

California State Archives  
State Government Oral History Program

Oral History Interview

with

**ROBERT E. ALSHULER**

Regent, University of California, 1961-1963

December 3, 1991  
San Clemente, 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:

Robert E. Alshuler, Oral History Interview, Conducted 1991 by Dale E. Treleven, UCLA Oral History Program, for the California State Archives State Government Oral History Program.



**March Fong Eu**  
**Secretary of State**

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

Information	(916) 445-4293
Research Room	(916) 445-4293
Exhibit Hall	(916) 445-4293
Legislative Bill Service	(916) 445-2832
(prior years)	

## PREFACE

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

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

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

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

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

Oral History Program  
History Department  
California State University, Fullerton

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

Oral History Program  
Claremont Graduate School

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

Oral History Program  
University of California, Los Angeles

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

John F. Burns  
State Archivist

July 27, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTERVIEW HISTORY . . . . .	i
BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY . . . . .	ii
SESSION 1, December 3, 1991	
[Tape 1, Side A] . . . . .	1
Family history--Interest in agriculture-- Extracurricular activities while growing up-- Notable professors at UCLA--Student elections-- Robert Gordon Sproul--Friendships with Earl J. Miller and William C. Ackerman--Student leaders-- Reserve Officers Training Corps--Incarceration of Japanese-American student at Manzanar.	
[Tape 1, Side B] . . . . .	30
More on internment of Japanese-Americans-- Student jobs--Military training and combat in WWII--Cofounding a mortgage banking company-- History of the company--Involvement in Republican politics--Fraternizing with alumni-- Involvement in Alumni Association.	
[Tape 2, Side A] . . . . .	60
Franklin D. Murphy--Expanding the scope of alumni fund-raising--University expansion and development--Impressions of individual regents of the University of California--Dynamics of power and influence within the board of regents-- Regental committees--University investment policy.	
SESSION 2, December 3, 1991	
[Tape 2, Side B] . . . . .	90
Movement to establish parity between UCLA and	

University of California, Berkeley--Ideological differences between individual regents--Clark Kerr--Other university administrators--Governor Edmund G. "Pat" Brown, Sr.--Logistics of regents' meetings--Medical education--Visiting campuses.

[Tape 3, Side A] . . . . . 120

Graduate student housing--Controversial issues on campus--Balance between academics and athletics--Satisfactions and disappointments while serving as a regent--Involvement in alumni activities--Retirement activities.

## INTERVIEW HISTORY

### Interviewer/Editor:

Dale E. Treleven, Director, UCLA Oral History Program

### Interview Time and Place:

December 3, 1991

Alshuler's residence, San Clemente, California  
Session of two and one-quarter hours (morning).

December 3, 1991

Alshuler's residence, San Clemente, California  
Session of one and one-quarter hours (afternoon).

### 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 biographical summary.

Alshuler 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

Robert E. Alshuler served from 1961-63 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). During his tenure he served on Audit, Grounds and Buildings, and University Relations Committees as well as Subcommittees on Investments and on Graduate Student Housing.

Alshuler was born on August 9, 1920, in Racine, Wisconsin, but moved shortly thereafter to Los Angeles. After elementary and secondary education at the Laurel Grammar School, Bancroft Junior High School, and Fairfax High School, Alshuler earned his bachelor's degree at UCLA while majoring in political science. He was the UCLA student body president during the academic year 1941-42. After serving for three years as an army lieutenant in the United States Army Infantry during World War II, Alshuler became a loan administrator for a mortgage broker in Beverly Hills and cofounded the Metropolitan Mortgage Corporation. After retiring in 1970 he continued to serve on a half-dozen corporate boards until the late 1980s.

The interview focuses primarily on Alshuler's early life, matriculation, student leadership activities at Fairfax High School and at UCLA, and his UCLA Alumni Association presidency and corresponding University of California regency.

Alshuler and Patricia Chisholm were married in 1974; by a previous marriage he has one daughter, Katherine D. (Katie) Voss, and one son, John E. Alshuler.

[Session 1, December 3, 1991]

[Begin Tape 1, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Well, it's December 3, 1991, and I am here with Robert Alshuler in San Clemente. We're here mainly to talk about your term with the University of California Board of Regents, but I think before we get into that what I'd like to do is to begin at the beginning. By that I mean, could you give me your date and place of birth?

ALSHULER: I was born in Racine, Wisconsin, August 9, 1920. Does that answer all that? Date and place. Came to California fourteen months later.

TRELEVEN: What was your parents' family background?

ALSHULER: Well, my father was in the haberdashery business in Racine, and my mother a housewife.

TRELEVEN: Had they been in Racine for a number of years?

ALSHULER: I think that they had both been in Racine for a few years. My dad's business was there. I think my mother moved to Racine at some point. I really don't recall all of that history. Her

maiden name was Fernie Bourque, and that's French Canadian. Alshuler is German.

TRELEVEN: Well, why did they bring you across the great expanses to California?

ALSHULER: Well, I always tell people I brought them in a covered wagon. But I guess it was for the opportunities in California. They hadn't been married too long, and I think they wanted a change of environment. And my mother's sister was already living out here.

TRELEVEN: Living . . .

ALSHULER: In Long Beach I think it was at the time. So we came to Long Beach for a short time before we moved up. Lived right near the [Los Angeles Memorial] Coliseum for a while.

TRELEVEN: Really.

ALSHULER: My folks used to point out I think the court that we lived in at one time was there until a few years ago. I'm not sure whether it's there anymore or not. Since UCLA quit playing there I don't see it as much.

TRELEVEN: Do you remember the name, what main street it was near?

ALSHULER: Near Figueroa [Street], of course.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

ALSHULER: I think it was on the Normandie [Avenue] side, but I've forgotten the street.

TRELEVEN: Is that where you began your schooling then, in that area?

ALSHULER: No, we moved, before I was eligible for grade school, old enough for grade school. We moved to, oh, what would now be considered West Hollywood, north, up near Santa Monica [Boulevard] and Fairfax [Avenue]. I lived in that general area all the way to UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Just to switch back once more to your father, what did he do once he came out here?

ALSHULER: He was in a distributing business in appliances: radios, refrigerators. This was before TVs, but he would have been in that had he carried on. So he was in the appliance distribution business.

TRELEVEN: So this is at the wholesaler level?

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: I see. Tell me a little about your schooling, I guess beginning with elementary and proceeding up to secondary in terms of where you went.

ALSHULER: Simple course. It was Laurel Avenue Grammar School, which is again very proximate to Fairfax

and Santa Monica. And then Bancroft Junior High [School] and Fairfax High [School], just progressively through all of those schools. My mother died right after I graduated from Fairfax, that summer.

TRELEVEN: Which would have been the summer of . . . ?

ALSHULER: 'Thirty-eight.

TRELEVEN: What kind of interests did you find yourself developing as you were going through elementary or high school?

ALSHULER: Well, I spent a lot of time at the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association], the Hollywood Y, so I had a lot of athletic interests, swimming and basketball mainly. In high school I had kind of an interest in agriculture. The agricultural teacher had a club called California Club, and I was involved in that and enjoyed it, related to agriculture in California. I got over that with time. [Laughter] My dad encouraged me to be a lawyer, and that was my intent. Going to the university I would have proceeded on to law school if the army hadn't claimed me.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, we'll . . .

ALSHULER: I jumped ahead.

TRELEVEN: Jumped ahead, but that's okay. That's the way these discussions go. Agriculture, I'm . . .

