising agency in the world. It's an international agency with offices all over the world, headquartered in New York. And I started in the New York office. In order to get a job I had done some research on. . . . They had a unique consumer marketing tool, which was this consumer panel where people kept a record of their purchases and various product categories, and then we tabulated them and did repeat buying analysis and all that kind of stuff.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I see.

HALDEMAN: And so I did some research on the consumer panel and I went to the guy that headed the consumer panel at Thompson and said, "I've come to New York to get a job at J. Walter Thompson in the consumer panel, because I think it's the most interesting market research thing, and I have experience in market research doing survey work in L.A." And that interested Jack Forshe, who was the head of the panel, enough that he got me hired even though they weren't basically hiring people in start-up positions, except you went into the mail room and you didn't get paid. And I went into the consumer panel as a market

analyst theoretically, but what I did was run a comptometer counting up the reports on these consumer purchase records. And I got paid thirty-five dollars a week and worked a solid forty hours. And then I worked. . . . My wife got a job in a toy store up in Hartsdale, so I worked in the toy store on the weekends and she got about eighty cents an hour and I got about eighty cents an hour at the toy store, so putting it all together we managed to survive, and I'm not quite sure how. I spent a year on the consumer panel. I started angling towards the end of that year to getting transferred to the West Coast, because I wanted to come home, and my wife very much wanted to come home.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, one season of winters back there will do that for you.

HALDEMAN: Right. Plus then the distance was a real distance, and we didn't have the money to fly back and forth or telephone back and forth and all that. Our kids now are all over the country and it doesn't seem to matter much, but then it did. So I got a chance to get an assignment in the San Francisco office in the media department

as a media buyer, so I took it and moved to San Francisco.

TRELEVEN: This would have been one year later.

HALDEMAN: In 1950. And in San Francisco. . . . Geez, I've got to hit the pause again.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: I'm sorry.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're resuming. We're on Tape 2.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: You were talking about having moved back to California, San Francisco.

HALDEMAN: Okay. We moved back, spent a year in the San Francisco office of the J. Walter Thompson Company as a media buyer. I was buying newspaper and outdoor advertising space, and that's. . . . You do the media planning. You have a client, like Shell Oil Company was one of our major clients. We'd decide to run a newspaper series, and I'd do the buying, I'd do the analysis of the papers, the coverage to provide the areas that they wanted coverage, set up a list of papers, and then actually buy the space through a

newspaper rep, place the contracts, and all that. The same with outdoor billboards. I was the newspaper and outdoor buyer in the San Francisco office media department for a year. And all that time I was angling to get back down to L.A., which was where both my wife and I wanted to be. And in a year I got transferred to the Los Angeles office as sort of an administrative assistant to the manager of the office. It was somewhat a created job to give me a way back to L.A. by the company, but also was a functional position, sort of learning the overall range of the business by working as an aide to the office manager in L.A. And then over time in L.A. starting in '51, I fairly soon became a junior account executive and then account executive with specific accounts that were my own responsibility to handle, and I handled a number of accounts. I had one that was. . . . We were especially successful in getting the western region business of Boyle-Midway, which was a division of American Home Products. It was the household products division of American Home Products, which is a huge international

corporation. And as a result of our performance on Boyle-Midway, I got the chance to make a presentation for the national business of some of the household product lines and did, and we got the account, and I went back to the New York office in 1958 as the account supervisor on that group of accounts, the product lines that we had picked up out of the Boyle-Midway national business. And that took me back to New York.

In the L.A. time one of the interesting facets of my time there--it sort of sprung out of those, in a way, the All-U-Sings at UCLA--I handled this Boyle-Midway account, and for Boyle-Midway we sponsored a television show, a local television show called "I Search For Adventure" with a guy named Jack Douglas. It became an enormously popular show, and it became a real coup in television buying, because we were getting . . .

TRELEVEN: This is when television was just beginning and coming on strong.

HALDEMAN: Television is just starting. And yeah, because it's in the early fifties. And a lot of television was local. We were still all black

and white, there was no color, and we were still There was no network as we have now. There was the microwave relay, and we could get stuff microwaved out and they'd film delay it, because there was no videotape.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: And then we'd either run the programs off film or we'd run them off the microwave, and we did get some live programming from the east out here. I bought this show "I Search For Adventure," which was a local show. It was a one-hour, weekly show where Jack Douglas was the host, and he brought in people who had had interesting adventures and had taken movies of them, like shooting down a river rapids, or he had Sir Edmund Hillary on the Everest climb and things like that. He would get the person in and they'd run the guys' movies and Jack would interview the guy like we're doing now and get them to describe, and he'd ask questions and get them to tell what they were seeing in the movie. It was a fascinating program, in that time especially. National Geo[graphic specials] has of course topped all that stuff in spades by now.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, but this was locally produced in L.A.?

HALDEMAN: This was locally produced in L.A. It was run as a local station--local program. But it was filmed and syndicated so that they did then sell the films to other cities, which was the way you did that kind of stuff then. You didn't put it on a network and run it simultaneously.

TRELEVEN: So it's the whole film including the advertising?

HALDEMAN: Right. No, no, they'd film just the show and then there'd be breaks for advertising. We put advertising breaks in, but the show was done live here. And then they filmed that show here and then the syndication would not have the advertising in it, although we ran it in--I handled the whole western region--we ran it in western region markets, so we syndicated it in effect for the west. But then Jack Douglas syndicated out to the eastern part of the United States, and other sponsors would come in.

TRELEVEN: I'm missing something here.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: How did you make the money for the agency? I mean, where . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Okay, the agency makes their money as a 15

percent commission on the expenditure. The expenditure by the client is for the commercials in the program. It's an hour program, and there are commercial breaks, and we run our products' commercials in those commercial breaks. We pay the station for the commercial time. The agency, in those days, the agency. . . . There was no good television, and the stations didn't have the wherewithal to do it, so the agencies were in effect producing shows that . . .

TRELEVEN: Oh okay, I see.

HALDEMAN: Now in this Jack was an independent producer. Douglas produced the show and sold it to us. We then contracted with KTLA [TV] to put it on the local station and with other places to put it on their local stations. And we paid for the time and put our commercials in it. We meaning our client paid for the time, and we got a 15 percent commission on what the client paid.

TRELEVEN: Okay, got it.

HALDEMAN: So that's how the agency got paid.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

HALDEMAN: It was very successful, we made good money, and it was a very successful advertising medium,

because it got a big audience and a very loyal, enthusiastic audience. So that gave me a taste of television in the early days, and I got intrigued with that.

I had another account called the California Lima Bean Advisory Board, which was the California Agricultural Association of the state marketing act that assessed the lima bean growers a promotional fee on a basis of how many bags of limas they produced that was used to promote the consumption of lima beans. We had at the same time in the Thompson Company, out of the Chicago office, handled the Kraft [Foods Company] account and we did a spectacular program out of there called "Kraft Television Theater," which was a live dramatic show, outstanding television.

TRELEVEN: I remember it.

HALDEMAN: On "Kraft Television Theater" we did live food preparation commercials where a Julia Childs type came on and said, "Now tonight we're going to make Kraft Cheese Whiz sandwiches with tuna." And then she'd prepare the thing, and the camera would be watching. We were doing this live on the air, and she had the things preprepared at

the various stages so we could cut from spreading the butter on the bread to taking the bread out of the toaster to having the cheese and the tuna on it going into the oven and then pulling that out and showing this delicious tuna cheese thing-- whatever it was that we had whipped up. Well, that was so successful, and it was great creativity in television and it got a lot of big, good press, because the commercials were marvelous. Ed Herlihy, he did the voiceover on them. He had a marvelous voice, and it was just. . . . The whole thing was very good television in those days. So we decided to do the same thing for the Lima Bean Board. So we bought a show that Klaus Landsburg at KCOP was producing as a local live show called "Western Varieties." It was a terrible program, but it had an enormous audience. It was sort of a country-western Ed Sullivan show where you never knew what was going to happen, but he'd get all these acts on, you know, one act after another, like a western vaudeville show. We had Doyle O'Dell and Eddie Cletro and his band. The one that became a big star out of it was Jimmy Dean who is the big Jimmy Dean sausages and

everything now.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: Well, he was the boy singer on the show. We had the Wy-Knot Twirlers, that was a square dance group. And Sherry, what's her name? She's famous. Sherry Lewis, ventriloquist. She became big-time later too. But Klaus Landsburg was a madman who produced this show live and he didn't know what was going to happen on the show either. I mean, we'd say start at eight o'clock, and all this hell would break loose for an hour and then that would be the end of the show.

TRELEVEN: Sounds wonderful. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: And we did our live commercials in the middle of it the same way as the Kraft commercials, but we did lima bean dishes.

TRELEVEN: Lima bean dishes.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. And so that was. . . . I was reminiscing. I was over on the Fox [lot] set, which used to be the old KCOP set where we used to do the show, and we were talking with one of the old-timers there who remembered Klaus Landsburg and what we had done, "Western Varieties," and who was a good friend of Doyle O'Dell's, who is still around and alive as a

western singer. But anyhow, those were sort of the highlights of those years. And then I ended up back in the New York office handling the national account for several years and got into the political thing through that, and you know we can pick up that from there.

TRELEVEN: Let me sort of . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . segment that?

TRELEVEN: Well, since you're in L.A. in '52 and I think again if my memory serves me right according to your book you got interested in Richard Nixon in '52 when he was the vice . . .

HALDEMAN: I really got interested back when I was in New York and the [Alger] Hiss case was going on, and we were all caught up in that.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: I was intrigued with him from that and from my family's anticommunist. . . . Do you want to move into the Nixon thing? Is that what you're saying, or do you want to put it aside?

TRELEVEN: Well, since . . .

HALDEMAN: Take whatever order you want.

TRELEVEN: I was thinking since your interest or since your involvement in a Nixon campaign, if I remember

your book correctly, came in '52, before we shove you on to New York in '58 that . . .

HALDEMAN: Okay, in '52 I . . .

TRELEVEN: But can I back up just once more?

HALDEMAN: Sure.

TRELEVEN: Were you aware of or were you enough politically aware earlier in '46 to be aware of the Nixon campaign against [Horace Jeremiah] Jerry Voorhis and a little later the Helen Gahagan Douglas campaign, where there . . . ?

HALDEMAN: To a minor degree, and I can't honestly tell you now how aware I was then or how much my awareness is hindsight from being so much aware of it in later years.

TRELEVEN: Having read a lot.

HALDEMAN: I was aware of Richard Nixon. I don't know that I was aware of the elements of the campaigns of Voorhis. I'm sure I was with Douglas, because that was a statewide campaign, and was I a voter then? Douglas was '48?

TRELEVEN: 'Forty-eight, yeah.

HALDEMAN: So I was a voter. I voted in the '48 election, and that was my first presidential election. I was a strong [Thomas E.] Deweyite and my roommate at the

Beta house at the time was a very strong [Harry S] Trumanite. We had sort of some political debates at that time, and there was an interest in the election. I was of college age and interested in a little more of the world at that point. I wasn't actively involved at all in any of it. But in '52, I have been now at Thompson in New York for a year, Thompson in San Francisco for a year, and now I'm back in L.A., and Nixon is going to run for vice president or is running for vice president under [Dwight D.] Eisenhower. And the Nixon-Checkers thing, the Nixon fund came up, the big scandal that Nixon had accepted an \$18,000 fund and was clearly a corrupt politician having been bought off for \$18,000. So there was a big stir about that and a demand that he get off the ticket and all that sort of thing. And he flew out to L.A. to make his nationally televised address, which became the Checkers speech.¹ And I got intrigued with that

1. Nixon's speech of September 23, 1952, in which he addressed allegations of financial impropriety, solicited public support, introduced the family dog, Checkers, as having been given to his children by a supporter, and declared his intention to keep the beloved Checkers, regardless of possible impropriety.

whole thing just as. . . . I had been interested in Nixon because of the Hiss case and I had followed some of the Hiss case from the outside. It was sort of. . . . It was fairly big stuff in New York especially because the trial was going on there or something. I forget what was happening at that time, but something while I was in New York was in the big news on the Hiss case.

TRELEVEN: It might have been the typewriter.

HALDEMAN: Whatever it was. I don't remember what phase of it it was, but I remember that it was big stuff, and we talked about it at the office and stuff like that. So I was interested in this guy Nixon who was the congressman who was, you know, over undoing this and all. Now wait, something's wrong here. 'Forty-eight? Yeah, well, it was '46, '47, '48, '49 when I went to New York. So it was in the '50 period that the Hiss case was coming up, but he didn't run. . . . He was a senator then. Something wrong. Well, anyway, the interest was there. I had followed the Hiss case during the early pumpkin papers stuff and all that and gotten interested in all of it when

he was a congressman. Then when I was in New York he must have been a senator, because that was in 1950. It was '49 and '50, well, he became a senator in '50, so he was still a congressman when I was in New York. He became a senator in '48.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, because . . .

HALDEMAN: He became a congressman in '46 and a senator in '48 I think. Well, whatever it was . . .

TRELEVEN: We've got the records to . . .

HALDEMAN: Yeah, you can check that out. I had the interest anyway in the guy, and then '52 came along and he's going to run, and then the fund case and all intrigued me. I decided I should. . . . Well, a little background. J. Walter. . . . Advertising agencies, some of them are used in political campaigns. Political campaigns use advertising agencies. J. Walter Thompson Company would not take a political account, because they believed that it would not be right to divert their staff and attention for a short-term, intensive period away from their ongoing clients' business to the hullabaloo of a campaign. They didn't want to staff up for a campaign, because it wouldn't be

Thompson people and Thompson level of service. And they were concerned about the diversion of personnel to a campaign that they didn't believe in, and they didn't want to put people in that kind of a position. So they had a company policy that they would not as an agency handle a political campaign. Their counter to that however was that they encouraged their personnel to work in political campaigns and they gave them leaves of absences to enable them to do so. But they had to take a leave of absence and go out and work as an individual and not as J. Walter Thompson Company, but they could take their talents to the campaigns. And they encouraged their doing that as a public service. So I liked that idea.

TRELEVEN: Pro bono work.

HALDEMAN: Pro bono, exactly. I liked the idea and I was intrigued with his problem and everything, so I decided to try and volunteer for the campaign. So I wrote a letter volunteering and outlining my background and my bonafides as an anticommunist because my grandfather was in the Better America Federation and my parents were friends of the

Chandlers. You know, I pulled all the strings I could.

TRELEVEN: Let me interject one question here. Where were you philosophically at that time? Let's say [Robert M.] Taft compared to Eisenhower, because those did represent the wings of the national Republican party as I recall.

HALDEMAN: They did. In retrospect I would say I had obviously become a somewhat practical politician by that time. I think probably philosophically I know my mother and father were for Taft. They were for [Douglas] MacArthur and they were very much on the conservative side of the Republican party. I was strongly pro-Eisenhower, and it was because I believed Eisenhower could win as a Republican and that Taft wouldn't win as a Republican. And so it was not. . . . Ideologically, I was probably more pro-Taft than pro-Eisenhower, but maybe not. I may have because of the association with Jane Wilder and Hugo Morris and my friends at UCLA and all, maybe I had changed that viewpoint some.

TRELEVEN: It sounds like pragmatically you were strongly pro-Eisenhower.

HALDEMAN: I think it was more pragmatically, but I was pro-Eisenhower before he got the nomination and then very definitely afterwards, because I was certainly pro-Republican and I've always been pro-Republican. And okay, so . . .

TRELEVEN: Right, that answers my question. And before I interjected that, you were talking about having communicated with Richard Nixon.

HALDEMAN: Well, I wrote this letter to communicate and then I decided that instead of just sending a letter in that will get lost somewhere, I will. . . . I read in the paper that he was going to go to the El Capitan Theater in Hollywood to do his TV speech. He was staying at the Ambassador and he was going to go over to the El Capitan and do this nationwide address. So I went over to the El Capitan long before the time the address was supposed to be and got in the driveway out there where the car would have to go in, hoping that I would be able to stop him on his way into the studio and say I'd like to work on the campaign.

TRELEVEN: My god, it sounds dangerous. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: Well, it turned out to be not. . . . It wasn't dangerous, but it was impossible. The car shot

by, you know, and he was in and locked up, and I had no chance at all. So I finally somehow got to Murray [M.] Chotiner, who was his campaign manager and was there, and I handed the letter to Murray and said, "I'm an advertising man here in Los Angeles and I'd like to volunteer to work in the campaign, and this is my letter and all that. Could you get it to Mr. Nixon?" And he said sure and took the thing. Well, a few weeks later I heard back from [Congressman Glenard P.] Glen Lipscomb, who was a congressman from Glendale who was one of the senior. . . . Had volunteered to work in the Nixon campaign and was working in the Nixon campaign in the office in New York or Washington or wherever the office was, Washington I guess. I got a letter from Lipscomb that was sort of form letter that said, "Thank you for volunteering for the campaign. We appreciate your interest and we would suggest you get in touch with the local Republican headquarters and see if you can work something out." Well, that wasn't what I had in mind at all, so I just dropped the whole thing, and that was the end of it. I did nothing in the '52

campaign except to vote.

TRELEVEN: Oh. So you weren't really involved in, what, [Los Angeles] County Republican party activities or anything like that?

HALDEMAN: Not at all. Not at all. I was a member. I joined during my years in the fifties at J. Walter Thompson. From '52 to '58 I was in the L.A. office and I got involved in some local activities in L.A. I joined things like the World Affairs Council and a group called Republican Associates, which was a businessmen's Republican organization as much--Junior Chamber of Commerce and stuff like that--as much or more for the contacts than for the substance of the organization.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: But I had no political activism during that time in the fifties at all. And then when '56 came around and Nixon was vice president and was running for reelection I got interested again. The convention was to be in San Francisco, and my family had a friend who was the coordinator of all the entertainment activities at the convention, so I got a job through her as a

driver at the convention just to be able to go to the convention. And I again re-volunteered . . .

TRELEVEN: I thought you were going to say you got out your accordion. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: No. [Laughter] Re-volunteered in the Nixon thing, but at that point I worked my way in through his vice presidential office, because his office manager was a girl named Loie Gaunt who had been the office manager of Dean [Earl J.] Miller's office at UCLA when he was dean of students. We had had a big. . . . Her brother [Roy Gaunt] was a fraternity brother. He was a Beta in the Beta house at that time, and Loie was in the dean's office. And we had a big fracas. I don't know if you remember, but there was a big to-do about the Beta dog case which was our chapter of the Beta Theta Pi, and it was a totally irrelevant thing, but I got involved in trying to work on resolving the problems with that and was meeting with the dean's office. And Loie was helping us because her brother was in the house and all that.

TRELEVEN: I see.