ALSHULER: It's just. . . . I don't know why it appealed to me, but I guess it probably was the personalities; the particular man that taught that was a fellow that I admired and enjoyed. So I've always sort of liked to putter around in the garden and thought if I ever made another career, I wished I would have been a landscape architect. But that's just in retrospect.

TRELEVEN: I see.

ALSHULER: But I thoroughly enjoyed the outdoors and working with plants. It was just a sideline, because I was basically a major in social studies to go on to the university.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so . . .

ALSHULER: So athletics, a little bit of interest in agriculture, and associating it on flowers, plants, that sort of thing. Horticulture you might say. But that sort of passed with time and exposure to other things.

TRELEVEN: Can you tell me a little more about your athletic career at Fairfax High?

ALSHULER: Well, I played basketball. My experience in

basketball came from the YMCA, which was sort of the center for focus on basketball at the time. Hollywood Y seemed to generate a lot of interest in basketball also. When I went to Fairfax, that was the sport that I went out for. They didn't have swimming, which I did a bit of. I played all I guess it was three years then of high school and was captain of the basketball team the last year. But the talent of basketball players in those days and the talent of basketball players today are worlds apart.

TRELEVEN: Well, the rules were different too. [Laughter]

ALSHULER: Well, the rules may have been different, but so were the physical capacity of the individuals. On the other hand, there weren't the rewards at the end of the line that make it so attractive to become thoroughly skilled as a basketball player.

TRELEVEN: Would you care to mention any particular teachers that you feel were of great influence while you went to Fairfax?

ALSHULER: Well, the agriculture teacher's name was Koenig, "Pop" Koenig we called him. Yeah, Walter Koenig. And his daughter was in my class, too. So I knew the Koenig family quite well. I guess

I'd have to put him number one, because he's about the only one of the high school teachers that I can remember by name.

TRELEVEN: And did he actively encourage you to go to college after high school?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess that would be true, yes. There was never any doubt of my intent, so I didn't need a lot of encouragement. I got it at home.

TRELEVEN: So your parents were very supportive.

ALSHULER: Oh yeah, extremely supportive and wanted me to go on to law school. I mean, they had the whole thing mapped out.

TRELEVEN: Maybe one more question before we get you to UCLA. Did you have to work growing up?

ALSHULER: From day one, yes. We were certainly a bread-and-butter family. Yes, I sold Saturday Evening Posts and that kind of thing, worked at the Farmer's Market for quite a few years in its embryonic stage, worked at the Pan-Pacific Auditorium as an usher for things like the Ice Capades and events of that nature. I worked all the way through college, too, as a matter of fact. Oh, I was a camp counselor. I went to Y camps and then got involved with counseling, but

that was mainly just for room and board and not much compensation.

TRELEVEN: So you not only went to the Y to enjoy the swimming and the basketball, but you were an active member in the Y?

ALSHULER: Yes, very active.

TRELEVEN: And a leader?

ALSHULER: Yes, I was active in the whole Y program and went to the summer camps for eight or nine years and then went on as a counselor in the same area even into college a little bit. I was active in student government. I was senior class president and on various high school boards and stuff like that.

TRELEVEN: So you had political ambitions early.

ALSHULER: Well, I had, yeah, I guess you could say that. I ran for student body president and was beaten. But I did make senior class president.

TRELEVEN: Does that mean to say that you were interested in government and civics and politics already before entering UCLA?

ALSHULER: I guess that had some influence on me, yes, because I was active in student organizations. I just liked to be involved.

TRELEVEN: Well, you live fairly close to 'SC [University of Southern California], and there are probably some other options for colleges and universities. Why did you decide to enroll at UCLA?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess the basic reason was I could afford it. Also, I didn't get a basketball scholarship offered at 'SC and I did get one of sorts, a job arrangement, at UCLA and was recruited by UCLA by Wilbur Johns when he was the freshman coach. I guess that was the appeal. I couldn't afford 'SC, and it probably was between 'SC and UCLA because there weren't a lot of other options that occurred to me. I needed to be close to home. I'd lost my mother that summer, so my dad was alone.

TRELEVEN: So does that mean you were a commuter then?

ALSHULER: To begin with. Then we moved to Westwood, my dad moved to Westwood.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

ALSHULER: So we had an apartment in Westwood instead of in West Hollywood. So I was a commmuter at the beginning but not for long.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So let's see. This means you enrolled at UCLA in '38 if I have the dates correct.

ALSHULER: I started in '38.

TRELEVEN: Now the yearbook says you majored in political science.

ALSHULER: Right.

TRELEVEN: In fact you took your A.B. degree in political science. That's accurate?

ALSHULER: Yes, that's correct.

TRELEVEN: Does that mean political science was your favorite subject area?

ALSHULER: Not particularly. It was the principal major for law school at the time. I enjoyed history, took a lot of history courses, always was attracted to the history end of things too. And they relate, of course. I was a lousy linguist. I think we need to turn this off for a minute.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. You were talking about political science and history courses.

ALSHULER: Yes, those were the two. I was a lousy linguist, I started to mention that. But because I took Spanish in high school, I took Italian at UCLA. Are anecdotes in order at this point?

TRELEVEN: Sure.

ALSHULER: My Italian professor was a young Italian fellow

named Speroni. I don't know whether you . . .

TRELEVEN: Charles.

ALSHULER: And we became very good friends through the years.

TRELEVEN: Really.

ALSHULER: He gave me two Ds in Italian, and I still just love the guy. I took what I had to take. But he was just a marvelous man, and we maintained our friendship all through college and on in the years. As he progressed up at UCLA, why, we would see each other at events. Carmela is his wife, and we knew Carmela. When I first met Charles I guess he just had. . . . He was probably two or three years into being probably just a teacher or an instructor at the time. But we just sort of clicked and all through the years we stayed in contact. When I went to Italy I wrote him about Italy and how much I enjoyed it. In fact I wrote it in Italian, had an Italian translator help me write it.

[Laughter] My favorite story was that I told him how all my friends I was traveling with appreciated my background in Italian and how I acted as translator for the group and that he was

so helpful to me in giving me my ability to speak Italian and that I loved his country and that sort of thing. When I got home, the first time I saw him he was a very effusive kind of a guy and was thrilled that I'd been to Italy and that I had taken the time to write him. But he said, "Where did you learn the Roman dialect? I never taught it to you." [Laughter] He was a grand fellow, and I thoroughly enjoyed his friendship.

TRELEVEN: I'm pleased to tell you that we have a very long interview with him in the UCLA Oral History collection.

ALSHULER: Is that right?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Well, he would be delightful. Did you do any of the interviewing?

TRELEVEN: No, the taping was done before my time. But we got the manuscript done after I came.

ALSHULER: Well, he'd have some interesting things to tell. Like in the writing of Michelangelo, he was very involved in that with Stone [Irving Stone, The Agony and the Ecstasy, a Novel of Michelangelo] I know. And he was very

articulate, very funny, a delightful man.

TRELEVEN: Well, here I was going to ask you about memorable professors. I never expected that you would name someone whom you had gotten two Ds from.

ALSHULER: Yes, it's an unusual fact. He always denied it, and one time I dug up my photocopy of my records and showed it to him. But, oh, another fellow that I had great admiration for was [Charles Grove] Haines. I think he was Charles Haines. I think he was Charles, too. He was . . .

TRELEVEN: For which Haines Hall was named.

ALSHULER: Haines Hall was named after him. He was a constitutional law professor of some renown. In fact his daughter became a good friend, and I've seen her all through the years. But Charles Haines, I took constitutional law from him, because, one, it was one of the few law courses offered at UCLA at the time. And secondly, because he had such a tremendous reputation. And it was a great experience. He was an outstanding professor and very encouraging along the line of going to law school. So he's another one that I remember distinctly. I don't remember the poli sci professors too well, although I took a number

of classes from them obviously. But they weren't particularly my favorites.

TRELEVEN: Your political career continued at UCLA, if I'm not mistaken. How did you come to decide that you wanted to not only be active in student government but really assume leadership in student government at that time?

ALSHULER: I don't know how you decide those things, it just sort of came natural to me. I was always involved in groups. When I was involved in groups I would end up usually being president. So it just seemed to be the thing to do, so I went for it. Let's see, I was sophomore class president and then student body president and, oh, fraternity president and things like that.

TRELEVEN: Was there a connection between your fraternity activities and running for, say, ultimately, student body president?

ALSHULER: Well, the only connection. . . . There have been a lot of Phi [Kappa] Psi student body presidents. But that was sort of I guess you'd say traditional, but nobody there in the house particularly encouraged it one way or the other. But they were extremely supporting and

may have been the cause of my winning the election, because it was a rainy day and several of the fellows in the house worked for a beach club. And they went down to the beach club and got the great big beach umbrellas that used to be at all beach clubs--and I don't know whether they still, yeah, I guess they still do--and brought them up. And the fraternity brothers all walked up and down the hill. The voting was at Kerckhoff Hall, and the students, you know, were up in the quad[rangle]. So they would walk them down the path to the voting booth and back up again and do some selling. The margin of victory was rather narrow, so I've always kind of felt that may have been a deciding factor. So the fraternity in that way was helpful.

TRELEVEN: So is that what you meant in the UCLA Magazine, June 1949? You referred to it as you won the election because of "the dry vote." That's what the magazine said.

ALSHULER: Oh, well, that must have been a way of phrasing it, yes. [Laughter] I don't remember that at all. It sounds like I was a teetotaler.  
[Laughter]

TRELEVEN: I know. It sounds like you were a Prohibition candidate.

ALSHULER: Yes, I guess that was. . . . I never. . . . Is that all it said? It didn't carry the description of how that . . .

TRELEVEN: No.

ALSHULER: Because I've never heard that before.

TRELEVEN: It looks like the writer had talked to you or interviewed you.

ALSHULER: Tongue in the cheek or something.

TRELEVEN: He's quoted you as saying "the dry vote" without explaining what it meant. But I guess . . .

ALSHULER: That's the explanation all right, not a Prohibitionist.

TRELEVEN: Right. I also noticed that you were a member of Blue Key, which is?

ALSHULER: An honorary. I don't know whether it exists anymore. I can't even remember what Blue Key was all about.

TRELEVEN: Cal Club you mentioned.

ALSHULER: Cal Club was another. Well, now the Cal Club at high school was entirely different than the Cal Club.

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

ALSHULER: The Cal Club at UCLA was Robert Gordon Sproul's instrument for bringing together the various campuses and keeping them amicable. He was astute at politics. You could learn a lot from him on political maneuvering. One of the things he did was form the Cal Club, and there was a Cal Club group, you might say chapter. But members at the then existing campuses, which I guess at that time was just UCLA and Cal [University of California, Berkeley]. Yes, there weren't any others. Then we would visit Cal, and Sproul would be there. We'd associate with the Cal Club members who were basically the student leaders at Berkeley and the student leaders at UCLA. They would come down south, and the same thing would occur, and we'd go to the president's house for something. He would have a program, and I think it would probably, as I recall, it might relate to the football game. When Cal and UCLA would play we'd all get together there.

TRELEVEN: So you got to know Sproul a bit.

ALSHULER: I got to know Sproul reasonably well, yeah.

TRELEVEN: Tell me a little more about him.

ALSHULER: Remarkable man from my perspective. He was the

ultimate politician. He was in the students' eyes, you know, you looked up to him a great deal. As time went on you began to realize he was rather manipulative. He was not ever for having UCLA as a separate campus. That happened in spite of him. And UCLA's growth happened sort of in spite of him with fellows like [Edward A.] Dickson forcing. . . . Wasn't that Dickson?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Sort of forced the issue on the growth of UCLA. Then others did the same as time went on in terms of starting the professional schools down there. But in the main, Sproul certainly was a constructive influence in my view in the building of the university, despite his partiality to Berkeley and his strong evidences of it. He still in the long run was a constructive part of the growth of the university in my mind. So it was fun to know Sproul. At the time, he was something else.

TRELEVEN: As student body president, did you get to know Ernest Carroll Moore?

ALSHULER: No, in fact I think Moore was on sabbatical by then. I don't think Moore. . . . The two men

that I got to know and the one that I dearly love, and I don't know why, I guess it just hasn't come around, was Earl [J.] Miller. As far as I know Earl is still alive. I have seen him through the years, but I haven't seen him in the last three or four years. His boys are both fraternity brothers and were probably due to my making sure of it. He was an intimate friend, I mean, way beyond what might be just a college relationship. We were at his home on a night when they thought L.A. was being bombed. The lights all went out right after the start of the war.

TRELEVEN: Oh, after December 7 in 1941.

ALSHULER: We had to pull all the curtains and watch the lights in the sky and the antiaircraft. I spent lots of time with Earl Miller and thought he was a remarkable man and really very much involved with the students and had his low, understated talent of getting the most out of people and putting his point across.

The other fellow, and they were sort of at odds with one another but yet served the university in their own way, was [William C.]

Bill Ackerman. Ackerman was coming in from the other end, but of course as time went on I had more contact with Bill because of his. . . . He was--what did they call it?--a graduate manager, I think, undergraduate manager, undergraduate manager, some name like that for the Associated Students.

TRELEVEN: Associated Students.

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: And that's at a time when the Associated Students are running the athletic program.

ALSHULER: Yes, that's right. It was a part of the Associated Students. So Ackerman was in that role instrumental in hiring coaches. Although the university got into it too, it was sort of quasi-independent. So Ackerman was and has been a friend all through the years. I think Miller was more beloved to me than Ackerman, but I respected and admired all of the things that Bill did through the course of the years. He was always a very good friend, a friend of the student body presidents. Brought them together on occasion.

TRELEVEN: Ackerman I take it was the person that you worked

with most closely as student body president.

ALSHULER: Well, yes and no, because you also worked with Earl Miller a lot as dean of students.

TRELEVEN: Dean of . . ?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess he was dean of men then, that's right, because there was another, there was a lady.

TRELEVEN: Helen.

ALSHULER: Helen [Matthewson] Laughlin, who is a gem. You've probably heard tales about her, but she was really an unusual lady. Absolute opposite of Earl Miller. Earl was soft-spoken and very understated. And Laughlin was almost a jock, I almost describe her that way.

TRELEVEN: A real extrovert.

ALSHULER: A real extrovert and strong and very positive in her views and vocal of them, so they made quite a combination. But yes, Ackerman in the performance of the job was probably the most influential. But Miller was constantly there with us. He would attend the student council meetings and I've forgotten what other groups. I guess maybe he was involved in the Cal Club, probably through Sproul. It kind of fades from

view as to how those things happen. But I spent lots of time and hours at Dean Miller's home, which was close to the campus. I loved his wife, who was a grand lady. So they were both great, brings back great memories.