HALDEMAN: So I got to know Loie through that. And so now

we're into '56, and Loie is Nixon's office manager, not his secretary. Rose Woods was his secretary and Loie was the manager of the office. So I wrote to Loie and I said I had volunteered in '52 and it didn't work out. "I'd like to re-volunteer but I'd like to do it in a way that would get. . . . I want to work in the national campaign for the candidate. I don't want to work in the local headquarters here. And if I can, I can get a. . . . If I can get the position, I can get a leave of absence from the company and I think I can be of some use to you in the campaign." Well, she brought it to Nixon's attention, he referred it to Ray Arbuthnot, who was one of his old advance men out here, and said, "Talk to this guy and see if he's got any potential as an advance man." Ray talked to me, decided I did, decided I should be an advance man. In the meantime I had signed on as a driver at the convention, so I was going to be there. So Ray said, "This would be. . . . You can meet Nixon then and we'll finalize it." So I did and that's how I became an advance man in the '56 campaign. And that's what I was. I took a

three-month leave of absence to do that and then went back to Thompson after the election.

TRELEVEN: Okay, when you take a leave of absence, that's unpaid?

HALDEMAN: I forget. Originally, they were paid leaves of absence, because a corporation was permitted to make a political contribution and Thompson was willing to make the contribution. Later, it couldn't be a paid leave of absence technically, so what I was given was a leave of absence without pay and then a bonus at the end of the year that compensated me for the loss of pay, more or less.

TRELEVEN: I see, right, right.

HALDEMAN: So I went on leave without pay, and I forget which campaigns were which in that sort of thing. By the time. . . . Well, I took the three-month leave in '56. I took another three-month leave in '58 to travel with Nixon as vice president when he was campaigning for senate and congressional candidates around the country and he needed some advance men then, so I went in again as an advance man, did the same kind of a job for three months then, took a leave then.

Then comes '60 when he's going to run for president and he asks me to come in as campaign tour manager, which was running all the advance men and managing the candidate tour operation, the whole . . .

TRELEVEN: Scheduling.

HALDEMAN: The whole thing: scheduling and logistics and operations and moving through the crowds and everything else. So I took a year's leave of absence in '60, pretty much a year. Well, I think it was a year. I think I left in January and didn't come back until December, because I took some time off after the election. And that was an unpaid leave of absence from the company, and I went on a campaign payroll.

TRELEVEN: That's what I was going to ask, yeah.

HALDEMAN: And at that, because that . . .

TRELEVEN: Pretty long period.

HALDEMAN: They couldn't do the other thing. And so I just was off the Thompson payroll, but still on the Thompson staff on leave and with the understanding that I would come back after the election, which I did. So I managed that. . . . I mean, I ran the tour for the '60 campaign. We lost the

election, and I went back to J. Walter Thompson Company. At that point the account. . . . I had moved to. . . . I was in the New York office in '60 and I was supervisor on the account, and obviously taking a year's leave they had to replace me as supervisor and they told me they were going to, because the client had to be handled. The three-months leave you can kind of do without anybody noticing you're gone, but the year wouldn't have worked. And the commitment by Thompson was that if I wanted to come back and if there were a suitable assignment for me I would come back with no loss of status and I maintained my profit-sharing position, stockholder position, and all that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: If I decided I didn't want to come back or if there wasn't a suitable place for me, then I wouldn't come back and I'd sever at that time. I came back, they flew me back to Los Angeles as the manager of the Los Angeles office, so I came out here in 1961 as manager of the L.A. office and was in that role until '68. Well, no, I was in that role for '61. Then Nixon moved to

California.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: And Nixon decided to run for governor of California in 1962 and asked me to manage the campaign. I went back to Thompson and took another year's leave of absence from my post as manager.

TRELEVEN: Here he is again.

HALDEMAN: Well, there was a senior guy in the L.A. office that was perfectly. . . . They didn't want to make him manager because he was too old and they wanted to build the office, but he was perfectly capable of being manager, and he agreed to stay on through that time and manage the office while I was gone, which he did. So it worked out that I was able to do it. Thompson saw the advantage: my managing a California campaign for governor was not a bad deal for them from a business viewpoint in terms of the contacts and, you know, visibility that I would acquire in that and all. So it was their own self-interest, too. So I took another year's leave of absence, managed Nixon's campaign for governor. He lost again, and I came back to Thompson and resumed my

post as manager and stayed as manager until '68 when I left the company to go into that [presidential] campaign. Actually, I was on a leave of absence. Technically, I was on a leave of absence for the '68 campaign also, but when I went to the White House the leave of absence was withdrawn. They said it was time for me to quit.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, when you get to '68 in fact after you were appointed to a seat on the [University of California] Board of Regents, I noticed there a kind of hopscotch across some of the meetings that year, so I had assumed that you must be . . .

HALDEMAN: In '68?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, '68.

HALDEMAN: I missed some meetings then.

TRELEVEN: You must have been involved in the . . .

HALDEMAN: Yep. By that time, yeah. I was an appointed regent then.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: I missed several meetings and I've got to miss this one for a minute.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

[Interruption]

Okay, we're back on. What in your mind being

close to the campaign of '62 was most responsible for [Edmund G.] Pat Brown [Sr.] winning that election?

HALDEMAN: Really, I think what is most responsible is that Nixon didn't want to be governor.

TRELEVEN: Really?

HALDEMAN: I never felt he should run for governor. I argued strongly against his running for governor. He was told by Eisenhower and by [Leonard W.] Len Hall, the chairman of the Republican party, and a lot of his other very strong supporters and well-meaning people that first of all he had a duty to the Republican party. He would be the strongest candidate that they could put out, and that he therefore had a duty to the party to run. Secondly, he had a duty to himself to run, because in order to have any political future he had to maintain a political base, and as governor of California he would have the prime or a prime political base.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: My argument against his running was pure and simple. I didn't think he would be a good governor and I knew he didn't want to be

governor, and I don't think anybody should run for and hope to get and face himself with the possibility of winning and having to hold an office that he doesn't want. He had no interest in the. . . . I should. . . . I'm overstating the point. He had little interest in the state of California per se. His interest was global and national and not state and certainly not local. It was the wrong job for Richard Nixon. I didn't feel. . . . The only reason he was running for governor was because of these other arguments, that he needed it for a political base and he owed it to the Republican party. I didn't think those were very good arguments, either one of them, so I argued against it. Right then I walked with him from the hotel room down to the press conference where he announced that he was going to run, and all the way down I kept trying to talk him out of announcing. But he had made up his mind and it was obvious he had, and he ran and he lost. And I think he should have lost. The thing that proves my point is the Freudian slip he made when he said something about, "Well, as president of California I would do such and

such" in his speech. I mean, that was not surprising to me at all.

The other side of that obviously is a Democrat has an edge in California going in because of the preponderance of Democratic registration. That doesn't hold true in terms of results. I mean, we end up electing Republicans to a far greater extent than we do Democrats on a statewide basis.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: But theoretically at least, if you could get a straightline party vote, the Democrats got it made. But traditionally, California Democrats have obviously switched on statewide offices. They vote Democrat for Congress and assembly and stuff and Republican for the state offices. Or at least some of them some of the time or a lot of the time. But also Pat Brown had a very strong following. He had been a good governor in a lot of ways and he had a pretty good case to make as a good governor. I think we had a pretty good case, which was rather crudely made on his deficiencies as governor, and we ran a negative campaign.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: But it didn't work, and Brown was reelected.

That's the general sense. The other thing is that as a political analyst, which I am something of with some credentials, I believed at the time and I think I still do, although I haven't sat back and tested my belief recently, that we had built a campaign on the Nixon style, and Nixon was running that campaign. There's no. . . . I mean, I had the title of campaign manager, but the campaign manager's job was to do what Nixon told him. He didn't call shots, he carried out. I was like I was as chief of staff: I carried out someone else's orders. I was not a policy maker and I wasn't in the campaign.

TRELEVEN: So you wouldn't have a group of people sit around with Nixon and decide how he's going to run the campaign.

HALDEMAN: He'd have a group of people sitting around and he'd listen to them, but he decided. The group didn't decide how he was going to run the campaign.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: Unlike the [Ronald W.] Reagan brain trust, the

[Henry] Salvatoris and the Holmes Tuttles and that bunch. They ran the Reagan campaign, Ron didn't.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

HALDEMAN: But that's. . . . Nixon ran his campaign. Anybody involved in it will confirm that. He ran his presidential campaign in '60 that he lost and he ran his. . . . Even though Len Hall and [Robert H.] Bob Finch were the cochairmen, neither of them had anything to do with final decisions. And in California absolutely I didn't, and I wasn't of a political stature or knowledge or background to even want to try to run it. There was no way I would have taken the job if I felt I was going to run the campaign. I took the job because I was going to do exactly what I knew I was going to do: I was going to be an administrative manager for Nixon and carry out his decisions. And the strategy of that campaign was a typical Nixon strategy, which was a very carefully thought out timing thing which was designed to peak in the few days before the election and not to peak too soon and then hit a decline. And we were building up. . . . We had

both our positive and our negative campaigning programs and all the efforts geared on an increasing intensity basis to build up to a peak just prior to the election so that we'd come in. There's no question in our polls, which were valid polls (and the public polls in California are not totally valid polls--were not in those days--I don't know what they are today) but our polls were as valid as you can be within the inaccuracies of polling. We were definitely gaining at a rapid rate on Brown going into the closing days of October. And then came the Cuban missile crisis, and both Nixon and I, we said to each other, we both came to the same point at the same time in the same way independently, which was, "There goes this election," because we had saved a lot of what was going to be our clinching arguments and all to use in the peak final drive. And as of the day of the Cuban missile crisis and from then on nobody had the slightest interest in the California election anymore. So in effect what it did to the California vote was put it on freeze, put it on hold, and it stayed on hold or idle or whatever you want to call it

from that point on. And that cutoff point was when Brown was still substantially ahead, but we were coming up. The trend was the right direction. I believe--I believed then and I think I still believe--that we had a reasonably good chance of winning that election if we had been able to run our campaign out on our timing thing, but the missile crisis wiped it out. I believe that it really did and that it ended up that it went on freeze and the vote went as it had been at the time of the missile thing, which was with Brown ahead. I think certainly Brown wouldn't have won by anything like the majority that he won by had we been able to finish the campaign.

TRELEVEN: Well, what would have been the big slameroos at the end?

HALDEMAN: I don't really remember. They were. . . . Nixon had some specific positives, proposals and stuff that was going to come out, you know, in final form and be really hyped up, and we had some endorsement things that were coming that were going to be hopefully very effective. And the negative campaign that Brown was the tool of the

California Democratic Council [CDC] thing also, the pressure was building up on that, the anti-Brown Democrat effort.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: It all was supposed to be orchestrated to a crescendo at the precise right moment, and all of the sudden they snatched the music away.

TRELEVEN: What's your belief about the validity of the events that led up to Richard Nixon saying, "You won't have Richard Nixon to kick around anymore" to the press. Was he treated that badly?

HALDEMAN: Yes, I think he was and I think, you know, that we--he and many of us that were associated with him--have been accused of paranoia and persecution by the press complex and all that. I'm sure that in our terms at times we overstated it and in our own minds probably we overrated that opposition. But there's no question that it was there and that it was a major factor in that election and it was in all of his elections. I mean, his analysis of that has some merit I think, which was that the press. . . . And you can't generalize the way I'm generalizing now and be accurate.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, because we're talking about print media and electronic media.

HALDEMAN: Because there is no such thing as the press.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: What we're talking about is the whole media complex.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: And within that there were strong pro-Nixon people as well as strong anti-Nixon people. I don't think anybody, any knowledgeable person would question my contention that the bulk of the people in the working press, the working media, that an enormous majority were not pro-Nixon and that a substantial majority were anti-Nixon. In other words, only a small minority was actually pro-Nixon. There were some that didn't care a lot one way or another, but basically they certainly weren't for him. And then there was a very strong element and a substantial element that very strongly disliked him or were opposed to him. Why? A lot of reasons. McCarthy, Hiss, Republican, personality, and the factor that he put in, which is that so many of the people in the working media "have a vested interest in my

unsuccess because they have predicted it so often" that, you know, it's just a personal pride kind of thing. They don't want me to succeed because they've said I'm not going to. They've said I'm through, and then I've come back. To a degree that applied. They said he was through in '60 and then he came back in '62 at least to run for governor. And then they certainly said he was through, as Howard K. Smith did in that wrap-up broadcast after '62. But I think that in general he got an unfair shake more often than not with the working media. Now the answer to that always was in California and there was some validity to it. Nixon can't complain about the press, the press made him. The press didn't make him, Kyle Palmer made him, who admittedly was a member of the press on the staff of the L.A. [Los Angeles] Times, but Kyle Palmer was a political guru first and then a media person second. He was a king maker, and Nixon was one of the kings he decided to make, and he did. And the Times did under Norman Chandler and Kyle Palmer very strongly back Nixon. In those days the Times blatantly took positions, not quite as blatantly

as Hearst, but the Times went all out for their candidate. Under the Otis Chandler Times, the Times changed from an advocacy paper advocating Republicanism, let's say, to what they believed to be an unbiased news medium instead of a biased propaganda medium in some areas. But in the process of that I think there's merit and I think I could make a good case of it if I took the time and had the resources that you could show that we had a very strongly adverse press in the news reporting of the '62 campaign as Nixon had had in earlier campaigns. And there's no question that he asked for some of it in terms of the Voorhis and Douglas campaigns and his reaction to that, and maybe you'll argue that he deserved it. But it was there for whatever reason, and I think it was a factor. He very definitely was speaking from the heart when he went down there. He was tired and he was not in any way at his best form that morning when he went down and made the speech to the press group down there. He wasn't supposed to. He wasn't scheduled to go down there and said he wasn't going to go down and then. . . . Not me. You asked about the events

leading up to it, and I'm in some accounts said to be the one that said, "You've got to go down there and tell them to go to hell or something." It's not true. I didn't know he was going down until he had started down. Somebody ran into the room where I was. I was not in the room with him when. . . . I think it was Jack Drown and Ray Arbuthnot who talked him into going down and said, "Tell them to go to hell." And he said, "By god, I'm going to. It's all over now and I've got nothing to lose," and he didn't. That's my guess. I wasn't there. Someone ran in and said, "He's going down to talk to the press," which absolutely. . . . He had sent [Herbert G.] Herb Klein down to deliver his withdrawal or whatever you call it.

TRELEVEN: Concession.

HALDEMAN: Concession speech, and Herb was down doing it, and I thought that was going to be the end of it. We were going to leave, and that was that. And then Nixon decided to go down, and I roared down by the back way and got down there ahead of him and tried to signal Herb and couldn't get Herb's attention. And Nixon got his attention a

couple seconds later when he walked in, and that was the speech. If you watch the speech today And we did. We watched it ad nauseam in 1968, because one of the arguments against his running was he would have a horrible time trying to deal with that speech. And we decided, and a lot more astute media analysis-type people than I decided after a lot of review of that speech in '68, early '68 or late '67, that it actually didn't pose a real problem and that the Democrats would not use it, because it had some real plusses for Nixon in it also and that it might backfire on them and that it wouldn't be a problem for us. And they didn't use it basically, I think.

TRELEVEN: What was the thinking that . . .

HALDEMAN: It wasn't nearly as bad a speech as you thought it was, as it was made out to be by the media afterwards.

TRELEVEN: . . . that overexposing that would really create a lot of sympathy for the underdog by many people who consider themselves . . . ?

HALDEMAN: To the degree it created sympathy for the underdog, but also that it had been made out to

be so bad. He had been so ridiculed for that speech. That, and in some ways it was a very effective speech, and that putting it on the air would serve Nixon's positive purpose more than the opposition's negative purpose. And I think that the Kennedys decided the same thing. They were pretty shrewd people. And I think that's why it wasn't really used, and it really wasn't. There was some poking around at it but they. . . . Like so many things, the conventional wisdom had become that it was a total disaster for Nixon, and it really wasn't a total disaster. It was a fairly well stated case in some ways, certainly not his most effective kind of a thing, but it wasn't nearly as bad as it had been painted to be. Therefore, when you go expecting to see Nixon fall flat on his face in a pile of shit, he didn't. And therefore, the effect on the viewer in the aftermath would be that he wasn't nearly as bad as they say he was, which could become a positive. Anyway, that's . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah. You felt he really did not want to become governor. Do you think that showed?

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: I mean, was that discernable by, say, the electorate during the campaign?

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. What I meant to ask is, did Nixon sort of lack vim and vigor, really, you know, wasn't after that job as vigorously as he might have been?

HALDEMAN: I think that's true. I think that he wanted to win the election, there's no doubt about that one. I mean, he didn't enter the election planning to lose. But I don't think as he thought about being governor of California. In other words, as a candidate you look ahead and think of your programs and what you're going to do, and then you try to articulate those in the campaign. As he looked at those you never saw any spark of real interest or excitement about that, as contrasted in 1968 when we were looking forward to ending the Vietnam War, building the structure for a generation of peace, revising and reforming the Great Society's mistakes, let's say, as he viewed them; there was real excitement there. There he was charged up. He was never charged up in the '62 campaign. There

was never any great desire to get the California Water Project completed and, you know, do great things at the University of California and all that kind of stuff.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah.

HALDEMAN: There just wasn't.

TRELEVEN: Which were in many ways the pillars of Brown's administration up to that point.

HALDEMAN: The university and water and so on, yeah. That's why there was so much of a negative campaign. I'm trying to hang Brown on the philosophical thing with the CDC, which was not mainstream California . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: . . . instead of going on trying to challenge Brown on his failures as governor, because he really then in a general sense was a very good governor. And the voters decided he was, too.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Again, if we're looking at up through '62, '63, then we'll back up again, you were not active in Republican party politics at the local level?

HALDEMAN: No.

TRELEVEN: Not at all?

HALDEMAN: No.

TRELEVEN: You were not a grass-roots person?

HALDEMAN: I think I did in one election. Somewhere along the line I volunteered I think as a member of Republican Associates. They asked us to do poll work, and I did. I remember one election somewhere in that that I took the election day off and did do the poll watching and then checking off people that hadn't voted and then tracking them, trying to help them get to the polls. I think I did volunteer doing that to drive people to the polls one year, but that was about it. I was on an election board one year. We had the polling thing at our house in our garage or something, and I was on the thing to check people off. So I worked on election day that way as a volunteer, but I wasn't involved in political action really at all in the fifties.

TRELEVEN: Okay. We were going to I think back up a little again. Your bio lists a number of activities. By bio I mean the one that appeared in the centennial history of the university,¹ and I

1. Stadtman, Verne A., comp. and ed. The Centennial Record of the University of California. Berkeley: University of California, 1967.

don't quite know what fits where. You've talked about the fraternity, you've mentioned the Salvation Army as an activity that you really inherited after many years in your family . . .

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . and continued doing that. I guess my question there is, why is that important? Why is the Salvation Army important to you?

HALDEMAN: I think first of all on the real merits that it's an extremely worthwhile activity that accomplishes a great deal of good. The people of the army are very impressive people in their dedication to what they do and the sacrifice that they make to carry out their mission as the Salvation Army salvationists. So the intrinsic merit of the organization to all of us was very strong and clear. Then that gets brought home in a personalized way because of the involvement of my grandfather and my father and my mother in Salvation Army activity. And then my sort of following along is a family tradition I guess.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: I spent only a short time on the Salvation Army advisory board. I was not. . . . Because my

father was still on the board. I was on at the same time he was, and I think we were the first father-son combination ever to serve on the board at the same time, although I'm not sure of that, because there were some other people who sort of the families picked it up also in Los Angeles at least. As an advertising agency. . . . Well, in the fifties as an advertising agency account executive in Los Angeles, I had a desire to participate in community activities both to give something to the community and because there's some business value in it in terms of meeting people and being aware of what's going on in the community and that sort of thing.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: So it was a natural inclination anyway, and the Salvation Army was a good slot. My wife's currently very active on the army advisory board up here [Santa Barbara]. In fact, I think that's where she was off to today. But it's a satisfying group to work with, because they accomplished so much good with the very limited resources that they have to work with, and they are really dedicated people.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Junior Achievement. Now is that a fifties . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Junior Achievement was a fifties, maybe it was sixties, I'm not sure. I probably have something that tells, but I'm not really sure. Well, I say '61 on this thing so it probably was sixties. I may have been involved at one level and then when I came back here as. . . . See, I was a junior account executive and then an account executive in the fifties at the Thompson office. I was not in a position to go on boards and things like that, because boards weren't looking for people at my level. When I came back in the sixties as the manager of the office I had a stature that made me a desirable candidate for various boards, and I was approached by people.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: And also as manager I could and should spend more time in the community in establishing visibility for the company. Providing community assistance is one of the jobs of a manager as contrasted to an account executive, who is servicing his own accounts. So Junior Achievement I was in because I very much believed as sort of again an offshoot

of Better America and my grandfather and all. I believed in the free enterprise system and I believed that education in the area of free enterprise was a way of combatting the academic, economic anti-free enterprise bias that is fairly strongly felt. Not at UCLA anymore, but in a lot of academic institutions. So I thought that Junior Achievement. . . . I liked the idea of Junior Achievement as a grass-roots. . . . Show them how the free enterprise, free market system works on a practical basis, and got involved in Junior Achievement for that reason. Our company sponsored two Junior Achievement companies, and I went on the board of Junior Achievement and became a vice president of Junior Achievement. So that was why I was on there.

TRELEVEN: World Affairs Council you said I think that was a fifties . . .

HALDEMAN: I think it was, and that's just. . . . There's no activity there. It's a thing you join and go to their luncheons. It's a Rotary or something. But it isn't like Rotary, it's not nearly as involved. They had interesting lunches, interesting speakers. I didn't go to very many

of them, but I did belong and go to some. Same with Republican Associates and with Town Hall, which is another one I belonged to which was purely a luncheon speaker kind of organization.

TRELEVEN: Right, yeah. Town Hall I didn't catch on . . .

HALDEMAN: Missed that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, yeah, I didn't find that one.

HALDEMAN: That was another one. But they're really insignificant. It's not a community participation thing. It's a self-enlightenment really. It's a chance to go and hear interesting speakers.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so if we were looking at Junior Arts Center, Coro Foundation, Chamber of Commerce . . .

HALDEMAN: Coro Foundation was one that came. . . . That was in the sixties and came out of my political involvement. I don't know if you know what Coro Foundation is but . . .

TRELEVEN: No, I want you not only to explain it to me but the researcher who is going to listen to this some day.

HALDEMAN: The Coro Foundation is an interesting thing. I can't give you an accurate history of it, but its program, it gets money from somewhere and it uses

the money to give fellowships to interns. Internships is what it gives to people. And it's an intern in public service. What they do is they intern in the mayor's office or councilman's office. It's pretty much local, in local government public service kind of things. And it gives promising young people an exposure in those areas. That is the purpose. I think the goal of the Coro fellowships or internships was to get people that were good, able people in the private sector exposed to the public sector and motivated to the public sector to the extent that they would come over. And a lot of Coro people do become councilmen and mayors and things like that. Coro has a great--I forget who that is-- bunch of the state assemblymen and people who are former Coro interns who say that they got their first glimmer of interest in the public sector by the exposure that they got from Coro. It's an intensive program, very structured, and that was something I thought was a very worthwhile kind of a thing. I got into it on my own initially because of that.

TRELEVEN: So you mean by that you offered to be on the

board or . . ?

HALDEMAN: I think I was asked to serve. I think what happened is they get a group of citizens who have some visibility to serve on the selection board. I think I was asked to serve on the selection board, got caught up in it as a result-- and that's what they want to do--as a result of that. I have not, other than one exception, I have done no fund-raising and I have made a point of not being a fund-raiser, and Coro was looking for people who are fund-raisers. And I said I didn't want to get involved with Coro as a fund-raiser, but they also were looking at me for a board member because of both my community participation at that time in the sixties and my both advertising and political expertise or presumed expertise which they felt could be helpful to them.

TRELEVEN: State Chamber of Commerce? I picked that up somewhere.

HALDEMAN: L.A. Chamber of Commerce, not state.

TRELEVEN: State, okay, that's a correction.

HALDEMAN: I don't think I ever. . . . I don't think I had anything to do with the state chamber. I was

chair. . . . I went on the. . . . Well, our company was a member of the L.A. Chamber of Commerce as a corporate member. I was asked to serve on a committee, I served on a membership committee, and I was I think working up to the point where I was going to go on the board, but I never got up to that point.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

HALDEMAN: And I had been a member of the junior chamber. There was a lot of young start-up businessmen on it just as a way to meet other start-up businessmen.

TRELEVEN: There are several things on here related to the arts. One, Junior Arts Center.

HALDEMAN: The Junior Arts Center is something I have a cousin who was the chairman of it, and she asked me if I would go on the board, and I agreed to go on the board. What it is is a program at Barnsdall Park [Los Angeles] . . .

TRELEVEN: Oh sure.

HALDEMAN: . . . that was encouraging the underprivileged kids and other kids to develop any artistic talents they have and develop an appreciation and an ability to express, encourage an ability to

express . . .

TRELEVEN: It's still going, isn't it?

HALDEMAN: As far as I know it is. I've totally lost touch with it. And again, it was one that I got into in the period. . . . I have a feeling maybe it was right before I left to go into the campaign or when I was going onto the regents and the regents started taking more time. But I never spent very much. . . . It's true I was on the Junior Arts Center advisory board. I didn't spend much time on it. I didn't spend much time on the Salvation Army advisory board--more than I did on the Junior Arts board. There were some others, the Better Business Bureau and a couple others I spent more time on just because I had gotten involved in them earlier.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. How'd you get involved in Cal Arts [California Institute of the Arts]?

HALDEMAN: Cal Arts came after my first swing on the regents, after the . . .

TRELEVEN: Oh, so that's much later.

HALDEMAN: After I was an alumni regent.

TRELEVEN: Alumni regent.

HALDEMAN: That evolved because Walt Disney, who was the

guiding light of Cal Arts . . .

TRELEVEN: Go ahead.

HALDEMAN: . . . was trying to build some people onto the board. Got a problem?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, we've got something wrong here.

[Interruption]

HALDEMAN: Struck all that stuff. Can we leave it?

TRELEVEN: No, it's audible, and right now I can apologize to the transcriber and I can see her or him smiling right now as they listen to this. Sorry, one mike was not plugged back in, and you'll hear Mr. Haldeman much better right now.

HALDEMAN: That factor I've got to admit is Mr. Haldeman's fault, because I got up hastily and unplugged inadvertently and didn't realize it.

TRELEVEN: You're associating with another person who is not too handy with a recorder. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: [Laughter] Well, that's the story of my life.

TRELEVEN: No, this is going to be much better. You were talking about Cal Arts when I noticed the needle here wasn't wiggling the way it should be.

HALDEMAN: Cal Arts came after I had served my alumni president term on the regents, and Walt Disney was in the founding process of putting that

institution together and trying to bring about his dream of bringing together an institution that combined Chouinard Art Institute, the California Conservatory of Music, and he had hoped also Art Center School of Design, so that we would bring together the performing of the music arts, the visual arts, and he wanted to bring in dance and cinema also and try to get an all-around university of the arts. I don't know who recommended, brought my name to his attention, but at the time we were handling the Disneyland account, the advertising account.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

HALDEMAN: J. Walter Thompson Company, so I had some dealings with Walt because of that, but not very close. But somehow he found out or someone told him that I was a good candidate for the Cal Arts board, especially because of the time I spent, one year of observation and one year of participation on the board of regents and my knowledge therefore of that. Plus the . . . No, that was it. So Walt asked me to go on the board, and I was fascinated with the concept that he was putting together, this interdisciplinary

institution of the arts. So I went on the board and became active on the board. After Walt died he was succeeded immediately by the vice chairman, who was Lulu Mae von Hagen, who has some strong UCLA ties also. But then there was an election on the board, and I was elected chairman of the board and served in that post until for, I don't know, about a year I think, whatever length of time it was until I went to Washington. Then I resigned.

TRELEVEN: Okay, that's late '68, early '69.

HALDEMAN: I went on probably in. . . . Yeah, I resigned in '69. I went on probably in '66 or '67.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I have also something listed, California Council of the American Association of Advertising Agencies.

HALDEMAN: I was chairman of the board of governors of the Southern California Council of American Association of Advertising Agencies. The Four A's as it's called is the industry association in the advertising agency business. Oh, it's the vehicle through which the agencies do all of their volunteer service on the volunteer campaigns, the Smokey the Bear, and "A family

that prays together stays together," and all those campaigns that are public service campaigns are administered through the AAAA, the Four A.

TRELEVEN: I see.

HALDEMAN: Also it sets standards, ethical standards within the business, sort of like the American Bar Association is for the bar, except that membership is voluntary and by invitation, and agencies have to live up to their code of the Four A's to be members and so on. The national association has a regional council in each major region of the country and the member agencies serve as the members of the regional council. And so as the head of the L.A. office of Thompson, I was a member of the Southern California Council and I evolved one year into the chairmanship of the council and served for a one-year term as chairman of that council on the board of governors of the council.

TRELEVEN: Well, you're keeping enormously busy.

HALDEMAN: Well, I did. I said this publically before so it's no secret. In the mid-sixties I was getting bored with the agency business. I had been at it a long time, I had moved to the managership of

the L.A. office, the highest post there was out here. There was no up to go without going east, and I was determined not to go east again. So the only way I could go up was to go out and up rather than staying in and up, other than building the office, which I was doing. But still there was no up job for me beyond running the office. So I was looking to outside things and I grabbed onto the UCLA activities as one of those and some of these other things as others of them, and I justified them and properly so--and the company knew I was doing it--as being a prominent citizen in the community was a value to the company, and it was, it is. So I was encouraged to do it. It wasn't that I was sneaking out to do these things. But I found that I was getting more interested in them than I was in my day-to-day work at the office.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Before we get into UCLA specifically, are there any . . . ? Again, I have sort of rummaged through some biographical information I found about your service and business activities. Are there any that you have that I have forgotten that you'd like to mention?

HALDEMAN: I served on the [Los Angeles County] District Attorney's [Citizens] Advisory Council, which again was a thing where when Evelle [J.] Younger was district attorney he had a citizens advisory council that was just a community relations kind of thing. It was a minor community service kind of thing that I did serve on. Then I was active in fraternity things both in the fifties as chapter advisor to the UCLA chapter Beta Theta Pi. That's just an alumnus who volunteers to serve as a guidance person to the chapter and kind of a relational bridge between the chapter and the chapter's alumni and corporate board and that sort of thing. That led to my being appointed district chief of the fraternity, which is an office of the national fraternity with, as the name implies, the responsibility for a number of chapters. As district chief I was involved with UCLA, Berkeley, 'SC, Stanford, [University of] Arizona, and Arizona State [University] chapters. So I traveled and visited those chapters from time to time on a very infrequent basis but to maintain touch with that chapter's contact with the general fraternity. So I was

active in the fraternity on that basis. And we covered Coro, Better Business Bureau, Junior Achievement, Republican Associates. That's pretty much the things other than the UCLA activity.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, we didn't talk very much about Republican Associates.

HALDEMAN: That I was on the board of directors and executive committee of, and it was as I said just a business organization, an association of businessmen who were interested in helping the Republican party, advancing the cause of the Republican party. We had a candidate screening thing that would try to encourage good people to become candidates for office and give them encouragement in seeking office and give them a feeling that they had some backing before the official party actually got into it. It was a way we could provide some service to the cause of building a stronger Republican party.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and maybe one other thing before we go on to UCLA. I keep coming up with another thing. In the tussle which I believe was in '65 between the so-called Salvatori wing of the Republican

party and the moderate wing, and the Salvatori forces winning out, were you connected to any of that?

HALDEMAN: Well, not really. The tussle started in '62.

Well, it probably started way back. It started back with the. . . . You go back to the [Goodwin J.] Knight-[William F.] Knowland battles and the Nixon-Knight-Knowland battles, and a lot of back and forth things.

TRELEVEN: Sure.

HALDEMAN: But from my viewpoint at least it sort of peaked or started its emergence in a more open and strong way with the rise of the John Birch Society and with [Joseph C.] Joe Shell, Assemblyman Joe Shell's plan to become governor of California. He ran against Nixon in the primary of '62 for the Republican nomination. And he mobilized the Republican right, the Salvatori wing if you want to call it, or they mobilized him, or each mobilized the other. It was a mutual coming together to try and get Shell, an avowed conservative conservative, as the Republican candidate instead of Nixon, who was perceived--because he was anti-Birch Society,

despite his anticommunist credentials--was perceived as being a little too leftish for the group and not one they could really rely on. And he was tied to Eisenhower, which tied him to the Eisenhower wing rather than the Taft wing. So that came forth, and I think that was incidentally another factor in Nixon's loss to Brown in '62 was the fact that the Republican party had divided itself on ideological grounds in the primary with a very tough primary by Joe Shell that I think carried over and caused a lack of enthusiasm for Nixon's candidacy on the part of some of the strongest activist Republicans in the state. And that obviously weakened his. . . . He had the problem that [Mikhail] Gorbachev has: he got weakened from his people on the right and on the left.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: So as that became more pronounced, and actually you know Reagan was a factor in '62 also. There was talk of Reagan, a Reagan candidacy for governor as well as a Goodwin Knight candidacy for governor again, so we had a whole bunch from Reagan, Shell, Nixon, Knight. And Salvatori had

been a strong. . . . That whole crowd had been strong Nixon backers, but they sort of moved off in a way in '62. And then they determined to get control of the party from the Nixon wing after the Nixon defeat or from the Knight wing or from any left wing, the [Earl] Warren wing and any of the so-called left side of the party to get conservative control of the party. They mobilized behind Ronald Reagan as their figurehead and they had already control of the pursestrings of the party pretty much, because they were the major donors, or they represented a good chunk of the major donors. Was I involved? No. After '62, after the election and the loss in '62, I retreated out of politics into these other forms of nonbusiness, public service types of things, primarily the university when the alumni association. . . . Well, the [Edwin W.] Pauley [Pavilion] drive and then the Alumni Association and then the regency and all that really brought a major focus of my external activities into the university fold, and that replaced literally any Republican or political activity. But I wasn't involved at all in any of

that, not even peripherally.

TRELEVEN: Okay, maybe this takes us back to the fifties in the sense that you graduated in '48 . . .

[Interruption]

Okay, we're back on after a pause. I guess I was fumbling around with a question that had to do with, aside from the fraternity involvement which you've described, when or how good a member were you, if I can put it that way, of the alumni association in the early years after you graduated? Did you remain involved and interested in what the Alumni Association was doing at UCLA? Or what would you say?

HALDEMAN: I did remain involved and, as I did in most of these organizations we've talked about, I sort of started at the bottom of each of those things and worked my way up. I did early on (and I don't know when) go on the alumni scholarship selection committee program where we'd have our meetings to interview the finalists and select the winners of the alumni scholarship awards each year. And I did that several times. It seems to me I had gotten something else in the Alumni Association per se activity and I don't exactly remember

what. I don't specifically remember what it was. I was a member of Bruin Hoopsters as a basketball fan in the days when we brought John Wooden out to UCLA and when basketball was still a fairly low-level sport at UCLA. The Hoopsters, we used to meet during basketball season. We'd have a dinner every Monday night at Pico Pete's in the back room. And Coach Wooden came out, he carried on the tradition, had dinner with us, and there would be about anywhere from ten to maybe thirty depending on the times and all who would have dinner. The coach would give us a fill-in on what was going on and all that, the standard thing, but very small scale, which was, you know, things changed rather rapidly as the Wooden years came along.

My activity at the Beta House, I stayed close to the Beta House and became chapter advisor not very long after I got out of school I think. It was after I got back from New York and San Francisco, in the vicinity of three or four years after I got out of school. Quite a few of the basketball players at that time were members of the Beta House, so I knew the kids on the team

as well as being involved with the coach side of it, the alumni side of it. So I developed a strong tie to UCLA basketball that still continues. I was on. . . . I don't know. I can't remember what it was. I'm sure I did some other Alumni Association kind of things. I was also a member of Sportsmen of the South, which was then the football or the general athletic support, outside support group. I went to all the football games and a lot of the basketball games and was around campus for various things, including the fraternity stuff from time to time. So I really did feel I had continued a tie, although I was gone for two years, and then I was back for six years or something, and then I was gone for another two years, and then in and out and all. So my intensive activity at a major level really started in the sixties.

TRELEVEN: Okay, how was it that you became according to my notes general chair of the fund-raising for the Memorial Activities Center which today we know as Pauley Pavilion? How did that come about?

HALDEMAN: That came about because I was consciously interested in getting into more public

activities, public service type activities. And John [V.] Vaughn, a former president of the UCLA Alumni Association and also a Beta, a fraternity brother, was a good friend from. . . . I knew him through the fraternity I guess and his activity in the fraternity, and he was also president I think of the L.A. Chamber of Commerce at the time that I went to see him. In any event, I went to John Vaughn and said, "I would like to get more involved in a more meaningful way in some important community activities, and you're obviously doing that kind of thing." I'd ask for guidance, you know, how do you do it, and what should I do, and how should I go about it? And he said, "Well, that's great to know that you are, because there are always opportunities and people are always asking for people to go on boards and things like that, so let me keep that in mind." The next thing I know Vaughn calls and says, "We've got something for you that I think would be fascinating and I want you to join me and [M. Philip] Phil Davis for breakfast," I think it was, but for some meal to get together, and, "We want to talk to you about it." So I

said fine, so I joined them. Well, Phil Davis was at that time I believe president or president elect of the Alumni Association, and Vaughn was the past president.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: This tells when Phil is president, doesn't it? It's not Phil Davis. It's [W. Thomas] Tom Davis, I'm sorry.

TRELEVEN: The way the succession went as I remember, it was [William E.] Forbes, [Robert E.] Alshuler . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . Davis.