TRELEVEN: Yes. I'm happy to tell you another great interview in our collection is with Adaline [C.] Guenther . . .

ALSHULER: Oh, for goodness sakes, yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . who is now deceased, of course. That leads up to my question about how you came to be so involved on the University Religious Conference board.

ALSHULER: Well, I guess that came out of my girlfriend [Alice Wheaton], who later became my wife, who is now my ex-wife, who was active in that group. She kind of encouraged me to participate. And then Guenther was a real recruiter. I want to tell you she spotted everybody who was, you know, on their way up in student government and in activities involved in the university. She made sure that she cornered them for her group too. So I guess a combination of ladies conspiring is what got me into the Religious Conference group.

TRELEVEN: So was this a natural tie in a way between the Y?

ALSHULER: Well, with my Y background it made it easy.

TRELEVEN: I see.

ALSHULER: It wasn't directly because of the Y but because of the two ladies involved I guess you might say. But it made it an easy thing to be involved with.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Let me get the year you became involved with the Religious Conference. Was it . . . ?

ALSHULER: I really would be pulling that off the wall, but I would guess that it was probably while I was sophomore class president, because Guenther tended to start looking at the students who were active and make sure they were identified with the Religious Conference group.

TRELEVEN: I just wondered, because I think Gilbert [A.] Harrison would have been gone by then, because you know he was on the Religious Conference.

ALSHULER: I knew Gil Harrison.

TRELEVEN: He's another Fairfax High person.

ALSHULER: Yeah, I knew Gil from high school. I hadn't thought about Gil in a long time, but I can picture him, and you're right, he was very active in that group.

TRELEVEN: Well, I don't want to sound like a broken record, but we also have a very long interview with Harrison in the collection.

ALSHULER: With Harrison? He's still alive I take it?

TRELEVEN: He is.

ALSHULER: Where does he live?

TRELEVEN: I'm not sure whether it's [Washington] D.C. or Southern California. I'm not . . .

ALSHULER: I really never followed Gil to know what he ended up--what his career was or anything, but I surely remember him.

TRELEVEN: He ended up editing the . . . You know the title [The New Republic]. It's one of the three major news magazines.

ALSHULER: Oh, really.

TRELEVEN: It will come to me. I should know this. But anyway, the Conference board by the time Adaline got you involved, were you still having the trialogues where you'd have members of different faiths discussing their particular faiths in meetings?

ALSHULER: Oh yeah.

TRELEVEN: I know that was something that . . .

ALSHULER: One of her pet projects. It really was for

better understanding between religions. Yeah, you bring that up. Those things kind of fade from memory, but it seems to me that was a major part of her program.

TRELEVEN: Were you a speaker in the trialogue?

ALSHULER: No, I don't think so. I surely don't remember.

TRELEVEN: Okay, the other major thing that you were involved in was ROTC [Reserve Officers Training Corps]. You were definitely by the time you graduated a visible leader as cadet colonel if what I read is accurate.

ALSHULER: Well, that's right, but again I think that the ROTC like the Religious Conference tracked the leadership group and tried to be sure they were getting one of the visible members of that group. I did well in ROTC and had good grades in it and was encouraged. . . . Interesting sidelight. We had a fellow in our house named [Richard] Dick Jensen who was maybe a year ahead of me. A marvelous man and very gung ho for ROTC. In fact most of us were. Even though you're required to take undergraduate but not required to take. . . . Or lower class, and not required to take it for the last two years. So

then you volunteered for upper division ROTC. He just worked on everybody in the house to go for upper division ROTC. There was a navy ROTC that had just come into being, and he would try and talk you into forgetting the navy and go for the army and so forth. Jensen, to make a long story short, is the Captain Jensen in [George S.] Patton's story, which is true, and in the movie, who was Patton's aide who was killed in Africa, and where Patton walked off crying at the loss of Jensen who was killed by artillery fire in Africa. But Jensen was a major influence on a number of us joining ROTC. Of course, it turned out to be I guess you'd say a reasonably good move, because the war came along. When we graduated we got our diploma, a commission, and orders all in one package. So I went into the service as an officer, which I guess was somewhat of an advantage, although those of us who were in that class were a high mortality group. If you add those that weren't in ROTC but who were drafted or enlisted and so forth, why, it was a tremendously high mortality group.

TRELEVEN: So you went in as a commissioned . . .

ALSHULER: As a second lieutenant, right.

TRELEVEN: Right out of UCLA, or did you need to go through further training?

ALSHULER: Well, you got your commission but you went. . . . I went to Fort Knox and got ninety days more of intensive training. So they still ran you. . . . You went through as an officer but you went through an additional training period and then got your marching orders from there to duty, line duty.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I'm going to pick up with that in a minute. I want to pull us back just slightly. In the mid-thirties at UCLA as well as at Berkeley there was quite a peace movement going on, and part of that was anti-ROTC sentiment as well. Did you encounter any of that? Were there counterarguments that were made?

ALSHULER: No, I never really ran into that at all. I think my memory would be the practicality of whether-- when you had the decision to make of--whether to go for upper division or not was what you thought was going to happen and how soon and that sort of thing. Whether it was an advantage to be an officer versus being drafted or enlisted or going

into one of the training programs that might evolve. But I don't think that there was any strong--at least it certainly doesn't serve my memory that there was--antiwar movement in that war. In other wars there were. And of course Pearl Harbor put the clamp on that in a hurry anyhow.

TRELEVEN: Okay. When you opted for upper division ROTC, did you get a stipend for doing that?

ALSHULER: No, no. No, there was no pay at all involved in upper division. In fact you had to buy your own uniform as I remember. You get some [course] credits, I think a couple of units for taking ROTC. But no, there was no compensation involved at all at the time, which brings back another memory. A young Japanese-American was through the years sort of a political compadre and good friend by the name of Hitoshi "Moe" Yonemura. And I noticed just recently there was a program out at UCLA honoring some of the Japanese-Americans that went to UCLA who were incarcerated, and Moe was one of them. He was head yell leader. He ended up being head yell leader when I was student body president. And he

was in ROTC, upper division ROTC, and actually fell short of getting his commission because he was picked up and his family in the group that was taken to Manzanar. And he was one of the Japanese-Americans who was on the 442d combat team. He got a commission ultimately and went to Italy, and he was killed in Italy. Somewhere in my collection of memorabilia, I have a letter from him from Italy where he was quite concerned about whether he was going to make it or not. A very intimate letter. He was a very good friend. I had talked to some Japanese later in life and found that he was a real leader up at Manzanar. He did a lot for them, helping their morale and getting them organized. I don't agree with what they did for the Japanese. I think that this was just. . . . If you did that all the time, I think, you know, you should have done it for the different ethnic groups in World War II. We should have done it for the Germans after World War I. I just don't think that (this is an aside)-- That particular effort wasn't necessary. I know there's a lot of Japanese-Americans, the ones that I talked to about Moe,

who achieved immense success afterwards, who were incarcerated in Manzanar and got over that and looked back at it as something that happened to them in their lives. Anyhow, that's an aside.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I've got to turn the tape over. Just a second.

[End Tape 1, Side A]

[Begin Tape 1, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. I wanted to ask you when Japanese-American students were being incarcerated, was there any way that you as a student leader or student government could . . . ? I mean, what was the reaction of . . . ?

ALSHULER: They were gone. I mean, all of a sudden we realized they weren't around. There was no chance for a demonstration or a protest or anything. They were gone.

TRELEVEN: You mean they were on campus one day and gone the next?

ALSHULER: Well, I can't be real precise in how this happened, but more or less they were picked up, and I don't think they were given much time. But I don't really remember the mechanics of the details. But also there wasn't. . . . Most of us

felt that it was unfair, that the guy was as American and as occidentalized as you could possibly be. But his family, as a nisei, his family were totally Japanese extraction. You know, as they say it was like a Polish family: they all spoke Polish at home, but the kid was as American as could be. Well, that's about the way we felt, most of us. We couldn't understand why they would haul him off, except that nobody knew that until they checked him out. But you know he wouldn't have been in the upper division ROTC program if there'd have been any concerns on this. So there was general unhappiness, but a sort of resignation because of the nature of the war at the time, the feelings that were so strong against the Japanese that you might say, "Well, they've got to be sure."

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

ALSHULER: So I don't think there was ever any student movement to do anything about it. At least in my mind I don't recall it. There may have been some. But it seemed it was relatively abrupt, that they didn't say, "In a month we're coming for you." They pretty much picked them up.

TRELEVEN: Were there any problems with hostility against Japanese-American students after the bombing of Pearl Harbor?

ALSHULER: Nothing that I remember. Nothing at all that I remember.

TRELEVEN: Now, you're playing basketball, you're student body president, you're active as president of your fraternity. Does this mean you could forgo working during college?

ALSHULER: No, I never. . . . I worked all the time. Originally, I think my scholarship was that I got to work for the university gardening department, whatever they called it then. Now it would be the environmental something or other.

TRELEVEN: Facilities management. [Laughter]

ALSHULER: And there was an old fellow named MacGillivray.

TRELEVEN: Oh sure, Alex.

ALSHULER: [Alexander] Alex MacGillivray. He was in charge of keeping the athletes as well as the nonathletes mowing lawns. Somewhere in my collection of junk I've got a picture of me pushing a lawnmower maybe to document the fact that I did work once in a while. But yeah, my first job with the university was doing that. It

didn't pay that well. It was lousy work anyhow, so it wasn't too long before I found some other employment. Going back to my background in Y, I got work with a private boys club called Beverly Boys Club, which picked up kids at their home after school and gave them an organized afternoon and Saturday program. We drove a little what would now be called "woodies," the wooden-sided station wagons of the era. I did that for a number of years during school. And they had summer camp. We would sometimes, at least one summer, take them to summer camp for the summer. Then I worked in the latter years-- again, political benefits I guess as you move up in visibility--I worked for Desmond's as a campus representative and also in the store, and, you know, on Saturdays, Christmases. You get a discount on clothing and that sort of thing, so that was sort of a benefit. You were in their ads in the paper when they ran. You know, they used to have a rotogravure section, and Desmond's always advertised in the rotogravure. Of course, there was a fellow, Joe Valentine, the manager of Desmond's, who again in UCLA folklore was part of

the Young Men's Club in Westwood who were so supportive of athletes. Joe Valentine was the manager of Desmond's for must have been twenty years, maybe thirty years in Westwood. Ardent UCLA supporter. He and [Robert] Bob Campbell were sort of the anchormen of that group, the Westwood Village group. In later years I did get some support from the Men's Club. I'm trying to think what it was like, forty bucks a month or something that they. . . . I went down to pick it up from Bob Campbell or Joe Valentine. That was maybe when I was a junior.

TRELEVEN: And this . . .

ALSHULER: That related to basketball.

TRELEVEN: Okay. What do you do as a campus representative for Desmond's? What does that involve?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess they print in the paper that you are their campus representative and they have the photographs and you have little cards. And you sport these nice clothes and say, "I got them at Desmond's."

TRELEVEN: Oh, I see.

ALSHULER: They had campus representatives for all kinds of things. Cigarettes, all the cigarette brands had

campus representatives who carried a bunch of cigarettes and passed them out. That was another great job. I didn't smoke and had no interest in it so I wasn't involved. But there were people who were popular, active on campus who were campus representative for cigarettes. And there were campus representatives for varying enterprises which I have forgotten now. But I remember cigarettes being one of them and Desmond's more so than any other store. They did the same thing at 'SC, had campus representatives.

TRELEVEN: Well, back to Fort Knox. You went there for further training and, what, you come out of there as a second lieutenant?

ALSHULER: No, see, in ROTC you got a commission right away. So then they had these special schools for the ROTC graduates they were getting in from all over the country who had commissions, but they still wanted to give them more basic and more intensive training, so then you'd go there for ninety days. It was probably a little more advanced than the "ninety-day wonder" theory, because you already had a lot of this manual of arms and junk

like that. So they were trying to. . . . In my case the armored force school was in Fort Knox. I was sent to armored force school. My closest friend was sent to Fort Benning, which was the infantry school. So how you were picked to go to either one of their or any of the places, nobody knows. It just happened. Computer version must have done it at the time.

TRELEVEN: I've interviewed another person who has a great story about that, but I won't tell it now because it will take about five minutes, and I don't know if I can remember all the details about how people get assigned . . .

ALSHULER: To the various . . .

TRELEVEN: . . . in the military to the various places.

[Laughter]

ALSHULER: So I went to Fort Knox and from Fort Knox back to tank duty in California with. . . . Well, I guess I went to Marysville and picked up a tank unit there. Then we came down to the desert to maneuver. This was about the time Patton was either on his way to Africa. I think he was right ahead of us. But we were trained in desert tactics. Then again, due to the unknown activities

of the army I end up not in the armored force, but in the armored infantry, which is really infantry. It was then being hauled in armored vehicles and then dumped out on the ground to fight. So I was in the armored infantry just in the shifting from one unit to another. And from armored infantry. . . . See, they sort of. . . . Whoever told you how things happen at the second lieutenant level, you sure as blazes can't figure out how you got jumped around. Or I couldn't figure out how I got jumped around, because I ended up from there at. . . . Armored infantry was back. . . . That was back at Camp Beale, which was up near Marysville. And then down, because a combination of armored infantry and tanks, I got sent to amphibious school at Fort Ord where they were using and first had these amphibious tanks kind of thing come through the surf for landing, for ocean landings in the Pacific. And I broached one, turned it sideways and rolled it over with the few of us in there. That ended my career in the amphibious corps, which was all right with me, and I ended up in the straight infantry from that experience and

was sent down to San Luis Obispo where I taught swimming for several months to guys that were about to go overseas. You'd test them to see if they could swim or not by making them jump off a tower with stuff on and swim to the shore to the edge of the pool. And I had that duty and then tried to show them how to survive for those who had trouble.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Then went back to the infantry unit and ultimately was shipped to the South Pacific on a long, slow boat that went through Hawaii for training and ended up in the Palau Invasion. On the island of Angaur the army landed. On the island of Peleliu the marines landed. We didn't have any resistance, and the marines had vicious resistance, and so we were pulled. We finished Angaur, which was almost nothing, and were hauled across the channel to replace the marines who were decimated. And we were promptly decimated. And I got shot in the fanny.

TRELEVEN: This is where you were wounded.