TRELEVEN: . . . Davis, and you.

HALDEMAN: I think Davis either was about to come in as president or something like that. Because it wasn't Alshuler, so it must have been Davis. Anyway, we talked, and what they said is, "We've got this campaign that we're going launch, the Memorial Activities Center thing, the first capital campaign, and we've got this concept," and all this stuff. By that point Franklin [D.] Murphy was at UCLA, and he may have even been at the meeting with us. He's also a Beta. John Wooden is also a Beta. [Laughter] There are lots of Betas around.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Bill Forbes is a Beta and Phil Boyd is a Beta-- was a Beta. Anyhow, what they ended up saying is, "We want you to consider being chairman of the campaign. We want to get a young alumnus in." The Alumni Association to that point had been dominated by the prewar alumni and intentionally so. They would never let a postwar alumnus into anything of any importance. Now you're going to prove I'm wrong.

TRELEVEN: Well, pre-World War II is what you mean.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: So you're talking about John [E.] Canaday.

HALDEMAN: I'm talking about John Vaughn, Bob Alshuler, Tom Davis. You look at all the presidents: Bill Forbes, Alshuler, Davis, the ones you got here. They were all prewar.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: I mean Forbes was class of '28, something like that.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: Alshuler was immediate prewar. He was the youngest. He was the shining star. They say, "Oh, we have lots of young people in the Alumni

Association. Bob Alshuler is president. He is a young guy."

TRELEVEN: I think he was class of '42.

HALDEMAN: He was prewar.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Okay, so you've got some old fogies.

HALDEMAN: And then Tom Davis was earlier than Alshuler.

TRELEVEN: And then I think it's true that then these people constitute the past presidents association.

HALDEMAN: Well, all past presidents constitute the past presidents association.

TRELEVEN: Right, which in terms of, what, power within the association or influence . . .

HALDEMAN: It was more powerful then than it is now.

TRELEVEN: Oh, it is.

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: It isn't powerful at all now. It doesn't have anyone that will listen now.

TRELEVEN: Oh. Well, that will be a chapter we'll have to take a look at.

HALDEMAN: But in those days there was a tight control of the Alumni Association, and it was the old boys [who] picked the next president. They thought they had made a real racy move when they brought

Alshuler in. And this was a real super racy move when they brought me in--not as president of the association; they weren't talking to me about that. That was a hallowed post that they never thought of, but they wanted to get a young guy in to run the. . . . A postwar alum to run the Memorial Activities Center campaign because they wanted to cover the whole thing across the board and all that. So they asked me if I would do it and John Vaughn said, "If you want to get into community activity, here's a way for you to come in and do something that will have enormous visibility, enormous opportunity to contribute. It's a tremendously worthwhile thing. You're setting the groundwork for the future of the university." I mean, there was this huge mountaintop discussion of all the great things this was going to lead to and that I certainly should do it. In politics I had taken the position all along and in these other activities, some of which preceded this, I had always taken the position that I was not a fund-raiser, did not want to be, I did not like the idea of fund-raising, and I didn't have the means to be a

major contributor to anything. I felt that what I'd seen of politics that a successful fundraiser is the guy who is a major contributor who gets other people to do as he did, and I couldn't do that. So I told them that. I said, "I am not in the position to make a major contribution to the campaign and I have never done fund-raising. I have always avoided it." Vaughn said, "Yeah, but this is the way to earn your laurels, and it would be a good experience for you." So I decided. . . . And they said, "You'll have a huge staff and backup of volunteers and all that stuff, so there'll be lots of people who know how you do it and all that sort of thing." So I took on the job, and we did do pretty well for those days, and that was in sort of an archaic time of fund-raising expertise. We did a good job of laying out a campaign and setting our goals and our procedures for how we were going to get the money and that sort of thing, and basically it worked.

TRELEVEN: Well, how did you get Pauley roped into this?
The Democrat.

HALDEMAN: Well, this wasn't a political campaign, not by

any means.

TRELEVEN: No, I understand. But he made the important . . .

HALDEMAN: What we did was Pauley had a . . . And I don't know whether this came through. . . . I don't know who the knowledge came from: maybe Bill Forbes; or maybe Tom Davis, who was at that point the alumni president, therefore meeting with the regents and was in contact with Pauley, I don't know; or maybe Franklin Murphy, who was obviously playing Pauley as strongly as he could. I was told. . . . We were given the information that Pauley had committed long since to a \$1 million gift to UCLA, but had not. . . . Was seeking the focal point for doing it and had in mind a library or something like Pauley Union at Berkeley or whatever. I mean, he was looking for the right thing for which to make his \$1 million contribution, and it would obviously be a thing that would bear the Pauley name. So he was looking for something that he would have the right connotation of the Pauley name on. So he was clearly the single most obvious potential, major donor of the list, and we had compiled an extensive list of the people that were likely to

be able to give. But what we looked at as a major donation was \$25,000 or over, I think. Maybe it was \$50,000. I think it was \$25,000, but I'm not sure. No, I guess it was \$50,000. But anyhow, whatever it was, Pauley clearly if he would give his \$1 million to this it would be much more. Well, we worked out with a steering committee that we had for the campaign and that Franklin participated actively in. Franklin was the general chairman or the honorary chairman or something of the campaign and was very much involved, because he was convinced that this was the opportunity to get the alumni as such--not necessarily the Alumni Association but the alumni of the university in totality, the alumni of UCLA in totality--out of the Alumni Association role of contributing ten dollars a year to the scholarship fund or the progress fund to give alumni scholarships or total awards of \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 or something. We were talking in today's terms in real idea of peanuts in those days. And I know--well, he said he did--that Franklin saw this being a, first of all, the first capital campaign we had done, and,

secondly, the first campaign for major funds. It was the chance to use this as the focal point for kicking people out of their ten-dollar annual contribution kind of thinking into the \$100,000, \$1 million, \$15 million dollar kinds of levels of contributions. He knew it would take time to get up to the heights, but that you had to start. And that was one of the real things, missions, of the Memorial Activities Center, was to get it. . . . And they felt that the concept of a multipurpose center for student activities and academic activities was a good concept. They sold the regents on a concept that was very good, because the facility was designated as part academic and part athletic and part student activity. Therefore, it could be funded properly by, first of all, state funds for academic use, secondly, athletic funds for athletic use, thirdly, student activity funds for student use, and fourthly, alumni or interested outside contributions as a thing to enhance it beyond what all the others together could do.

TRELEVEN: You're not just building a basketball court.

HALDEMAN: It was never conceived as building a basketball

court. And at the time we were building it, UCLA was not a basketball power in the terms that it became coincidentally with building it. And it to a great degree was coincidental, but not totally coincidental. But I'm getting. . . . I don't want to run you out of tape.

TRELEVEN: Well, one more minute.

HALDEMAN: Okay. We approached Ed Pauley on the basis that this was the ideal contribution or point for his \$1 million contribution. He was not totally convinced of that at the outset, because he saw it as a basketball court, and our point was it will be an enormous pavilion. It will be a focal point, if not the focal point of the campus. And it will provide the facility for all the major public events that will take place on the campus, not just basketball but commencement, regents' lectures, rock concerts, the whole range of kinds of things that will have public attention and will be identified as coming from the whatever-it-is pavilion. And that Pauley Pavilion was a nice alliterative sounding thing, and we kept working on the Pauley Pavilion concept as being the focal point of the Memorial Activities

Center, and then we came across the device of his giving the \$1 million not as an outright gift but as a matching fund and that we would commit to raise \$1 million in alumni funds to match his \$1 million. And so he gave it as a matching gift. We only got the \$1 million if we raised \$1 million. We got whatever we raised.

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're just about at the end of the tape.

HALDEMAN: All right.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Session 2, June 18, 1991]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're in the afternoon, and technically this begins our second session. We left off by discussing the fund-raising for what became Pauley Pavilion, and I wasn't quite sure you indicated how the finger got put on Pauley or not. Maybe he obviously ended up giving the money. You left off by saying that he would give it contingent on another \$1 million being raised . . .

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . through the fund-raising effort that you were chairing. Who would have talked to Pauley about this, or who would have arranged that contingent?

HALDEMAN: Several of us did, and I was in the discussion and I don't remember who else was. It may well have been Franklin Murphy and someone like Tom Davis, who was at that point president of the

Alumni Association. I'm not sure. There were several of us that talked with him at some point about this and covered, you know, the points that I went through earlier.

TRELEVEN: Right. One other thing about the Pauley Pavilion, how did you go about structurally organizing the campaign?

HALDEMAN: We hired a professional fund-raising manager-type person who had had experience in this. We laid out an organizational plan based on I guess that person's standard approach and our modifications to fit our specific circumstances. We set up categories of donors and then goals within each category, using some sort of standardized formulas and modifying them that you generally get, what is it, 80 percent of your funds. That's the old 80-20 rule, I think: 80 percent of your funds from 20 percent of your donors.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Then you have a general drive for mass participation that doesn't produce. . . . Is not particularly profitable, because you have to spend almost as much as you get out of it, but it's worthwhile from the viewpoint that you do

make some money on it and you get a broad base of people participating, which was one of the objectives of this campaign--to get a broader base of participation in university support. But it was extensive. We set up the standard committees then: a major gifts committee and a chairman and a special gifts chairman and a founder's gifts chairman or whatever it was. I mean, we had all the different fund level categories, and then each of those chairmen had a team of cochairmen or lieutenants who would divide up the contact names. It's the standard pyramid thing. You ultimately get all of your prospects outlined and then you assign them so that each person only has four or five calls to make or something and then follow up, try to get your gifts out of that. Each of the individual solicitors is a part of a subteam, and then that's part of a main team, and that's part of a general category, and that may be part the way back up.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think it could be probably honestly stated that this was the first really major fund-raising, major fund-raising that UCLA had done.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, it was.

TRELEVEN: I mean, there was scholarship fund which you indicated earlier . . .

HALDEMAN: That was an ongoing, annual giving kind of a program. As I understood it there had never been a capital fund drive or anything for building a building at all. And as far as I know I don't think there was any major. . . . There were the things like the athletic support groups and obviously there were gifts that were given over time for various things, scholarships, fellowships, chairs . . .

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: . . . but not on an organized program. There wasn't any entity to do it.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, the only building that comes to mind is the one built with. . . . That Mrs. Kerckhoff gave money for, you know, way back.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: And that was not a fund-raising thing.

HALDEMAN: I don't think so. It was a donation.

TRELEVEN: Right. And then it was matched by. . . . Matched how? I was going to say state funds. I'm not sure that's it.

HALDEMAN: Probably was.

TRELEVEN: But it did not involve a fund-raising amongst the Southern Branch alumni at that time.

HALDEMAN: Right. Well, the only fund-raising entity that really was was the Progress Fund, and that was for the annual alumni scholarships and never got up to any substantial amount of money.

TRELEVEN: And that's what the Progress Fund is. In other words . . .

HALDEMAN: Was.

TRELEVEN: Was. Board of trustees, you were chair of the board of trustees, UCLA Progress Fund. That was the scholarship fund.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. And that was at the . . . I was. . . . That was after Pauley Pavilion.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so . . .

HALDEMAN: And that was. . . . I forget how I got into that, but it was later, because, see, in effect we dissolved the Progress Fund and resolved it into the UCLA Foundation . . .

TRELEVEN: I see.

HALDEMAN: . . . with a much broader mission than the Progress Fund had, because the foundation was conceived as an ongoing, permanent entity that

would provide the vehicle for all the different kinds of fund-raising things we've been doing since or that they've been doing since.

TRELEVEN: Okay, up to the time that the big fund-raising began to take place, what had the achievements been, first, and secondly, what had the problems been of the Alumni Association? You mentioned the old fogies before--I guess that's my phrase, not yours--but what else . . . ?

HALDEMAN: The achievement to a degree was maintaining some degree of alumni interest in the university. To what end? Well, some funds for the Progress Fund for the alumni scholarships, some political support base. In other words it was a community-wide or statewide focal point for mobilizing when we had a bond issue coming up or some legislative action that needed to be opposed or backed, that you could get some people to contact their congressman or their assemblyman or whatever and get some grass-roots type activity. There were alumni activity things, the Bruin Clubs. The Alumni Association was the parent basically of the Bruin Clubs, which was sort of the neighborhood breakdown of the overall thing so

that people had a chance to maintain their tie to the university, which was deemed desirable, but I'm not exactly sure why other than to have a favorable public opinion, which is vital to a state university. At least the Alumni Association accomplished something in that direction. I'm not sure how much good it did or didn't do really. I imagine it probably did some good. From the alumnus's or alumna's viewpoint it provided a route to maintaining relationships with the university to participating in some sorts of university events using the library services. I mean, some of the various so-called benefits of Alumni Association membership were provided to alumni, and that was worthwhile to them. The magazine or whatever form it took--its publication has gone through various cycles--but was a good communication vehicle, and the Alumni Association funded that basically out of the original dues. So I think it had those kinds of values both ways, to the university and to the alumni community. The problems I think generally could be lumped under the overall thing of relevance, you know, the answer to the other

question: what good really was it doing for the university? And really what good was it doing for the alumni? And maybe you got through the end of the area of questioning, what good should it be doing and isn't it doing it and that sort of thing? And that gets to what to me is in a way unfortunate, but I guess it's inevitable: the principle function of alumni associations worldwide seems to be fund-raising for the institution. And maybe that's a good end-all and be-all for alumni associations. I don't know. Obviously they have these other things, but when you boil it down the other things end up being vehicles for the fund-raising vehicle. And if that's the ultimate end, then our problem was we weren't raising any funds.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. To what extent did the Alumni Association at UCLA kind of mirror an image that persisted that UCLA was still the small sister of Berkeley?

HALDEMAN: I don't know that it mirrored the image. I think it rather formed or provided a focal point or a rallying point for fighting the image, because I think the feeling, the sense that you had within the Alumni Association in the early time that I

was an alumnus, was getting out from under--and it was a feeling when I was a student--it was getting out from under the university. Let's, you know, get away from Southern Branch and establish our own identity. And I think the UCLA Alumni Association was an implement in the effort to do that. And as it grew in numerical and economic and political strength, it became a more effective vehicle for that.

TRELEVEN: Well, this sort of brings us back to Franklin Murphy. Where do you begin to assess his impact, I guess first of all keeping it in the context of the Alumni Association, as an individual who did give the association a little broader vision than it had had?

HALDEMAN: Well, he gave the whole university a broader vision than it had ever had, I think, and that's my feeling. I think that my personal feeling is that the arrival of Franklin Murphy at UCLA marks the beginning of the emergence of UCLA as a separate entity of enormous stature and distinction in its own right rather than as being a part of the University of California, which to the world was Berkeley. And I think Franklin had

a vision and a driving. . . . Provided a driving force to achieve that vision of bringing UCLA into the circle of great universities of the world. And I think he was the one who really got it started. I don't think. . . . I don't have the feeling, and I could very well be wrong, but I don't have the feeling that anybody before that really had that view. Until Franklin came along I think it was more generally accepted even though often resented that UCLA was the Southern Branch of Berkeley and that, sure, we were getting big and we were getting better athletic teams from time to time and things like that, but the Nobel Prize winners and the big dudes were all in Berkeley. And I think Bob Sproul was a major factor in that. I think that probably Clark Kerr was a major factor university-wide in letting some of what Franklin Murphy brought in the way of drive develop into results. I don't think Sproul would have hired Murphy to begin with, and I don't think he would have left him loose for as long as he stayed loose actually. Obviously Murphy outlived Kerr as it turned out in the university. But I have always felt that

Franklin was really the catalytic force that made UCLA, that emerged UCLA from the shadows.

TRELEVEN: Well, in connection with another interview I've done--in fact I'm doing--with [Robert G.] Bob Vosper, who is the librarian emeritus . . .

HALDEMAN: Librarian, sure.

TRELEVEN: . . . who had worked with Dr. Murphy in [University of] Kansas. In terms of the context of my doing background research for that, the fact clearly emerged that Murphy had really built a close alliance with the alumni association at KU. So he comes to UCLA, and it seems to me that he definitely sets out to do the same thing at UCLA.

HALDEMAN: Absolutely.

TRELEVEN: I guess what I'm trying to get here is your sense of Murphy's role in energizing the Alumni Association.

HALDEMAN: Okay. I would say that it starts with his role in energizing the university, because I think if there weren't something for the Alumni Association to energize around outside of just being the Alumni Association. . . . You're an alumnus of something and your stature as an

alumnus of that is dependent upon the stature of that that you're an alumnus of. So as the university becomes great, the alumni become alumni of a great university instead of a second-level university. So as you see somebody building the university to greatness, you as an alumnus get excited about helping him do something about that in various ways. And Franklin had the wonderful ability to articulate his goals and his dreams and his objectives and all that in a very inspiring fashion, and he was willing to spend the time and make the effort to do that with alumni groups. He was a very responsive chancellor in terms of when we alumni needed help in trying to do something, whether it was the Pauley Pavilion drive for the Memorial Activities Center, or later when I was alumni president and we were trying to restructure the Alumni Association, which we did, and then the foundation and the fund-raising arm of it. A lot of the things we were working on within the overall university picture I guess, too. It was his. . . . He clearly had some level of recognition or some feeling of either the actual

or potential value of the Alumni Association. He was willing to help build it, because he saw that it would be one way of helping to build the university, which it has been. And I think he was willing to put a lot of effort and his name behind the Memorial Activities Center drive, which was in the overall picture of things a pretty insignificant kind of a little thing, because the drive itself, the fund-raising drive, our goal was only \$1 million. We only had to raise \$2 million, and Pauley provided one of them. It was a \$5 million project with \$3 million coming from athletic, students, and state, and \$2 million from the alumni. But he put a lot of. . . . When we needed him for a luncheon or we wanted to have a special thing for a big donor at his house or something like that or a little tea party or something or needed him to speak at some other outside gathering, he was not always but usually available, and he would come in and give it an all-out effort. He was so good at it that, you know, it was really worth having him at those things. Some of those people, you know, they'll come, but they don't

help you much when they're there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. How about the goal of achieving parity with Berkeley? Did he articulate that publicly?

HALDEMAN: No.

TRELEVEN: As you remember.

HALDEMAN: I certainly don't remember and I would not. . . . I'm kind of surprised at the question, because I don't recall hearing it expressed or thinking about the progress of UCLA in the context of achieving parity with Berkeley at all. It was in the context of achieving status in the topmost echelon of American universities without regard to Berkeley. I mean, it was with regard to Harvard [University], Princeton [University], Yale [University], Columbia [University], [University of] Michigan or whatever public universities or private and all that. And Franklin, as I recall his comparisons, and he was constantly using his benchmarks and he always had thirteen different things that he'd say we had now arrived in the world ranks of, you know. He'd move them on up, saying we had the most bones in our graveyard or whatever it was, the most books in our library, and all that sort of

thing. I don't recall it--certainly not being acutely aware of it--being in any attempt to equal or top Berkeley so much as it was to simply arrive in the utmost ranks, uppermost ranks.