ALSHULER: Yes, in the Peleliu Invasion. And on a place called Bloody Nose Ridge where a lot of marines

were killed and wounded and then replaced by our infantry unit. It was a mound of earth that oversaw an airstrip that could strategically involve the invasion of the Philippines which was to follow. So I guess they wanted to eliminate this airstrip from being a threat. And in the process they killed a lot of guys and wounded a lot of guys. I had a rifle platoon, a third of them were killed, a third of them were wounded, and a third of them survived one day of combat.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

ALSHULER: Because we couldn't see them. We were climbing up a mountainside, jungle-like mountainside. They had bombarded it with artillery, but it was just rubble of trees and stuff. And they were entrenched from a tunnel from the back end of this mountain that came out with little fingers, and they had just shooting galleries. They'd shoot down certain lines of logical approach. So in any event, it was pretty tough. They backed everybody up after that day and just blew the devil out of the place absolutely with artillery and aerial bombardment. I was gone. I was on a hospital ship on the way home by that time. I

mean, they evacuated. . . . I evacuated myself down the hill when we were ambushed, and I had to jump over a couple of my guys who were already dead and landed on my belly and put my head down, and the bullet hit my butt instead of my head. Then I jumped and got down the hill, and then from then on I was on the hospital ship and home. That ended my military career, although I was not really seriously wounded. But I did spend nine months in and out of Letterman Hospital because of complications that became phlebitis. In those days they knew what it was, but they didn't have all the mechanics for handling it that they have now as with so many other things. So I've had a phlebitic problem all my life from that. And I'm retired on a disability from the military. But that's my military career in a nutshell.

TRELEVEN: That's it. Here I was looking for you to tell me how you got onto Italy, but that was later when you went to Italy.

ALSHULER: Oh, that had nothing to do. . . . No, I went there with friends on a . . . . Might have been an alumni tour, because we went on several UCLA

alumni tours. But we visited Italy much later.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: No, my sojourn was in the South Pacific.

TRELEVEN: Okay. So the war ends and my notes indicate then you went to law school at USC.

ALSHULER: I tried to go to law school, did go to law school for a year at USC. UCLA didn't have a law school.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

ALSHULER: That was still prior to anything out at UCLA. And at the same time went to work for a fellow named Joe Crail, who was a UCLA alumnus who hired a lot of UCLA students in his savings and loan, which is Coast Federal Savings [and Loan Association]. Joe was a lawyer himself and a very eccentric guy, but nevertheless very dedicated to UCLA and supported it by hiring a lot of the graduates. And so I tried to. . . . I worked at the Savings and Loan. By that time I was married and had one child. And I went through one year of law school and did very poorly and decided I couldn't do both, and I liked the career better at the savings and loan, so I started out in the savings and loan

business.

TRELEVEN: So you went to 'SC under the GI Bill?

ALSHULER: Yeah, under the GI Bill. But I still had to work. The GI Bill didn't exactly pay for a family living.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

ALSHULER: So I worked half a day essentially and went to law school half a day. I guess I was out of the study habits and more interested in the practicality of making a living, and I gave up the idea of law school. About that time my dad died also who had lived with us. I got married, oh, I guess it was September after I came back to California from Fort Knox.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Well, but ultimately you ended up at Metropolitan Mortgage Corporation. How does that happen?

ALSHULER: Well, I worked for Coast for three years and saw fellows in the mortgage banking business which I thought was more promising than the savings and loan business. An interesting premise, but that's what I thought. So I quit the savings and loan, and there were three of us. I was the lead man, and the other two stayed there and helped to

get the company started. One of them was a prominent UCLA alumnus named [Charles] Charlie Wellman who went on in the savings and loan business, but at the time his intention was to join me in the mortgage banking business along with the third man who was a non-Bruin. But both of them were lawyers. But I was to go out and get the business started and did, and we named it Metropolitan Mortgage.

TRELEVEN: Oh, so you started it.

ALSHULER: We started it.

TRELEVEN: Oh. Why was it a good time to . . . ? There must be a certain amount of risk involved. Why was it a good time to take the risk?

ALSHULER: Well, the time to take a risk is when you're young and energetic and there's other employment opportunities. There was obvious more opportunity. . . . It was hard to make a mistake in retrospect. I mean, if you were dishonest you can make mistakes. But if you're honest and work hard and in the environment of that time, in spite of little economic fluctuations, why, you were in an economy that never looked back. I mean, every day something was worth more than it

was the day before. I mean, it wasn't so visible to you at the time, but in retrospect just the value of land, the cost of building, everything just kept going up. There were little dips that caught you, but basically it was hard to make a mistake. You know, we made some but not enough to wipe you out.

TRELEVEN: This is really the beginning of that whole postwar boom that lasted for several decades.

ALSHULER: Of course. Yes, we formed the company in 1950, give or take. And I worked out of my home to begin with. The baby's crying in the background, and I'm trying to make a deal. Wellman never left, and Frank, who was the other partner, did come out.

TRELEVEN: This was Frank . . . ?

ALSHULER: His name was Drohan.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: We were partners for five or six years. He was a lawyer from the east, Union College and Harvard [University Law School], older than I was by several years. We brokered real estate loans to begin with in an era when there was a vital need for that. But our idea was to get to be a

mortgage banker, which in our definition was to make loans for someone and actually create the loan and then sell it to them and then look after it for them. We call it servicing after the fact, so that you build a business that has an anchor of not just having to make a one-shot deal but the servicing grows and becomes a form of income for you. You sell insurance to the borrowers. You otherwise make sure they pay their taxes and that sort of thing. It was loan servicing, so our objective was to get into that, and we gradually did. It was a partnership, then it became a corporation, then we sold some stock privately to individuals and just went through the gradual progress. In the course of events, Frank and I had a parting of the ways, and I kept the company. He went on to other things. And then I had other shareholders, and we built the company up. I gradually bought out some of the shareholders who were from out of state and ended up with a few here in California. And then ultimately sold the company.

TRELEVEN: Still going?

ALSHULER: No. We sold it to a Hawaiian company called

Amfac [Incorporated], which was a New York Stock Exchange company. And I stayed on. We sold it in 19--God, I have to look in perspective, because--in 1970 we sold it to Amfac and took stock. And I've forgotten, I know after the sale I agreed to stay for five years, but it seemed to me when we left the stock was worth something like fourteen. And we went on a trip. We went to Russia and we were gone about a month, went to Europe and then on into Russia. Great trip, but when we came back the stock was seven or something like that. We caught it right in the middle of the drop. So in any event we. . . . I stayed on with Amfac for about eight years, built the mortgage company, changed its name to Amfac Mortgage Company. Then we bought more companies. It got quite big, and I became chairman of the board, and another fellow became president. Then I gradually worked my way out of it. Ran the real estate operations of Amfac on the mainland, not on the island.

TRELEVEN: I see.

ALSHULER: And gradually sold all of that stuff off after a decision made by the board at a certain point in

time. They sold that all off. The mortgage company went on. Amfac ended up selling that to General Electric [Company], and it became part of the General Electric [Company] mortgage operation on the West Coast. So as Metropolitan Mortgage goes, that's been gone for quite a while.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

ALSHULER: But that's the history of the company, and all of those people who were involved with me in that business have long since retired.

TRELEVEN: Well, as you say, you had your ups and downs, but overall a very successful operation.

ALSHULER: Overall, I was very fortunate. The times were perfect for that business. Getting out was at the right time, because you had to have larger and larger capital base. Otherwise downturns that became more frequent could just put you out of business. So over a period of time we came to realize that, and that's why we looked for a company like Amfac to tie in with. It was that or trying to go public, and that had other problems with that, so we opted for selling.

TRELEVEN: Maybe one more question about that going back at the beginning, where did you get what I guess

we'd call venture capital to begin with to get started in your very small way I'm sure?