TRELEVEN: I am using the word parity relating to financial resources. For instance, to take one example, in terms of the library where funding for library from what we now know as UC systemwide was a bit shaded in favor of Berkeley, and at a time when UCLA had maybe half the number of volumes.

HALDEMAN: I still don't remember it in a context as anything vis-à-vis Berkeley but rather in just, you know, we need to get two million volumes in our library, and it wasn't. . . . He would fight for university funds but he would fight for outside funds. You know, he'd work all the things he could, and not only funds but contributions. He did a marvelous job of working people for collections: books and artifacts and the various kinds of art objects and paintings and everything else.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, he had a nice network.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, he really did. And he loved it. He loved playing that role in that world.

TRELEVEN: First of all, let me lead into this by saying you do become Alumni Association president in 1966, but that means you were the vice president the year before?

HALDEMAN: No, I became president by accident.

TRELEVEN: Oh, tell me.

HALDEMAN: As a result of the Memorial Activities Center campaign, which was considered a great success and all that by the time it was done . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes, I'm sure.

HALDEMAN: . . . and I had had to officiate a lot of major ceremonies and activities, so I had achieved some level of status in the UCLA alumni and faculty and administration community. And Tom Davis's vice president or successor. . . . It isn't vice president. Vice president doesn't move up to the presidency or didn't then. The vice president was normally a woman, and, I mean, we were. . . . You know, it was all pretty stereotyped. I mean, they were all white Anglo-Saxon Protestants, and . . .

TRELEVEN: Male-female in terms of top positions.

HALDEMAN: As I recall, it was pretty. . . . I can't remember who. . . . It's terrible, but I can't

remember who the vice presidents were, but it was pretty much the president. . . . Well, all the presidents were men until very recently.

TRELEVEN: Very recently.

HALDEMAN: And of course, prior to my becoming president they were all prewar graduates.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: Then after I became president I think they've all been postwar graduates. I don't think we ever went back to the prewar crowd. But in any event, they elected a president elect the year before he became president I think.

TRELEVEN: That's probably right. It was . . .

HALDEMAN: And you served a year as president elect and then two years as president or something like that.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so it's president elect, not vice president. I think that's what it is.

HALDEMAN: I think that's right.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: And the president elect was [Daniel L.] Dan Duggan under Tom Davis, and Duggan was the chief executive officer of Coldwell Banker. And right after he was elected president elect, Coldwell Banker went through a corporate reorganization. I

think what it was was they were originally. . . .
At that time they were a partnership and they became a public corporation. Anyway, they went through a major internal structural thing that caused Dan Duggan to decide that this wasn't the time for him to be president of the UCLA Alumni Association, and so he resigned as president elect. And Tom Davis and John Vaughn I think-- again these same two guys--talked to me about would I be willing or interested in being president elect and becoming president to succeed Tom and replace Dan Duggan in that role. And I said yeah and did. So I was not president elect for a full year. Dan Duggan was president elect for most of the term, whatever it was, I think it was a year. I came in sort of at the end of it when Dan pulled out and then moved right into becoming president of the association at Tom's end. And the president is president for a two-year term, the first year of which in those days he served as regent designate and then the second year as the voting regent.

TRELEVEN: Okay, that squares with the data I have. Now, what's important about this, and you alluded to

it and I want to get back to it, is that when you were elected president you still had the Progress Fund?

HALDEMAN: Yes, I think so.

TRELEVEN: And it was after you became president that you and others decided to essentially turn the Alumni Association upside down.

HALDEMAN: Right. When you come into a job like that you usually come in with some kind of an agenda or you fall into an agenda or something that needs to be done now, whether it can be something important or something not important.

TRELEVEN: You had an agenda?

HALDEMAN: Well, yeah. It was to reorganize the Alumni Association, and I guess that's sort of my pattern. I tend to get into that. I'm obviously structure oriented and everything that I get into I tend to reorganize it.

TRELEVEN: Okay, but then I want to get back to the question again. You've probably answered it and I'm not hearing it, but why did it need to be restructured? Why did you feel it needed to be restructured?

HALDEMAN: Because I didn't. . . . Well, there were a lot of

reasons and they weren't all mine. Mine was a synthesis of the reasons that seemed to be coming out, that I had had from my experience as a scholarship chairman, running the fund drive and dealing with the Alumni Association there and the alumni staff and that sort of thing, and seeing that we were a less effective. . . . I think the feeling was that we were a much less effective force and less effective service to the alumni because of the looseness of our structure and the fact that we. . . . It sort of gets back to the, you know, what was it doing? The question was, what was it doing? I mean, we weren't really doing anything. What were the Bruin Clubs doing? What were the athletic support and all the other things, the Prytaneans and the . . . ? I forget, there's that whole slew of . . .

TRELEVEN: Gold Shield [Alumnae of UCLA]?

HALDEMAN: Yeah. All these fringe organizations that were all rattling around with their own agendas and their own causes and no combination. And it seemed that we had the opportunity by coalescing all of that into an entity that is the overall Alumni Association with all of its integral

parts, each carrying on their separate program but with some coordination and with representation. Because there were. . . .

Conflicts is too hard or battles is certainly too hard, but there were differences of objectives and means and everything else in the perceptions of these various organizations. Some wanted to take care of scholarship things, some wanted to support athletics, some wanted to collect libraries or art museums, and some just wanted to have a good social time. There were various motivations involved, and they would be in conflict or in non-agreement at least as to both ways and means and desired results. So the whole thing was to try and get it coordinated, and then there didn't seem to be any real reason for the Alumni Association board of directors and what it did. This goes way back to my first sort of association thing after I got out of school, which was the Junior Chamber of Commerce, I think. And I joined the Junior Chamber of Commerce in San Francisco when I moved out of New York to San Francisco with J. Walter Thompson. I went to meetings, and they had a meeting once a

week I think on Wednesday for lunch or something like that. And I'd go to those meetings, and most of the meeting they would sit around and say, "What should we do?" You know, "We need a program, we need to do something." And then they'd talk and talk. I finally got fed up and I said, "It seems to me what we should do is adjourn permanently, because if we don't have any reason to be then why do we be?" And that's sort of I guess what bugs me on everything I get involved in. There's too many things that are there because they're there rather than because there's a reason for them to be there. And if there isn't a reason I don't see any point in having the thing. And I think I felt there was something of that kind of an issue in the Alumni Association. Obviously it had some reasons for being. But then I think you had the drive of Franklin Murphy and the successes in that campaign and the feeling that there was a lot we could do in fund-raising that we weren't even beginning to scratch the surface of, that there was a lot more we could do in the way of political support, in the way of mobilizing

alumni and special interest alumni--you know, to get the canoe club going and the kayak club going and the row boat club and anybody else that wanted a club and let them feel a part of this thing tied to their own interest and support the university's interests in the area of their common interest. But to coordinate it through an overall entity so the university didn't have to deal with all these loose apparatuses scattered all over and that there's something that could fund itself and also provide funds for other ongoing things. It wasn't all my idea by any means. It was sort of a seeing a need and trying to put the need together and do something about it. To me the way to do something about things is to restructure them so that the structure reflects what it is you are trying to do and then you can do it. Whereas if you try to do it and then try to structure it, it doesn't work. And so we set in. The time was right. Franklin was a good force for pushing for reorganization. I think he wanted reorganization. I'm sure we talked about it in terms of his concept and may well without my knowledge--you gave me a little

clue to this--have come out of his experience at Kansas. And he may well have had an alumni relationship there that he felt he could build here, but he needed a better alumni apparatus to build it with. And I suspect that he provided a fair amount of impetus towards the reorganization.

TRELEVEN: So the cornerstone of the reorganization--I'm just trying to get this straight--the cornerstone of the reorganization was the establishment of the UCLA Foundation?

HALDEMAN: No.

TRELEVEN: No.

HALDEMAN: The original cornerstone was the restructuring of the association itself.

TRELEVEN: Okay, maybe you better explain it to me.

HALDEMAN: Well, I'm not sure I can because I'm not sure I remember. [Laughter] What happened was we said that we ought to restructure it so that we have a board of directors of the Alumni Association elected by the alumni at large the way we did, but that we ought to have an ex officio board that's a much broader thing that's a coordinating council type of thing that consists of the

chairman--so they'd be ex officio members of this council--chairman of all recognized university support activities, and that they'd have representation. So Prytanean could come in with Gold Shield and say, "We want to do this instead of you doing this. We want to give this scholarship to the prettiest girl in L.A. High," or whatever thing they were doing.

TRELEVEN: Sure, sure.

HALDEMAN: And so that resulted in a restructuring as I recall--I wish I could remember this more clearly--of setting up the organization of the association in a different way in terms of who constituted the board and how its programs and policies and so forth were conceived and implemented.

TRELEVEN: And through the ex officio mechanism setting up then the basis for a coordinative vehicle . . .

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . so everyone isn't stumbling . . .

HALDEMAN: Both to come in and to go out.

TRELEVEN: To go out.

HALDEMAN: To mobilize all of our resources so that if you were going to do another Memorial Activities

Center campaign you'd have a much broader base for doing it.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: And that you'd mobilize people to support the university by virtue not necessarily of just their generic love for the university but because they thought it had a great horticultural garden or something, you know, and they wanted to support that or a good Ping-Pong team or whatever else it might be.

TRELEVEN: Right. Well . . .

HALDEMAN: And obviously the important things there were the academic support things. We had the school alumni in trying to tie into the engineering alumni and the business alumni and the medical alumni.

TRELEVEN: Endowed chairs and . . .

HALDEMAN: Endowed chairs carry on their interest to support research and in other ways support outside stuff, provide housing, provide communication vehicles, and everything else.

TRELEVEN: Okay, now what's the connection between . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . that and the foundation?

TRELEVEN: . . . reconstituting the Progress Fund board into

the foundation?

HALDEMAN: I would really need more history than I've got. There was a good reason. The Progress Fund was simply a fund collected and dispersed by the Alumni Association through its scholarship committees and whatever. The concept of the foundation I think was first of all to get it out of the Alumni Association and into a separate entity so that it wasn't limited to alumni, but provided university-wide support, an external support mechanism rather than just an alumni support mechanism. But a good starting point was to transfer the alumni support, which didn't amount to much in terms of financial stuff--it was the Progress Fund--to get rid of it and merge it all into this new foundation thing that would be a separate standing entity. I can't remember whether the foundation is an entity of its own or whether gifts. . . . In other words, do you give a gift now to the foundation, or do you still give it to the regents?

TRELEVEN: Let me think that through a minute.

HALDEMAN: Whether or not we changed, I think that was one of the things we had in mind. I don't know

whether we succeeded. I can't remember whether we succeeded or not.

TRELEVEN: To give the gift to the regents, you write a check to the regents, but it goes through the development office and foundation mechanism.

HALDEMAN: So you do still write the check to the Regents of the University of California?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: That's what we were trying to get away from, one of the things. We were trying to get to a thing where you could support the UCLA Foundation by writing a check to the UCLA Foundation so that you knew that your support was going to what you were aiming it at and so that we could promote and develop on the basis of the party's interests in UCLA as contrasted to a broader interest in the University of California, because the University of California is an even more amorphous mass than UCLA is.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, but I think they've got the mechanism definitely worked out so that you . . .

HALDEMAN: The funds go there, I know.

TRELEVEN: Oh, that's right, I mean, through a very complex accounting mechanism now.

HALDEMAN: But one of the things that came out of the Pauley Pavilion drive was that you had to make your check out to the Regents of the University of California, and we would have rather had you make your check out to the UCLA Memorial Activities Center.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: Because if I'm giving to the Red Cross then I'd rather give to the Red Cross than give to the Community Chest, let's say, which is going to give a little to the Red Cross.

TRELEVEN: But it's a convenient vehicle, because the regents are set up as a [IRS Code] 501(c)(3), nonprofit organization.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, but it's easy to set one of those up. There's a jillion of those now. Every rich family has at least one.

TRELEVEN: What in turn does that have to do with the Franklin Murphy Associates?

HALDEMAN: I'm not sure.

TRELEVEN: I was assuming that was set up during your presidency, but perhaps . . .

HALDEMAN: I think some of it was, and what we were doing then was trying to set up some levels as we had

in the athletic things. You had the Bruin Bench, which was the \$100--no, the ten dollars a year thing or something. And then there was Sportsmen of the South that was \$100 a year. So they were going to set up Chancellor's Associates and then the blue ribbon or the . . .

TRELEVEN: So it's tiered.

HALDEMAN: Set up tiers with varying levels of recognition, and we put a lot of that into the Memorial. . . . That was the first time we had done that. In the Memorial Activities Center campaign we put a lot of. . . . You know, special donors got four seats and major donors got six seats plus lifetime parking. We tried to build in these. . . . And how big a name you got on the plaque and all that sort of stuff. And we built that in or they built that into the foundation, because I think the history was. . . . I think I was the first president of the foundation also, because I think in the corporate thing we in effect dissolved the Progress Fund into the corporation. I can't remember what the process was, but it's my recollection that somebody else, Roger [C.] Pettitt or somebody, says that that's not the

case, that the first president was Dudley [E.] Browne. I know that Dudley Browne became president or chairman or whatever it is of the foundation while I was still in office, but I think in the interim I functioned in that role too for a while from a corporate viewpoint to get it set up. But anyway, it doesn't make a lot of difference.

TRELEVEN: Something worth checking. So really the slight to Murphy Associates . . .

HALDEMAN: Isn't that a part of the foundation?

TRELEVEN: That's right. I assume that this is what has become the Chancellor's Associates, which meets once a . . .

HALDEMAN: Well, one of them gets a black tie dinner at the chancellor's house once a year, and the next one gets a lunch at the Faculty Center once a year or something. It's just a way of recognizing the degree of contribution that's made by various levels of people. And I'm not in any of them at this point, so I'm not really current as to how they're structured.

TRELEVEN: Right. Now was the fund-raising activity for the [James E.] West Center, was that being talked

about or taking place while you were president?

HALDEMAN: No, the Memorial Activities Center was initially conceived as the pavilion and MAC A and MAC B, Memorial Activities Center A and Memorial Activities Center B, which would be two out buildings, one of which I think got built with Pauley Pavilion and the second of which became the John Wooden Center. The other is the athletic department center or something. I've lost even my fix on the geography there now.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, well, you've got . . .

HALDEMAN: There was going to be the pavilion and then two buildings outside of it. And then the West Center I think evolved later, because we didn't get. . . . They didn't finish MAC B. They didn't do the second Memorial Activities Center building. They just did the pavilion and one, and that was because costs went up on the pavilion after the thing got going and we had to make a lot of cuts even to get the pavilion built the way it was.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. Yeah, there had to be some redesigning.

HALDEMAN: But West Center as an alumni center was something that was talked about but I think was not in any

way a part of the Memorial Activities Center program.

TRELEVEN: Okay. For the uninitiated who are listening to this, the West Center is really the home now of the Alumni Association.

HALDEMAN: Right, and it was built as such. It was built as the place for the Alumni Association headquarters.

TRELEVEN: Right. And of course, a lot of development activities to this day run out of the West Center.

HALDEMAN: Right. Right.

TRELEVEN: One other question I might ask you is along in the sixties the idea was floated about building a major football stadium.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: What were your feelings about that?

HALDEMAN: I was all for it.

TRELEVEN: You were?

HALDEMAN: Yes. Very strongly.

TRELEVEN: [Assemblyman Thomas M.] Tom Rees wasn't.

HALDEMAN: Well, Buff Chandler wasn't either.

TRELEVEN: Well, tell me the background of that.

HALDEMAN: I don't know all of it. I know that there was

. . . . It looked as if that dream which had been a dream for a long time of a lot of people was . . .

TRELEVEN: Instead of playing at the [Los Angeles Memorial] Coliseum.

HALDEMAN: Right. Was at the point of fulfillment, or potential fulfillment. We had gotten over as I understood it--or the administration, the planning people, the internal university people, and the community relations stuff and all that--had gotten to the point where there was still opposition obviously, but where it looked like the thing was ready to roll. And it came to the regents for. . . . As I recall it had preliminary approval and then came for final approval, and my recollection subject to verification, because I But my recollection is that the vote was positive, but Buff Chandler wasn't in the meeting. Then she came in and voted the other way, and that sank the football stadium. Now whether it would have been completed ultimately I'm not sure, even if it had passed that particular regents' vote. But it certainly wasn't completed when it failed that vote. And I want to hedge that again. I'm not sure my facts

are. . . . That's an impression that I have, a recollection that I have now.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think it is a fact that residents of Bel Air were not very happy about it.

HALDEMAN: There was strong opposition to it. There were strong arguments both ways, and I still think as a UCLA partisan that I wish it were there now. The Rose Bowl beats the heck out of the Coliseum, but the seats aren't very comfortable.

TRELEVEN: Well, I mean, you know, one thing that comes to mind in reading through years of regents' minutes is that if you're going to build a building, you've got to have parking spaces. And for the football stadium, how the heck would you ever park?

HALDEMAN: I forget. That was worked out though to what at least at the time I believed was an adequate answer to that question. Part of it being that you had a lot of. . . . It was a scheduling thing. There was an enormous parking capacity and a lot of new parking capacity on line in long-range master plans for the university that if scheduling were done properly would be available, could mesh with the academic uses of

the parking lot. And you'd schedule games and major events in the stadium for times that wouldn't be big demands on the parking for other purposes. But that wouldn't solve the whole thing. I don't know how many. . . . Well, I don't know. How many spaces do we have on campus now? We have a lot.

TRELEVEN: I don't know the answer to that.

HALDEMAN: I haven't any idea.

TRELEVEN: It's interesting though. Anytime anything is to take place on the campus that takes away parking spaces, a report must be submitted to the systemwide. That's how conscious . . .

HALDEMAN: But we don't have adequate parking, because I have a Blue V parking permit that theoretically let's me park virtually anywhere and . . .

[End Tape 3, Side A]

[Begin Tape 3, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Well, when the tape ended we were commiserating about parking and that despite your privileged sticker you have problems finding a parking space. It's a universal complaint.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. And obviously if we had a stadium it would be a more universal complaint, so maybe it's a

good thing we don't. For community relations I'm sure it probably is.

TRELEVEN: Well, I'm reminded by the real old-timers like Bill Forbes for instance that parking was a problem way back for different reasons of course. They had all of the space in the world, but there was no paving, and it would rain and mud and dust and so on and so forth. And space to some extent up in the quad area when the ravine went through and so on.

HALDEMAN: What was it that Franklin Murphy, or maybe it was Sproul, but somebody was supposed to have said that the mission of the university administrator was to provide, what is it, pay for the faculty, parking for the students--sex for the students, and parking for the alumni.

TRELEVEN: I think that was Clark Kerr.

HALDEMAN: Was it Kerr?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Okay. And I've misstated it some too.