ALSHULER: Well, our first venture capital was our own in that none of us had anything but energy. The two fellows that didn't come out of the company agreed to underwrite my salary or living expenses until I could generate enough myself. I did. And then the second fellow came out. Charlie never did. And the two of us as partners built up a business just from day-to-day work. The ultimate working capital came from contacts we made in the business. It just happened that these people were in Chicago that we were ultimately introduced to who knew quite a bit about our business, and they were in the insurance business, and they wanted to get the insurance business that would come from it. So it took only a modest amount of capital at that time. And it ended up I think we had to have \$100,000 to qualify with the FHA and the VA as an approved lender, and that was a goal you tried to reach, and that's what we did with a combination of our build-up capital plus the invested capital of these fellows. We ultimately took them out

happily, pleasantly, good relationship in the takeout. They made some money off of it, and we were free of their encumbrance, because they were too far removed from the business. So the venture capital came about in that way, that they had a chance to make some money off of the company as well as off of ancillary businesses that we were in.

TRELEVEN: Well, aside from the UCLA Alumni Association, which we'll turn to, aside from that, did you have time to be involved in fraternal or social or cultural organizations of various types? Or were you working twenty hours a day?

ALSHULER: Pretty much in the early stages, let's say until 1960, I was pretty much head down. Whatever extra time I had was in fixing my yard at home and taking care--we had another child--family duties, and intense efforts in work. In 1960 I guess I joined a country club. I always liked to play golf, so I joined Bel Air Country Club and spent a little more time over there playing golf. The kids were also a little older and could stand to have me away once in a while on the weekends. No. Oh, I got into the Young

Republicans for a while.

TRELEVEN: Young Republicans.

ALSHULER: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: This would be in the fifties.

ALSHULER: Yeah. Well, see, Joe Crail was an ardent  
Republican supporter.

TRELEVEN: Oh sure.

ALSHULER: And he kind of lured us into that. I worked hard  
on the [William F.] Bill Knowland campaign.

TRELEVEN: No kidding. Is this the fifties . . . ?

ALSHULER: I'm trying to think of when that was. It was  
probably was when Knowland ran for . . .

TRELEVEN: Governor?

ALSHULER: Governor.

TRELEVEN: This was the big switch.

ALSHULER: When he switched over. When Senator Knowland  
came home and ran for governor.

TRELEVEN: And [Goodwin J.] "Goodie" Knight for senator?

ALSHULER: I'm trying to. . . . You know I've forgotten.  
I've got to admit, I've forgotten. I'm not sure  
it wasn't when Knowland first ran for senator as  
a newspaperman from Oakland, and that might have  
been in 1952, something like that. I think  
that's when, because I was influenced

substantially by Crail who was an ultraconservative, more conservative than my views have ever been. So Knowland was pretty much along that line. But when Knowland came back, by that time I was somewhat disenchanted with Knowland. Not the man of character that I thought he was. Because I thought he was quite a guy and I had evidenced that, but that sort of turned sour as a senator.

TRELEVEN: So you were still young enough to be a Young Republican.

ALSHULER: Oh yeah, oh sure. But that probably ended my active political career was working on the Knowland campaign.

TRELEVEN: So your family had been Republican?

ALSHULER: Oh yes.

TRELEVEN: And you were a Republican, you remained a Republican?

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: How do you . . . ? Do you label yourself as a certain kind of Republican? I'm asking that partly because we're sitting here in Orange County. [Laughter]

ALSHULER: Yes, in spite of. . . . I'd probably be a

Republican in a very Democratic county too. I didn't move to Orange County because of its political. . . . You know, I was in Riverside County for the last eight, nine years, but a part of Riverside County that probably was 90 percent Republican. Oh, I would be on the liberal side of Republican in terms of viewpoints, not a hardcore. Although I must admit I haven't voted for too many Democrats.

TRELEVEN: Right. But that would mean that you would find yourself in terms of California politics more in the camp of, say, an Earl Warren than a Bill Knowland.

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Or later on . . .

ALSHULER: I got mad at Warren once in a while, but basically that's right.

TRELEVEN: And you'd be more in the camp of a [George] Christopher than a [Ronald W.] Reagan later on in the sixties.

ALSHULER: I was not a Reagan supporter.

TRELEVEN: You were not.

ALSHULER: No. I mean, you know, after he got there and all, why, I voted for him and all. But as a

governor I didn't vote for him. When he ran for governor I didn't vote for him. And I wasn't ever really a very big enthusiast to Richard [M.] Nixon. Like so many other folks I never trusted him. [Laughter] I can never figure out, you know, where he was coming from. So I wasn't an ardent. . . . I never worked very hard on Nixon's campaigns. So I'd say I'm more on the liberal side of the Republican party.

TRELEVEN: Okay, how did you . . . ? Well, let me begin again. After you graduated from UCLA, after you went through your military experience, came back, did you retain kind of constant ties with the Alumni Association at UCLA?

ALSHULER: Yes, encouraged again by Joe Crail, whose ties to UCLA were very strong. Through Joe and through Joe encouraging it I got involved in alumni activities on a very ground-level type of thing. Then through that I met a lot of people that you will interview and have interviewed, mostly have, because they are fellows senior to me. There was a sort of a nucleus of UCLA enthusiasts that went to a thing called the house party. I don't know whether anybody's ever

mentioned that, the UCLA house party.

TRELEVEN: No, tell me more.

ALSHULER: The [Lake] Arrowhead house party, which was really going up to the north shore of Arrowhead for four or five days, sort of like a retreat but it really wasn't. It was recreational. It was sponsored by the Alumni Association. [John B.] Johnny Jackson can fill you in on the house party coming and going. I'm sure you have some . . .

TRELEVEN: This was a family affair or staff?

ALSHULER: Family, very much family oriented. Family oriented. Crail encouraged me to go, and some of the other UCLA fellows and gals that were working for him, and that was sort of the start. I met fellows like [Frank S.] Balthis and [Frederick F.] Houser and [Cyril C.] Cy Nigg . . .

TRELEVEN: Canaday?

ALSHULER: John [E.] Canaday of course. John Canaday was very active in going to the house party. Who else? Hutchinson, Paul [R.] Hutchinson.

TRELEVEN: Paul Hutchinson, oh . . .

ALSHULER: Warren [H.] Crowell.

TRELEVEN: [Thomas J.] Tom Cunningham.

ALSHULER: Tom Cunningham goes way back. Tom was an

instructor in ROTC. That's another reason for my ROTC affiliation was Cunningham was on the ROTC staff at UCLA when I was going on through the ROTC program. So I think he was assistant. He was the number two guy. There was a colonel, and Tom had his commission as a captain or something. So I got very closely akin with Tom and enjoyed his friendship for a long time and saw him through the years. Of course, on the regents I saw him a lot.

TRELEVEN: Right.

ALSHULER: Is Tom still alive?

TRELEVEN: Yes, he is. He's a widower now.

ALSHULER: Is he?

TRELEVEN: Just recently, within the last year I think.

Yes, he's still hanging in there.

ALSHULER: Tom was a good friend.

TRELEVEN: I'm going to put the pause button on.

[Interruption]

Before the phone rang we were talking about the house parties.

ALSHULER: Yes, you never have heard of these?

TRELEVEN: No, it doesn't ring a bell at all.

ALSHULER: That's why it's such an interesting. . . . It's

more than a coincidence because of UCLA having the facility up at Arrowhead that it has had now for a number of years.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so this was on the site of what then was the UC Conference Center, which is now UCLA . . .