TRELEVEN: Yeah. How active was [Charles E.] Chuck Young in all of this?

HALDEMAN: Very.

TRELEVEN: Who Franklin was we can say in hindsight

grooming.

HALDEMAN: Grooming, right.

TRELEVEN: But that was not so apparent at the time.

HALDEMAN: I'm not sure it was apparent to Franklin either at the time. I don't know that he was grooming him at the outset. I think that he was certainly getting a lot of very effective help from Chuck on what he was doing and had used Chuck very effectively, and Chuck functioned very effectively in tandem with Franklin, at least in the time I was there.

TRELEVEN: And in connection with the Alumni Association and foundation things that we've been discussing, was Chuck quite heavily involved in all that as well?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, but Franklin, it wasn't a matter of Franklin shoving it off to Chuck. But Chuck was available to back up and all that, but Franklin was very much in evidence himself in all those things. Chuck was always, you know, if you couldn't get Franklin you could get Chuck and he'd get it done for you. He could be very helpful, and we learned to work with Chuck, because a lot of things you don't want to bother the chancellor with but you need to get something

worked out. And you knew in working with Chuck that it would be worked out and that it would go through, and it was. I felt a very good working relationship with Chuck as alumni president as well as with Franklin. Chuck reflected Franklin's very strong positive attitude of cooperation with the alumni, with the association as an entity.

TRELEVEN: Okay, is there anything more you'd like to say about the Alumni Association per se?

HALDEMAN: I guess not, not that I can think of.

Unfortunately, it's funny, but that whole period was so. . . . You know, I moved right from alumni to regents, and then the regent thing into the government, and then the government thing became so overwhelming that it sort of blotted out the immediate preceding years. You know, I have some general recollections. I think we've covered the important stuff on the Alumni Association.

TRELEVEN: That's my impression. Well, moving onto the most important function of the Alumni Association president--I say when I'm smiling--and that is you are one year a regent designate and a second year a voting member of the board of regents of

the university.

HALDEMAN: Right. And that I really did feel was the most important part of it. I loved it and I thought that was a marvelous opportunity.

TRELEVEN: Well, it was certainly an interesting period.

HALDEMAN: It sure was.

TRELEVEN: Just to sort of give us a baseline here, you attended your first regents' meeting according to the minutes on July 16, 1965. And that was not all that long after the Free Speech Movement and what's referred to sometimes as a "filthy speech movement." Leading up to your beginning of that year of observership in the regents, those activities had caused a rather strong reaction amongst the regents. So that is part of the scenario. That's not quite fair though, that sounds too negative, because the positive things going on were there were new campuses being built, there were new buildings being built on the older campuses, and a flurry of building activity as well. So it might be looked back on I suppose as a decade of unparalleled capital . . .

HALDEMAN: I think that really it was a very fortuitous time to have been on the regents, because we had a

very large bag of very positive growth and development issues to deal with and a lot of ferment on the positive side in the educational system and process. I mean, there was a lot going on, plus some really monumental challenges on the negative side from the student unrest and all the sort of stuff that you were referring to earlier.

TRELEVEN: Well, tell me to begin with, what is it like to walk into your first meeting with this august group of people?

HALDEMAN: It's a little awesome. It's a little awesome, and was I suspect more so then than it is now in that the regents' formality it seems to me was greater and the traditional standard procedures that everything went through and all. I have the feeling that it's become less formal and a little more laid back than it was at that time. We had some pretty towering figures on the board at that time too. You had the visibility and the foment within the university and the controversies that were swirling about externally because of that. So I was very much awed by coming into a regent meeting with the prospect of becoming a regent

and found it fascinating.

TRELEVEN: Well, according to the minutes, you, like any new regent, were introduced formally as being regent designate of. . . . I don't know who made the announcement. I suppose the chair at that time, which would have been [Edward W.] Ed Carter at the time you went to your first meeting. But what happens after that? In other words, was there a process by which you would begin to learn the ropes?

HALDEMAN: Not a formal process. My approach, and people kept encouraging me to speak up, my approach as a regent designate. . . . I was told that I had the right to speak, not to vote, but to speak, but I felt that I really didn't and that I shouldn't, and I don't know if the minutes disprove this, but I don't think I did speak very much except maybe to answer some specific question in some area that I was involved in, like a UCLA situation of some kind. But I felt that it was my job and I had the opportunity as regent designate, which was wonderful, wherein I didn't have to vote, so I didn't have to decide what I was going to do on any issue. Not only I didn't

have to, I couldn't vote. But I did have the benefit of sitting in on all the sessions, including the executive sessions, and I think pretty much anything except the Finance Committee. Pauley wouldn't let anybody in there.

TRELEVEN: Is that . . . ? He wouldn't? [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: I don't think so. I think it was Pauley and Carter and [Norton] Simon, and that was. . . . You had to. . . . Well, anyway it seemed. . . . I had the feeling that was a pretty closed . . .

TRELEVEN: These were the executive sessions of the Finance Committee?

HALDEMAN: I guess so. I finally ended up on the Finance Committee, but by then I was gone so it didn't do me any good. But what I found as a new regent was, first of all, I had never participated in anything that was as deeply involved in as broad a range of things as the regents were and that required not only an all-day meeting on Thursday and an all-day meeting on Friday, but an all-day meeting on Wednesday of various committees and things often working up to other things, and then very intensive meetings starting with a breakfast meeting, a formal meeting, a luncheon with

students or something like that, another formal meeting, and then a dinner with faculty or something like that, or some sort of a symposium. I mean, there was always something like that, or a briefing by the Los Alamos [Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory] people or Livermore [Lawrence Livermore Laboratory], or some medical development thing, whatever. Then the same kind of stuff all day Friday, going to the open formal meeting of the whole board where we took the final actions on everything, and the incredible volume of paper that preceded and accompanied all that. That really was mind-boggling, because before the meeting you'd get this briefing packet from Marjorie [J.] Woolman that was, you know, "Get this read and know everything that's there by the time you get to the meeting." I found you really put in an enormous amount of time and thought on it, and I tried to do that and I basically did as a regent designate just as. . . . That to me was the training ground. There was no. . . . Formally, nobody took you aside and said, "Here's lesson one, and we'll go on. Here's lesson two." It was sort of sit there and watch and

figure it out. I found right from the outset that the regents--which surprised me--that the regents were very cordial towards me and towards my, you know, the other people that came in similar things in later years and all that. There was much more of an openness than I had expected there might be. I had sort of viewed it. . . . You think of a board which in those years was a board composed most of it of people on sixteen-year terms and some of them in their second sixteen-year term.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: That this is a pretty, you know, old boy kind of outfit, and this kid coming in from down South is, you know, they're not going to be real excited about. But they were most cordial including--which was one of the most interesting things to me in the first meeting--including Pat Brown, who was at the first meeting that I went to. He came for dinner. He wasn't at the meeting, but he was there for the dinner the first night. And at that point it was a regents-only dinner and there was some question as to whether I should be there, because there was

going to be some kind of a knock-down-drag-out battle, and I forget what it was about, discussed, but then they decided yes. But anyway, I came into the dinner, and Pat Brown in his inimitable fashion made a point, came over, welcomed me by name, couldn't have been more enthusiastic and pleasant and said how wonderful it was. And I said, "I've got to tell you that I think it is too, because if I had succeeded in my mission, you wouldn't be here tonight, and I'm kind of glad I failed." [Laughter] We kidded each other and we've had that kind of a relationship ever since. I don't see him often and it's usually at some large public function and I don't go to many of those if I can avoid them. But when we do it's. . . . I don't like to impose on him, but he always makes a point of coming over, saying hello, chatting, saying you know he wants to get together, "We've got to get together," you know, "I just want to have lunch with you. There's a lot of stuff we ought to talk about." We never get around to doing it and we never have. I think he's a terrific guy. I really was impressed with the way he handled all

of that, because I think the regents were a little concerned about what was going to happen when, you know, I had run what they perceived and partly rightly a dirty campaign against him, and how would he react and how would I react and all that. It couldn't have been more comfortable. And it was beyond comfortable, it was fun. And I think it was for Pat Brown, too. He sure showed no signs of any tension, and some of the others did.

TRELEVEN: Some of the other regents?

HALDEMAN: Yeah. Some of the other regents at the outset, but not many of them. Well, I guess that really isn't right, except possibly [William M.] Bill Roth. He was the only. . . . I had the feeling Roth was sort of icy. [Speaker of the Assembly] Jesse [M.] Unruh I had no problem with. [Lieutenant Governor] Glenn [M.] Anderson I had no problem with on the political side of things. [William K.] Coblentz and [Frederick G.] Dutton, we became real buddies.

TRELEVEN: Buddies?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, very much so.

TRELEVEN: Well, they are pretty far over on the left, so to

speaking, aren't they?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, but we were all political professionals and perceived ourselves as such. Coblenz and I, I would say had a really strong personal friendship. We were on the same side of a number of issues and we were on the opposite side of others, and when we were on the opposite it was always with I think both ways substantial respect for the other guy.

TRELEVEN: You're fairly close in age too, aren't you?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, yeah. I think I'm probably older than Coblenz, maybe not. We are fairly close in age. I think Dutton's a little older, but not much. And Dutton was much more of a partisan political fighter, but, again, he understood where I was coming from and I understood where he was coming from, and we could laugh about the political stuff. I had a wonderful relationship with [Elinor R.] Ellie Heller, who was Madam Democrat, and she loved to talk about politics. We'd in the evening times, you know, when you ended up after a meeting sitting around for a while before you go back to your room or something, I had some wonderful talks with Ellie

Heller. I had enormous respect for her. And I got along well with Buff Chandler. That had developed in some ways into a strained relationship because of the relationship between the Times and Nixon, which had gotten strained to some extent. But she was as I said a good friend of my mother's, and we sat together and talked at meetings a fair amount, so that was fine.

TRELEVEN: Was she as a Buffum somewhat more liberal than the Chandlers?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, I think so. And I don't think. . . . Nixon's rapport with the Times was clearly through Kyle Palmer and Norman Chandler, not through Buff or Otis [Chandler]. Buff and Otis were generally over here, and Norman and his father and Harry Chandler and Kyle Palmer, the political guru, were very much over on the right. But there was a recognition of the political differences, but we had a good political balance on the board pretty much. At least I had the feeling we did. I don't know whether the facts verify that or not. [Philip L.] Phil Boyd was a Republican political type. John Canaday was a Republican political type. Ed

Carter was a Republican political. Dorothy Chandler was a Republican, but semipolitical. Coblentz was substantial left. Dutton was substantial left. In later times [Lieutenant Governor Robert] Bob Finch was Republican obviously. Forbes is basically nonpartisan. He was probably a Republican, is probably a Republican. Catherine [C.] Hearst is a super-Republican. Ellie Heller was a Democrat. [DeWitt A.] Dutch Higgs was a Democrat. [Charles J.] Charley Hitch I don't know. Clark Kerr I don't know. [Theodore R.] Ted Meyer, Meyer was a Republican, but not a partisan Republican at all. Ed Pauley was a Democrat. Max Rafferty presented an image, he really did. I think he did it in studied fashion a lot of the time of being a maniac. There was a pretty shrewd guy underneath the facade, but the facade could be pretty startling at times. Bill Roth was a Democrat. Norton Simon was a Democrat. Jesse Unruh was a Democrat. I think there was a pretty good balance on there.

TRELEVEN: Simon's a Republican.

HALDEMAN: Was he?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: That's right, he was going to run for governor, wasn't he?

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: I had forgotten that.

TRELEVEN: He challenged [United States Senator] George [L.] Murphy in the primary of 1970.

HALDEMAN: I had forgotten that. I was thinking of Simon as a Democrat. He was very close to Ellie Heller.

TRELEVEN: He took liberal stances.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, a very liberal Republican in a lot of areas.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: You're right. But obviously you had a lot of leftovers from Warren and Goodie Knight on the board, and then the Pat Brown legacy on the board during the time I was there.

TRELEVEN: So getting back to something that you said before, I take it that you had never quite observed a board of directors of this type in the private sector.

HALDEMAN: Well, I really hadn't been involved with a board of directors in the private sector in the sense of any major operation. I had been involved with

these civic organization boards and that sort of thing, but those were. . . . And that's the way I guess I pictured a board as being. But J. Walter Thompson during the entire time I was with the company was a privately held company owned by the employees, not a public company. They had a board of directors, but it functioned as a private board. I never attended a board meeting, although I was a vice president of the company, so I have no idea what happened at their board meetings. And I had no involvement in any of our clients' boards of directors. I dealt with top management but not the board. And then the other boards that I was on would be boards that met for two or three hours in an afternoon or something like that, you know. I never had gone through this two- or three-day exercise and with all the paper. And then when you really get into seeing what they are governing, it is awesome. And it stayed awesome for me all the time I was there. It dwindled rather substantially when I got into my next job and saw that there was even more awesome things than the Board of Regents of the University of California. But it was. . . . And

these were people that were very impressive people to me. I mean, they were the real pillars of the establishment in the state on both sides, and I found that to be a fascinating experience to watch them at work. And also I had not had the kind of exposure that that provided to the academic world, the academic administration world, the educational administration world, and the people of the Clark Kerr, Franklin Murphy-- you name them--[Daniel G.] Dan Aldrich, and [Vernon I.] Vern Cheadle, Roger [W.] Heyns, and all the people of . . .

TRELEVEN: John [S.] Galbraith.

HALDEMAN: Yeah. Yeah, right, I forgot about John. I hadn't! I knew John, because he got the faculty of the year award from UCLA when I was alumni chairman.

TRELEVEN: Oh.

HALDEMAN: So we presented Galbraith with his. . . . He was I forget what it was, but we gave a medal to the top faculty person each year, and he got it the year I was president. That was actually the same time I went on the regents. That was all at the same time. Anyway, it wasn't before. But

anyhow, I found it very, very interesting, challenging, and enjoyable.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you spent a year observing. What did you learn?

HALDEMAN: Well, boy, what did I learn? I learned a lot. I learned how to read all those voluminous papers without having to go through all every last line of them, but to be ready to consider an enormous range of issues at each meeting. I learned that you had a real range of views and approaches and methods of working on that board and that the twenty-four regents were a pretty diverse group and that it was important to learn how to work with each of them individually as well as with the board as a board. And I think I gained some ground in that. I had the feeling that I developed a very good relationship really with all the regents. I sort of felt that was a challenge that I had to figure out the way to do. And I always had the feeling, my own feeling, of being a somewhat second-rate regent, because these people were. . . . Well, there were eight ex officios, but most of the ex officios were there for four years or more.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: Some of them more. And the sixteen of them were sixteen-year termers, so they were going to or had been or would be or both around for a long time, and I was really only there to vote, to really participate for one year. By the time I got up to speed it was time for me to leave pretty much. The concept of the regent-in-waiting thing, the regent designate, I think is excellent. I think having that year to observe without having the responsibility of voting is a very good thing or was. I guess they still operate on that basis, but I don't know.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, it's still done. It's wider, more widely spread now.

HALDEMAN: Wider representation. It isn't UCLA every other year anymore.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: I think that's good, because I think you need the time to get up to speed. I learned a lot about the university system, how it functions as a system, which I knew absolutely nothing about, and the complexities of the system, the management of the funds. I mean, the working of

the Finance Committee I never got into, but you got the results. It was interesting. The Educational Policy [Committee] thing was even more interesting. The diversity of the university was something that I hadn't really realized--how diverse the campuses were and how much came together in bringing them together as a university system. Of course, we were in the really intensive growth stage at Irvine and Santa Cruz and Santa Barbara.

TRELEVEN: And San Diego.

HALDEMAN: And San Diego. The four campuses. I knew there were four, I just didn't remember the fourth one. And then Riverside in its own way also was not new growth, but there was substantial change and expansion.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: So there was a lot of ferment above and beyond the ferment that came as student ferment on the campus. Well, those are the kinds of things I learned. The specifics would be the specifics of those things, and those I can't recall to you, because it was an enormous amount of detail. You learn how to deal with that detail, make a

decision, vote on it, and go onto the next one.

TRELEVEN: But during the year you were just observing, would you get together with your Berkeley colleague, the one who had the vote, I think it was John [R.] Mage?

HALDEMAN: Curious coincidence there, John Mage was the Berkeley president and he happened to have been the best man at my parents' wedding. He was my dad's best friend in high school . . .

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned.

HALDEMAN: . . . and college. And here he was the president of the [UC] Berkeley [Alumni] Association the year I was regent designate, so he sort of took me on on a fatherly basis. So, yeah, we did, I worked with him. But the other one, Bill Forbes, I knew very well. He was an extremely close friend of my in-laws, my mother-in-law and my father-in-law. His wife was a sorority sister of my mother-in-law's at UCLA, Ann Forbes. And Bill was a fraternity brother of mine, so I had known Bill through the fraternity. Then he was in the advertising business and he was the head of television at Young and Rubicam in New York when I went to New York to start with J. Walter

Thompson. He lived in Scarsdale, we lived in Hartsdale, and we spent quite a few, oh, Saturday nights or Sunday afternoons with the Forbeses, because we were a newly married young couple lost in the big city, and Bill was a big time ad man at that point. He's a wonderful guy. So was his wife Ann, his first wife. They were great with us, and so I knew him very well, and Bill kind of took me under his wing. And then Phil Boyd was also a fraternity brother, but also a close friend of my parents. He was a business partner of another of my mother and dad's best friends . . .

TRELEVEN: I'll be darned.

HALDEMAN: . . . Frank and Melba Bennett, who ran an operation down in Palm Springs. He was sort of "Mr. Palm Springs."

TRELEVEN: Yeah, and was very close to Riverside, the Riverside campus.

HALDEMAN: Right, he was sort of the godfather of Riverside. But anyway, so Phil was always very helpful. And university staff, Marjorie Woolman was wonderful. I mean, she was a real jewel in helping a new regent try to figure out what the devil is going on. She really was and went out

of her way to be helpful and accommodating, as did [Elizabeth O.] Beth [Hansen]. . . . What's Beth's last name? Marge's assistant?

TRELEVEN: We'll fill it in.

HALDEMAN: Wonderful gal. The staff, the whole staff was. I was just greatly impressed with the attitude and capabilities of the systemwide group, with a few exceptions that you kind of wondered how they got in there.

TRELEVEN: These don't sound like meetings, they sound like productions.

HALDEMAN: Well, they sort of were productions. And some of it of course was. . . . I mean, there were meetings. There was intense debate and disagreement both at the table and in the recess caucuses and all that sort of thing. And then you get back and hammer it out, and regents were lobbying each other, and the faculty. . . . Not faculty so much. Well, the Academic Senate guys were working on the regents, and certainly the administrative people. And I haven't said anything about Clark Kerr. I should.

TRELEVEN: Well, if I can just squeeze in a couple questions.

HALDEMAN: Sure. Sure.

TRELEVEN: Was the whole prerogative and power of the Academic Senate something that had not occurred to you before that time? In other words, they have prerogatives when it comes to and that relate to educational policy . . .

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: . . . promotion and tenure and those areas, or had you been familiar with that before?

HALDEMAN: That's a good question. I don't know the answer, which is odd, because I know that it wasn't a surprise to me. It wasn't something that I said, you know, "Oh my goodness, look at this that I didn't know about." But on the other hand I don't know how I would have known, so maybe I just assumed that they had. . . . I knew about tenure, I knew about the status of the senate and the power, the academic power within the institution, so I guess it didn't surprise me. But I think it probably came as a revelation but not a startling revelation. In other words it was something I was not aware of, but that I learned, but didn't find unusual or strange.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I'm kind of raising it because there's a

lot of tension that results . . .

HALDEMAN: Well, through that time there was a lot of tension resulting from a lot of things. There was tension within the board of regents, regent vis-à-vis regent amongst various people or groups of people, and interestingly those tensions would shift as the issue shifted. This group would redissolve into two different groups for the tensions on another issue, and you had different combinations at times. But certainly there were tensions and there was academic versus administration tension that was apparent as well as academic versus regental and academic versus system as a whole tensions as well as administrative versus regent and administrator versus administrator within the administrative ranks. So, you know, it wasn't a standing battle with the academics versus the administrators or something of that sort. It was sort of a flowing battle with the sides evolving as they went along. At least that was the impression that I got.

TRELEVEN: And we'll get into some specifics a little later. You mentioned Forbes. Forbes was one of

relatively few people who was quite close to Norton Simon, but because of that, did you get to know Norton Simon quite well?

HALDEMAN: Yes, I did. I felt I did, yeah. I would say that he was one of the . . . Norton in the first place, he . . . Well, no, he was extremely active certainly during my alumni regent year, those two years actually. Norton was extremely active. I have a feeling he wasn't as active when I came back on as an appointed regent, but I wasn't as active either, because I wasn't there enough. I don't think I missed any meetings during my alumni years.

TRELEVEN: Not that I found, not according to the way Marge took the minutes.

HALDEMAN: I would be very surprised if I did, because it would have taken something cataclysmic to cause me to miss a meeting.

TRELEVEN: Yes. On my list was your initial impression and maybe beyond that of President Kerr, maybe not only him but his staff.

HALDEMAN: Well, I came in with I guess some bias, some anti-Kerr bias when I arrived at the regents. It evolved I guess from a feeling that Kerr was. . . .

It may have just come genetically out of the UCLA bias against university-wide administration. Although I knew Sproul pretty well from the California Club council stuff and had a lot of fun with Sproul. But to me Kerr was only. . . . I was talking about the congenial atmosphere that I had. I didn't ever have the feeling of a congenial relationship with Clark Kerr. Now whether that is due to Kerr's appraisal of me as an anti, which had some validity, or not, I don't know. But other people could have felt I was an anti also, Dutton and Coblenz from a political viewpoint and so on, and I didn't sense any coolness there.

TRELEVEN: His appraisal of you as an anti?

HALDEMAN: I'm saying as an anti-Kerr person.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: In other words, I don't know what the reason. . . . Obviously, I don't know what's in someone else's head, but I never had the feeling that there was any level of a warm, ongoing, open relationship with Clark Kerr. That was true of one or two others, and I can't name them unfortunately, within the administration. I don't remember who

they were. It was not true of others. I'm going to lose another name: the guy that was general counsel.

TRELEVEN: [Thomas J.] Tom Cunningham.

HALDEMAN: Tom Cunningham, [Owsley B.] Bod Hammond, as I said Margie Woolman . . .

TRELEVEN: And the legislative guy, he was in his last years at that point. Oh hell, the name is very familiar and I'm not going. . . . Well, Harry [R.] Wellman was there.

HALDEMAN: Harry Wellman couldn't have been. I felt a very warm relationship with Wellman. That's right, I'd forgotten him. And I was very much impressed with him. See, I went in with a bias I guess against Kerr that was strengthened as I got to know him better, which was a total disagreement with his handling of what I saw from the outside and as an alumnus at UCLA of the student issues of the university in turmoil kind of issues, because I am a manager-administrator-oriented-type person where Kerr is an arbitrator-negotiator-type person. My way of managing is exactly the opposite of his way of managing. Mine is to determine what's right and get it

done. His is to make everybody happy and don't worry about what comes out of it. At least that's my disparaging appraisal of his approach.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: I suspect that Clark sensed that from the outset. Whatever the reason, I was perfectly willing to learn and find out I was wrong. But my feeling was the more I got to know the situations and all, the more I got to feeling I was right rather than wrong. So I was not a Kerr backer. I agreed with him on a lot of things and I was fascinated with his vision of the university and with his technological understanding of the opportunities that education and communication had. I mean, he could hold us spellbound on things that he would go on, and I was in complete agreement and very excited about a lot of things that Kerr spelled out and was leading towards. It was in his other sort of administrative area that I found him coming up short as the chief administrative officer of the university.

TRELEVEN: An undercurrent of dissatisfaction with especially the Berkeley situation?

HALDEMAN: Yeah, you mean with the handling of the student You're talking about the Berkeley situation with student unrest?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, was the undercurrent more that Kerr hadn't handled it or that Kerr had meddled in the sense that there was a chancellor at Berkeley, [Edward W.] Strong at that time, and technically it wasn't Kerr's campus to run?

HALDEMAN: Who was chancellor?

TRELEVEN: Ed Strong.

HALDEMAN: Oh, that's right.

TRELEVEN: And he was succeeded by . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . by Roger Heyns.

TRELEVEN: Later by Roger Heyns.

HALDEMAN: At the outset I didn't know who was playing what roles obviously, so I couldn't have gone in with this undercurrent from my viewpoint that what emerged I think was Kerr's. . . . Well, the feeling that the Berkeley situation was being handled wrong and that Kerr in one sense was tolerating it being handled wrong and in the other sense, to the degree that he did meddle, was meddling in even a wronger direction. I don't know, it gets into the Angela [Y.] Davis

case and some of that other stuff that I just cited. There was clearly a dissatisfaction with Kerr element on the board of regents, and I found myself generally in agreement with them for the reasons that they had, which were these kinds of reasons.

TRELEVEN: How aware were you of a certain amount of dissatisfaction on Franklin Murphy's part with Kerr?

HALDEMAN: Well, I was a strong Murphy advocate, so to the degree that Murphy was dissatisfied with Kerr that may very well have been a factor or the factor in my initial view of Kerr.

TRELEVEN: Well, just about the time you began to observe, the regents did pass a decentralization measure. That was I think officially in the summer of '65.

HALDEMAN: How did that phone get back on? I must have left it on.

TRELEVEN: Shall we pause for a minute?

HALDEMAN: Okay.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Before we paused we were talking about the reorganization that I think became official. The

regents officially approved it I think late summer or early fall of '65. I'm trying to give you a frame of reference here.

HALDEMAN: I've lost my papers. Let me grab them here.

TRELEVEN: Lost your notes?

HALDEMAN: I'll be right back.

TRELEVEN: Okay. That in turn had come about . . .

HALDEMAN: That was in '65?

TRELEVEN: That was in '65.

HALDEMAN: Okay. So that was my observation year.

TRELEVEN: Just before you began your observation, the Byrne report of the Special Forbes Committee¹ had been produced, was reprinted in full in the L.A. Times. Among other things it called for a chartering of each individual campus as a means to insure more autonomy for each of the chancellors on the various campuses. You recall that?

HALDEMAN: I do, yes.

TRELEVEN: Well, I haven't really been able to connect how strong the relationship was between the Forbes

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].

Report and Kerr finally deciding to decentralize, which certainly stopped short of chartering each individual campus, which would have required a constitutional amendment. You know, if there is a connection between the two, and maybe I'll just ask. Maybe I won't ask anything until I turn the tape over, because we're getting near the end and I don't quite know how close.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

[End Tape 3, Side B]

[Begin Tape 4, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on with tape four. We were talking about the timeline of events that come just before and just after you become an observer regent: the Forbes Report, the regents' decision to decentralize.

HALDEMAN: And the decentralization was Kerr's proposal to the regents? Or did it evolve out of the regents?

TRELEVEN: Well, it's a matter of interpretation. What I'm trying to ask first of all is, do you remember anything about this?

HALDEMAN: Just in a general sense, yes. I mean, I remember the issue of the decentralization and I remember

the Forbes Report as a topic, but I don't remember the details, I don't remember the content.

TRELEVEN: Do you recall talking to Forbes enough to know that Forbes was becoming alienated from Kerr?

HALDEMAN: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And why?

HALDEMAN: I'm not sure. I think I shouldn't put words in Bill's mouth, because I don't really know, but my impression was that it was on an overall basis, that he was dissatisfied with his way of handling what he perceived as major problems and opportunities that were facing the university. That's sort of the route that I found myself on and, looking back now, probably arising out of Forbes's views and Murphy's views and perhaps others, because I listened to everybody. I listened to all the views and I figured out where I stood amongst them and where I didn't stand with any of them and what my, you know, if I had an independent position. But I know that I was much more allied with those who were not pleased with Kerr in whatever ways than I was with those who were staunch advocates of Kerr. And those

who were not as I recall. . . . And I don't know whether it was right at the outset or whether this evolved. I have the feeling that it wasn't right at the outset. I didn't come in anti-Kerr, I just didn't come in pro-Kerr. I wasn't coming in there saying, you know, "This is a terrible guy," but I also wasn't coming in saying, "This is another great guy," like I thought Franklin Murphy was at that time. If Strong was chancellor at Berkeley, Strong I don't remember at all. And that's kind of surprising.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, he was there during . . .

HALDEMAN: Through '65?

TRELEVEN: . . . the Free Speech Movement, which was '64. 'Sixty-five is a continuation of various activities.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, but did he . . . ? When did Roger Heyns become chancellor?

TRELEVEN: Actually, I could look that up.

HALDEMAN: It was later I guess, because I sort of remember the coming on of Heyns. Did Strong stay until Heyns came on or did Strong leave earlier?

TRELEVEN: No, there was an interim chancellor [Martin Meyerson] . . .

HALDEMAN: That's what I thought.

TRELEVEN: . . . whose name . . .

HALDEMAN: I don't think Strong was chancellor when I went on the board.

TRELEVEN: Well, okay.

HALDEMAN: I'm probably wrong, but I wouldn't be surprised.

TRELEVEN: You may not be, and I will not think of the interim chancellor's name either, but there was an interim chancellor, yes.

HALDEMAN: I thought so.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Because I don't think Strong was chancellor.

TRELEVEN: I suppose as long as we're on the Kerr thread, we might as well follow through with it if you're agreeable . . .

HALDEMAN: Sure.

TRELEVEN: . . . and that is. . . . And this gets into your becoming a regent with a vote and . . .

HALDEMAN: There's a background of that area that maybe you don't want to get into until we get to it chronologically if you want to stay with the other stuff, and we can resume Kerr with that.

TRELEVEN: Well . . .

HALDEMAN: Or we can run with Kerr, but you need the

background in a way to tie into it.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, maybe this is what you have in mind, maybe it isn't, but let me try this.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: Because I was going to look for another thread and that was the gubernatorial campaign.

HALDEMAN: Right. That is . . .

TRELEVEN: Is that the . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Yes.

TRELEVEN: That's the same thread you wanted to pull on.

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Great. Let's talk about that campaign, because Pat Brown had had a very successful almost eight years in office at that time. What involvement did you have in terms of what was going on in terms of the evolution of a Republican candidate to oppose Pat Brown?

HALDEMAN: Okay, none. None.

TRELEVEN: None at all?

HALDEMAN: None whatsoever. Absolutely none. Not directly, indirectly, or any other way.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so you . . .

HALDEMAN: And I made no effort to have anything to do with it.

TRELEVEN: You are still. . . . Divorced is not quite the right word, but you are . . .

HALDEMAN: It really is. I'm apolitical.

TRELEVEN: . . . from any kind of state Republican party matters.

HALDEMAN: Right. I was completely and I was very much absorbed in being a regent of the university. My interest in politics at that point was my interest in the university. So I finished my term, my voting term in July of '66. Is that right?

TRELEVEN: No, June of '67. You were an observer, '65-'66.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: A voting regent, '66-'67.

HALDEMAN: Okay, so I finished in June of '67. The election was in . . .

TRELEVEN: November of '66. And Governor Reagan's first Governor Reagan is sworn in in early January '67.

HALDEMAN: Okay, my frame of reference is skewed.

TRELEVEN: Well, I always get confused with these elections, because a governor is elected a certain year and it's the next year that he actually . . .

HALDEMAN: Okay, so I was regent designate. . . . No, I was

voting regent during the campaign. I became voting regent in '66.

TRELEVEN: That's correct, you would have been voting . . .

HALDEMAN: In June, and the election was in November.

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

HALDEMAN: So I was voting regent or had been already a year as designate, and I was now voting, and now the election was coming on. So Reagan came on the board while I was the alumni regent. Obviously he did, because he had to have. Okay, now I'm getting back there. Okay, here we go. So we're still in my . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, the thread I was . . .

HALDEMAN: So we're still in the same chronological thing. I'm coming on, I've been through my designate year . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: . . . and I'm now on my voting year . . .

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

HALDEMAN: . . . and one of the things that starts happening right at the start of my voting year is the election campaign.

TRELEVEN: Okay, that's right.

HALDEMAN: Okay. I had nothing to do with it up to the

point of Reagan being selected, which would have been in the June primary. So he was selected the candidate about the same time as I became a real regent.

TRELEVEN: How did you feel about that at the time?

HALDEMAN: I felt okay about it. I didn't have strong feelings pro or anti. But as a regent and looking at the university thing and hearing what I was hearing from within the Reagan camp, I became concerned about the conduct of the campaign in terms of using the university as a campaign issue and doing it with the wrong facts. A, I didn't want to see it used as an issue at all, as a regent. Yeah, as a regent and from the university viewpoint, I didn't want to see it be an issue. As a politician I recognized that it maybe was impossible for it not to be an issue, because it was an issue in the state at the time. So then, A, I didn't want Reagan to take the wrong position on the issue, wrong from my viewpoint, number one. And, B, I didn't want him to take any position, right or wrong, for the wrong reason. In other words to start. . . . I know Henry Salvatori very well. I know Holmes

Tuttle very well. I'll leave it at those two. I knew that they were calling a lot of the shots in the campaign. I became concerned about what I feared and maybe had already started doing it, the approach that Reagan was taking to the university.

TRELEVEN: You're talking about, "We have to clean up the mess at Berkeley"?

HALDEMAN: Was that what he was saying?

TRELEVEN: Well, that was one phrase that he used.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: I don't know if that's what you're referring to.

HALDEMAN: Well, I didn't totally disagree that we had to clean up the mess at Berkeley, because as a regent I felt we had an even stronger obligation to clean up the mess at Berkeley. But I didn't want to see it demagogued with a phony issue and I knew in a general sense that Reagan didn't know much about the university and that nobody around him knew much about the university. I knew that they were. . . . There were Stanford and 'SC people involved heavily in the campaign. I was not aware of the University of California, any of the campuses' people involved in the campaign.

So I took the initiative to seek a meeting with Henry Salvatori. I met with him and I told him of my concerns. I said, "I understand from the political viewpoint what the candidate's got to do. It's an issue and I'm sorry it is, but there it is. But it's very important that whoever is going to be the next governor not destroy in his campaign any relationship with the university and with the legislature vis-à-vis the university before he becomes governor, because when he becomes governor he will also become a regent of the university. He hopefully will be attending regents' meetings and he will learn an awful lot about the university that I know Ronald Reagan nor any of his advisers doesn't know now, and that . . ."

TRELEVEN: You're speaking from your very own experience as an observer by that time for about a year.

HALDEMAN: Exactly. And I'm speaking going further back from my experience as a campaign manager for a Republican candidate for governor of California. I know how you work the campaigns in the state and all that.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: So I was concerned for both sides. I was concerned that Reagan not do something that would hurt him politically and I was concerned that he not do something that would hurt the university. And I was concerned that the university not get crosswise with the man that I suspected was probably going to be the governor of the state. So very much on the QT. And I don't think--I'm not sure this is true--but I don't think anybody on the regents knew I was doing this, talking to Salvatori. And in the conversation with Salvatori I said, "There are some things in the university issue that can be fairly well simplified to raise the caution flags of where it would not be wise for the governor to take what I would suspect might be his natural position to take"--I mean the candidate--"vis-à-vis the university." And Salvatori said, "Okay, write them out. Write out a paper as to what you think and get it to me as quick as you can," because he said, "I understand the point you're making and I can see the potential problem and I can see the merit of what you're saying to a degree at least." So I did and I gave the thing

to Salvatori. I have no idea what became of it from there on, but I felt that the Reagan campaign vis-à-vis the university was not nearly as bad as I was afraid it was going to be. I hoped that perhaps what I had put in had been a mitigating factor there.

The other part of that is that I was on the steering committee by request. I was on Bob Finch's steering committee for the campaign, the campaign policy committee or something, whatever. I forget what they called it. But I only went to a few meetings. I wasn't a very active member. But I knew that Finch had a much better understanding of the university, even though he was an 'SC graduate and Occidental [University] trustee, than I suspected that Reagan did. And also, as an Occidental trustee he knew more about university administration and the issues involved.

TRELEVEN: He also knew another Occidental trustee, Ed Carter.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: There would be that connection, too.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: Anyway, go ahead.

HALDEMAN: But anyway I did spend some time with Bob on the same issue, but I wasn't worried about Bob. I didn't think he would go. . . . He wasn't under the influence of the Salvatori group to the extent that I felt Reagan probably was. The net is that my feeling today is that I ended up. . . . That that campaign ended up with my feeling that Reagan had not. . . . That things had not gone as badly as I was afraid they might. I don't think they went as well as I hoped they might, but at least we had averted some of the real dangers, I thought. After the election and before, I believe, yes, before the inauguration, Carter was chairman of the board at that time, right?

TRELEVEN: No, I think Ted Meyer.

HALDEMAN: Was it Ted Meyer by then?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Okay, whoever it was. . . . Yeah, you're right. Meyer was '66, yeah, and Chandler was the vice chairman. Okay, I talked to Meyer and I said, "I think that I can be of some help and I would like to be if you think it would be helpful." I know I did this with the chairman of the board of

regents. My point was I think it would be a desirable thing to have a private, regents-only dinner to which we invite regents designate Finch and Reagan and have them before they are inaugurated and before they lay out their final policies and everything. But now that we now they're going to be, so this would have been in December I presume of '66 after the election and before the inaugural. Because the inaugural was January 1 I think, wasn't it? So it has to have been . . .

TRELEVEN: The inaugural was the first week in January, I think.

HALDEMAN: Anyway, the net was that I gave a dinner at our home for the regents, and it was a regents-only dinner, and we invited Finch and Reagan.

TRELEVEN: The entire board?

HALDEMAN: The entire board.

TRELEVEN: Did everyone come?

HALDEMAN: No, but pretty darn near. Pretty close.

TRELEVEN: I'm thinking of Simon and smiling when I'm saying that.

HALDEMAN: I think Simon did as a matter of fact.

TRELEVEN: Really.

HALDEMAN: My wife probably still has the guest list. I don't. . . . It was a pretty. . . . It was most of the regents and it was tied into the. . . . We had a regents' meeting in L.A. at UCLA I guess, and I took the Thursday night or Friday. . . . I forget what it was, Wednesday night, Thursday night, or Friday night, one of those nights I had a dinner, a regents-only dinner, at the house.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so it was in connection with a regents' meeting that you had the dinner.

HALDEMAN: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I see.

HALDEMAN: And the purpose was that this was not a regents' meeting, it was a social--a personal, social function where the individual members of the regents could get to meet and chat with the two new members of the regents, not under the pressure of a regents' meeting or of having to grandstand their stuff the way the governors and other politicians often have to do at those meetings.

TRELEVEN: And Kerr is a regent and he is invited.

HALDEMAN: And he came as I recall. I think he did. I'm pretty sure he did. Anyway, it was quite a

successful dinner. It worked out pretty well. They all had a chance to chat with each other before dinner and at dinner and after dinner, and we had a toast to the university and the future relations of the university and the state of California and all that stuff, and it went well. By that time I was substantially committed to Forbes's determination to remove Kerr. I was substantially committed as a participant. As I recall Ed Pauley was another member of that coalition at that time, and there were several others. There were some strong members and some probable members and so on. But the count that we came up with at that point was that there was a Now when did Kerr go out?

TRELEVEN: At the meeting of January 20.

HALDEMAN: The first Reagan meeting?

TRELEVEN: Yes, it was.

HALDEMAN: Was it really?

TRELEVEN: Yes, it was.

HALDEMAN: Okay.

TRELEVEN: But . . .

HALDEMAN: That was the plan then.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, can I . . . ?

HALDEMAN: Sure.

TRELEVEN: Just let me back up. Did Kerr have anything to say during the gubernatorial campaign?

HALDEMAN: I don't know. I don't remember.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

HALDEMAN: I don't remember, but Reagan and Finch were both inclined towards the removal of Kerr. There was no problem persuading them.

TRELEVEN: Okay, you're back to the count now.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, so we got back to the count and we ended The count was that we probably had the votes to dismiss him, and as it turned out we did. We weren't sure as I recall, because it wasn't possible to ascertain each vote, but it was worth the try. The feeling was that it would be better, if we had the votes, it would be better to do it quickly than to start something stewing that would start boiling up and would be detrimental to the university and to the governor's office, too, probably.

TRELEVEN: Now this was

HALDEMAN: So we moved fast.

TRELEVEN: Now this was Was this something discussed at the dinner?

HALDEMAN: No.

TRELEVEN: No?

HALDEMAN: Not at all. There wasn't any university business as such discussed at the dinner.

TRELEVEN: Okay, this was strictly . . .

HALDEMAN: It was very much a social and personal relationship-type occasion where there was an opportunity for people to get to know each other, not to resolve their problems. But it was discussed after that in individual discussions and leading up to getting ready to put it to a vote at the regents' meeting.

TRELEVEN: Well, you really can't pass judgment on whether Kerr had heard about this or not. I mean, these kind of conversations going on, so I'm not going to ask that question.

HALDEMAN: I assume he had. Kerr had a very strong intelligence apparatus. I think he knew pretty much everything that was going on.

TRELEVEN: Because as I understand from other interviews and the [regents'] minutes that Kerr wanted to have a meeting with Meyer and Chandler. He felt that if. . . . Or this is the way the record explains it. I want to see if it jibes with your memory.

HALDEMAN: The record being the general minutes or the audio?

TRELEVEN: All of the above. He felt that if there was going to be any action taken in terms of his staying on as president, it should be taken at this meeting and not be strung out. It's not his words obviously. And that led up to . . .

HALDEMAN: He wanted a vote of confidence.

TRELEVEN: He wanted a vote of confidence.

HALDEMAN: That rings a bell. And I think there was an executive session when Chandler and Meyer reported that to the regents.

TRELEVEN: That is correct. Executive session and motion by [Laurence J.] Larry Kennedy, second by Forbes.

HALDEMAN: Larry Kennedy made the motion?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: I'll be darned. He was a Brown appointment, right?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, he was.

HALDEMAN: But he was very anti-Kerr as I recall.

TRELEVEN: Bill Roth made an amended motion to lay it over till July. Do you recall that?

HALDEMAN: Yes. I do now when you say it.

TRELEVEN: Got beat.

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: That went down.

HALDEMAN: And that was the test vote.

TRELEVEN: That's right. That would be the test vote. And back to the original motion then, it was 14-8.

HALDEMAN: It was that?

TRELEVEN: It was 14-8. And I've been able to substantiate that, but I first read the vote . . .

HALDEMAN: So there were only twenty-two voting, which would be Kerr missing and who else?

TRELEVEN: Somebody else was not . . .

HALDEMAN: Jesse [Unruh]?

TRELEVEN: It could have been a public. . . . No, Jesse was there, because Jesse is one of the eight who supported Kerr. But 14-8, I initially read it in Mrs. Heller's transcript,¹ which is public record, and I was able to check it out in other sources, and she was absolutely right.

HALDEMAN: She would be right. I wouldn't question. . . . If that's what Ellie says, I would take it as

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.

gospel.

TRELEVEN: So what I want to ask you, though, is the interpretation seems . . .

HALDEMAN: Now, she was a semi-swing vote. She ended up voting for Kerr, though, didn't she?

TRELEVEN: She ended up to retain Kerr, that's correct. In fact, I might be able to name them. Unruh, Heller, Coblenz, Dutton, Simon . . .

HALDEMAN: Simon voted to retain him?

TRELEVEN: Yes, he did.

HALDEMAN: Forbes never got Simon over to his side.

TRELEVEN: Well, Simon voted to retain Kerr. I said I could name them all. I guess if I looked at the list . . .

HALDEMAN: Well, Boyd didn't.

TRELEVEN: No.

HALDEMAN: Canaday didn't. Carter, where did Carter vote?

TRELEVEN: Carter . . .

HALDEMAN: Carter would have voted to fire him. There's no way he would have voted against Reagan at that point.

TRELEVEN: I'm just trying to . . .

HALDEMAN: Chandler probably, Chandler could have gone either way. Higgs? Higgs was another swing.

TRELEVEN: Higgs voted against Kerr. I thought I had this here, somewhere.

HALDEMAN: Doesn't matter. It doesn't make any difference.

TRELEVEN: One interpretation of what happened at that first meeting which you pointed out, Reagan's first regents' meeting, is that Reagan set out to sack Kerr, and by god, he did it.

HALDEMAN: Well, to a degree that's true.

TRELEVEN: And the counter . . .

HALDEMAN: The way to look at it the other way is that a number of regents set out to sack Kerr and took advantage of the Reagan-Finch votes to change the balance. As it turns out they didn't need them. They had enough anyway, but maybe some of those would have swung the other way if it had been. . . . Who'd Reagan run against? I can't remember who the Democratic candidate was.

TRELEVEN: No, I ran into this with another interviewee the other day, it was ridiculous. It wasn't the same election, but it was. . . . Who'd he run against in the election?

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Pat [Brown].

HALDEMAN: Did Brown run again?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

HALDEMAN: Oh, did he?

TRELEVEN: Oh, yeah. Brown was running for the third time. I'm sorry. [Laughter]

HALDEMAN: Okay. So if it had still been Brown, that might have changed some other votes who voted with Reagan, but would have voted with Brown had he been there.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, it's. . . . See, another school of thought says, "Well, look, Reagan hadn't been in office long enough to really appoint much of anybody," but one exception was [P.] Allan Grant, who was ex officio by dint of being [president of the State Board of] Agriculture.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: And if I have my information straight, Grant was Reagan's first appointee . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . in order to get the vote.

TRELEVEN: . . . in order to get the vote.

HALDEMAN: I think that. . . . That would be my impression. Reagan didn't come in for the purpose of getting rid of Kerr, but Reagan was totally in line with the group on the board that had decided that the Reagan arrival was the

opportunity. You had Reagan and Finch, and by making the Grant appointment you had Grant also to give you. . . . Actually, that's swinging three votes. It makes a six-vote difference. Since you had an eight-vote margin, you didn't need it, or did you?

TRELEVEN: Yeah, six-vote margin, 14-8.

HALDEMAN: You had a six-vote margin. Okay, so you did need it. If the six had switched the other way, you wouldn't have had it.

TRELEVEN: Okay, in your own mind there was no question about the way you were going to vote?

HALDEMAN: None.

TRELEVEN: But that's one of the greatest university systems in the world and one of the greatest educators operating it. That's a pretty momentous step.

HALDEMAN: It may have been. At that time I would not have been prepared to agree with you that he was one of the greatest educators, and even if I had agreed with you that he was one of the greatest educators, I would have not agreed with you that he was a great university administrator. There's an old saying in business that when you promote your top salesman to sales manager you have two

losses: you get a lousy sales manager and you lose a great salesman. And I would say in the university system that it is quite possible that a great educator could become a lousy administrator, and you'd have two losses. If he was a great educator. That I'm not prepared to I didn't have a feeling then and I don't have a feeling now as to this. He certainly was a great visionary in the field of education, and as I said, I found him very, very exciting and his views of the potentials and that sort of thing in education. I found him falling substantially short as a university administrator, and that's the job he was in. He was not hired as an educator [but] as president of the university. The president of the university has to have an understanding of education, but he does not in my opinion necessarily have to be a great educator. I am not prepared to argue the comparative merits of Kerr and his predecessors and successors, because I'm not prepared to say that they were all perfect either. But I felt under the circumstances at the time that it was imperative for the university that Kerr be

removed. And I was not only. . . . There was not only no doubt on my vote, but I was perfectly happy to play whatever helpful role I could in lining up and organizing and getting to the point where the change would be made.

TRELEVEN: What happened after the vote?

HALDEMAN: What do you mean? The minutes after the vote?

TRELEVEN: Yeah. I mean, in the hours, you had a whole meeting to . . .

HALDEMAN: I don't know. I guess Kerr was. . . . I don't remember.

TRELEVEN: I just wondered.

HALDEMAN: We went on to the rest of the agenda probably.

TRELEVEN: Harry Wellman became acting president at that point.

HALDEMAN: Then we started the search, and that was what ended up with Hitch. Was Hitch the next?

TRELEVEN: Charles Hitch.

HALDEMAN: Charley Hitch. That was a mistake, too.

TRELEVEN: Well, you were. . . . I'm trying to remember my own chronology here. Hitch came on board before you left for Washington?

HALDEMAN: Yep. I don't know when he came, but Hitch was definitely president of the university while I

was around.

TRELEVEN: And you definitely have negative feelings about him, it sounds like.

HALDEMAN: Not at the outset. I didn't have negative or positive. The jury was out. In retrospect, I like Charley Hitch, but I don't think he was the right guy for the job either. I thought I had a thing here with the presidents of the university. I guess I don't. Oh yeah, here's Hitch. Yeah, he came on in '68.

TRELEVEN: Were you involved with the search committee at all?

HALDEMAN: I don't think so.

TRELEVEN: Okay. I think Phil Boyd chaired it, as I remember, but I didn't have a full listing of . . .

HALDEMAN: I don't think I was. . . . No, I'm sure I wasn't on the search committee. And in '68, well, the search would have been in '67 now, wouldn't it?

TRELEVEN: That's right.

HALDEMAN: Well, I wasn't on the regents.

TRELEVEN: No, that's what I was . . .

HALDEMAN: See, I went off then in June of '67.

TRELEVEN: No, you . . .

HALDEMAN: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Reagan. . . . You went off in June of '67. You came back . . .

HALDEMAN: In January.

TRELEVEN: In March of '68.

HALDEMAN: March?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

HALDEMAN: Okay. By then Hitch was president.

TRELEVEN: And by then, I'm saying he probably was, because I don't have the exact date when he started, but presumably he was.

HALDEMAN: He was then or shortly thereafter or shortly there before. From my brief stint as an appointed regent, Hitch I think was president. I know he was president for part of it.

TRELEVEN: Okay. And just to fill that out, your last meeting, the last meeting you attended was October of '68, and you'd missed a few between March and October.

HALDEMAN: Yeah, sure had.

TRELEVEN: You probably had some good reasons for that.

HALDEMAN: October was campaign still. I'm surprised I was at the October meeting.

TRELEVEN: And your resolution was read in January. But let me just follow this other thread here, and that

is . . .

HALDEMAN: Let's take our break for a second.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. The next big issue after the Kerr decision was the fact that the regents came in with a \$278 million budget, and the Reagan administration wanted to cut that back to . . .

HALDEMAN: That was that awful meeting where that miserable little man that was the budget director came.

TRELEVEN: The budget director. I always get titles mixed up here. A. Alan Post was . . .

HALDEMAN: . . . legislative analyst.

TRELEVEN: Legislative analyst. And Smith? Gordon P. Smith.

HALDEMAN: Gordon P. Smith.

TRELEVEN: Funny little man. What more do you recall about that?

HALDEMAN: Not much. Lead me on a little and maybe I can interject. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: I'll lead you on. Several things came into play: first, that there was some feeling on the part of someone in the Reagan administration that regents' overhead funds should be used for

operating costs, which would have been an unprecedented situation at that time.

HALDEMAN: That was part of their creative look at the state budget to try and figure out how you could, you know, put things on a sounder basis.

TRELEVEN: Secondly, there occurred the thought that the shortfall could be made up by implementing for the first time tuition for in-state students. There had been out-of-state tuition. Now does that ring a bell?

HALDEMAN: Yes. Not my idea, but I know it was. . . . You know, they had a problem and they were looking at all the ways you solve it. The university was one of them.

TRELEVEN: In the midst of that, namely February of '67, Dutton, Coblenz, Forbes, and Simon call a special regents' meeting at UCLA to discuss mainly budgetary things.

HALDEMAN: Was that the one where the student got up and said, "Fuck you, Reagan!" in the middle of the meeting?

TRELEVEN: It may have been.

HALDEMAN: I think it was.

TRELEVEN: This was called an emergency meeting, because

four regents could call an emergency meeting.

HALDEMAN: Right, I remember that.

TRELEVEN: Seldom done, but it has been done a couple of times. And the one "must" in order to do that, they also must show cause. They have to spell out the agenda.

HALDEMAN: Right.

TRELEVEN: No other items can be discussed.

HALDEMAN: Right, special meeting you can only discuss the call.

TRELEVEN: Right, right. So the five issues were '67-'68 budget, recruiting and other matters regarding statewide administration, whatever that meant . . .

HALDEMAN: Probably the search for a new president.

TRELEVEN: New personnel and loss of existing personnel. I think this had to do with a migration of faculty that was beginning to take place. Item four, tuition. And item five, use of regent contingency funds--those are the overhead funds--for the purpose of financing the '67-'68 budget. Well, here finally after eight years of a Democratic administration is a Republican in office. And here you are in the regents a Republican. How does that affect you? What do

you think of these plans of the Republican administration to cut the budget or find funds in the regents' treasury that hadn't been used for?

HALDEMAN: I disagree with them. I don't take the side of an administration because it's Republican, nor do I oppose it because it's Democrat. I look at the administration in terms of what they're doing. I think Democrats do a lot of things right and I think Republicans do a lot of things wrong. That was a disturbing time. I expected it to be a disturbing time, because I knew and all the regents did. I mean, it was understood that you had an administration coming in that was not per se super supportive of the university and that it was going to look at the university on the other side and in favor of the administration. I've got to say that the university needed some looking at.

TRELEVEN: Why?

HALDEMAN: Because I think any monster institution needs looking at. And for the reason that I did not have full confidence in Clark Kerr as the chief administrative officer of the university, that would be another reason it needed looking at. I

think that there were, as there are in any bureaucracy, a lot of factors within the university that were bent on self-preservation, not the least of them being the Academic Senate. That isn't necessarily to the overall good. See, I believe in the value of change. I disbelieve in the maintenance of the status quo for the sake of maintaining the status quo. I think change is important and that to fight change just because it's change is not a supportable position. To fight change because it's a bad change is very definitely a supportable position. I think that the university. . . . I knew, and we talked about this--I talked about this with the regents--that the new administration was going to bring about some changes, some of which would appear at least and may in fact be painful and some of them actually harmful to the university. We've got to sort them out and we've got to be prepared to accept some changes, because we're going to get some. The people of the state want change. The people of the state voted for Ronald Reagan and not Pat Brown and there was a reason for that.

And we in the university have got to accept the fact that we're part of that reason, on the one hand. On the other hand, it's our duty as regents to try to manage that change so as to do if possible the maximum good to the university and at the least minimum damage to the university. And nobody disagreed with that particularly, because that's sort of God, mother, and apple pie, but then you get to the thing of how do you define what changes are necessary and what changes would be for the good of the university, and there you get some differences. I think that there was the feeling within the regents as well as in the administration and in the university at large and probably the state at large that the university was a closed, old boy society that was preserving itself and drawing its cloak of academic majesty about itself and saying, "You must not touch me." No institution can successfully sustain that role over an extended period of time. I did not feel that the university could. I was concerned, because I felt that we were under the kind of pressure that could lead to change that would be damaging. But

I wasn't prepared as I recall at that point to decide in my own mind which of the proposed changes would, if any, be damaging and which would, if any, not be damaging, and whether. . . . You know, I was ready to listen to them, and that was what I felt the regents had to do. They had to listen to these proposals and they had to weigh them in a realistic light. First of all, start with the given that there is going to be some change, and with that given look at these proposed changes in the light that there's going to be some change. Are these the worst things that could happen or the best things that could happen or somewhere in between, and how do you trade it off? I was sort of taking a Clark Kerr route to the decision, which was one of arbitration and mediation and that sort of thing. It's to get the least damaging combination and go with that, which is how I felt and I still feel. I think that was the right way to approach it. I don't really know at this point, because I was so much totally out of touch with the university once I left the board in '68, or is that when I left? The end of '68, let's

say. I spent from there four and six, ten years really till '78, totally absorbed in something that absolutely blotted out any even remote awareness of what was happening in the University of California. I mean, it's hard to believe that you can be as involved in something as I was in the regents and then have it really totally removed from your cognizance, but it was. And that's why I. . . . That's one of the reasons I resigned. I knew that that's what was going to be the case. I knew I could not sustain the present position I was in and a position on the board of regents both at the same time and do the regents a proper service.

TRELEVEN: Right.

HALDEMAN: I also felt very strongly that there was a clear conflict of interest between my position as chief of staff at the White House and my position as a regent of the University of California, an institution which derived one-third of its funding from the federal government of the United States. I also believed that William French Smith, Fred Dutton, Bill Roth, at least to name three I can think of right away, had the same