ALSHULER: Which was called the North Shore Tavern then.

TRELEVEN: I see.

ALSHULER: It was a private enterprise, and we stayed there as paying guests. Oh, we used to have a fun baseball game in the afternoons. There were always good parties. I don't think the golf course was in existence then. But there were always activities that went on and a lot of socializing and a lot of younger people meeting. . . . At that time I was one of the younger folks, and meeting the fellows a few years ahead like Canaday and Hutchinson and Bob Hixson was another one. I don't know whether he's been mentioned in the course of events.

TRELEVEN: So you're all members of the Alumni Association.

ALSHULER: Yes. Johnny Jackson was extremely active. In fact, he sort of put these things together. He was the executive secretary succeeding John Canaday, who was the first one.

TRELEVEN: Okay, aside from esprit de corps, rapport, that sort of thing, why is this important for the Alumni Association as an organization?

ALSHULER: It was sort of the incubator of leadership. We would keep inviting other UCLA people to come up, and that was sort of where the fraternity of people that gave the active support to UCLA gathered. Not everybody, and some never went. But let's say a good portion of a certain period there did. And then there would be, like, Crail would throw a party down at his home at New Year's because he lived right near the Rose Bowl. Particularly in a year when, say, UCLA was playing, he'd have a . . . Which wasn't real frequent at the time, but we did once or twice.  
[Laughter]

TRELEVEN: So you yourself got incubated.

ALSHULER: I got incubated. I met all these fellows that were involved in the university and through them met others. Like I met Dickson for instance through these same group of guys.

TRELEVEN: Sure. My record shows that you were elected president in '61 of the Alumni Association. Were you an officer, or was there a board or

something?

ALSHULER: Well, you go to the council. I was on the. . . . I guess it's the alumni board was what it was, the group that ran the Alumni Association and published the alumni news and hired and fired the executive directors, whatever their title may have been at the time. Johnny Jackson's successor was Harry [J.] Longway I think.

TRELEVEN: Sounds right.

ALSHULER: Yes, and I had worked with Harry as well as many years with Johnny. Well, you work on various committees. A very active one and a very useful one to introduce people into alumni activities was the scholarship committee that was beautifully organized early on and an immensely successful program for many years. I presume it still goes on.

TRELEVEN: Well, it certainly does.

ALSHULER: Yes, where alumni interview candidates for scholarships, and it involves them in a very, very constructive way. That program was one of the very earliest. And then there were Bruin clubs that were starting to form during that period that tried to do a geographical

dispersion. So there were all of these different devices or media for involving people in the university that the Alumni Association sponsored and that we. . . . You know, like I went to the L.A. Bruin club which was downtown and which had meetings once a month and speakers and stuff like that. So there were all of these different alumni activities that you could sort of get yourself involved in.

TRELEVEN: Okay, almost. . . . In fact it was before you were elected president. Maybe I better ask that first. Why did you decide to take the plunge and accept the presidency when you did?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess it was a natural consequence of events. I had been sort of doing different things for the Alumni Association, various jobs of responsibility. I've forgotten how the chairs work in that, but it sort of was logical at the time. I was building my business, and it was good for the image in my business. It was good for contacts in business. I made loans to a lot of people that I did business with, that I had become acquainted with in the alumni activities. And there were a lot of exchanges--

you might say trade--between the people involved. Frank Balthis became my lawyer, was my lawyer until he became a judge, and a very dear friend, member of the board of the company. So these things all just kind of progress.

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're just about out of tape, so I'm going to put in a new one. Excuse me.

[End Tape 1, Side B]

[Begin Tape 2, Side A]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. Not long before you became president of the Alumni Association, Franklin [D.] Murphy was hired to be the chancellor at UCLA.

ALSHULER: Oh yeah.

TRELEVEN: What impact did Murphy have on the Alumni Association and its activities?

ALSHULER: Well, I guess you'd have to start with the fact that the Alumni Association was very, very involved in selecting Murphy and very supportive of him as a candidate. The Alumni Association had grown in strength. Another thing that got imbued in the folks coming through the activities in the Alumni Association was that constant battle with Berkeley over not having Berkeley

dominate everything, including the selection of the man to run UCLA.

TRELEVEN: Excuse me, but Berkeley was still dominating despite the fact that [Clark] Kerr was now the president?

ALSHULER: Kerr was just trying to keep right on going. He was probably more progressive than Sproul in regard to the university's diversifying its campuses. But nevertheless, the Berkeley pressure was still on his back, so Kerr listened as little as possible to UCLA and ultimately other campuses, but the pressure was building all the time. There were strenuous efforts by influential UCLA alumni in the selection of Franklin. He was the UCLA choice. I don't think he was Kerr's choice. I think he had to go along with it, because he didn't want anybody that strong.

TRELEVEN: Does this--I don't want to put words in your mouth--but does this mean that the Alumni Association leadership was less than happy with [Raymond B.] Allen?

ALSHULER: Allen? I don't know whether it's kindly to say for the record, but Allen was a pussyfoot. He

didn't do anything. He was a very zero kind of a guy. No, he was not an acceptable candidate. He just didn't do much leading. He was. . . . I'd forgotten about Allen until you mentioned him.

TRELEVEN: Many people have.

ALSHULER: Yes. So the Alumni Association was very aggressively involved in finding and supporting Franklin for a candidate.

TRELEVEN: So this means the Alumni Association met all of the candidates?

ALSHULER: A committee of alumni were. . . . Some of them, I don't remember the process, but there . . .

TRELEVEN: You were not a member of the committee?

ALSHULER: I can't even remember if I was or wasn't to tell you the truth. That's the kind of thing that I just know that. . . . I think I was involved in some, but I'm not sure whether it was just the support of Franklin at that point or whether. . . . I can't tell you the answer to that. You're going to have to ask me a year, a president or two. . . . See, Forbes preceded me.

TRELEVEN: That's correct.

ALSHULER: Yes, probably Forbes gave you that. You've talked to Bill already, haven't you? He should

have filled you in on that I would think. He was extremely instrumental in Murphy coming. I think Cy Nigg as I recall was strongly involved in that too. You seen Cy yet?

TRELEVEN: No. I need to. He's on my list.

ALSHULER: He's a marvelous guy. You'll find that he has a memory like a machine.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I've really got to get back to him. So early on Murphy lived up to the kind of chancellor you . . .

ALSHULER: Oh, I think early on and later on nobody's ever been unhappy with Franklin and the job he did for the university. You know, he came along to give you the image you needed and the upper-level thinking that he has a talent for. And he was smart enough to pick a guy like [Charles E.] Young to pick up the pieces. Chuck was an administrator, still is an administrator. This is my viewpoint. It may not be concurred in by all, but he had Chuck and some others who did the things that maybe a hard-working, different type of president or chancellor might have operated. But Franklin in terms of building UCLA's image in the city and the country was perfect. And there

had to be the backup. Because you can talk and make a lot of representations about the glories and accomplishments, but people have to do it too to make it believable. Franklin was very instrumental in attracting people to come to the university, faculty members, and of course extremely capable at raising money. So I think most of us feel, the guys that were involved in the selection, that we would have been hard put to have ever found anybody as good under the times and circumstances.

TRELEVEN: Well, at least during your presidency, did Murphy come with a hatful of suggestions that might improve the Alumni Association, the scope of its activities and so on?

ALSHULER: Yes, but he was astute in his game playing and didn't. . . . There was always the feeling on the part of the old guard, which is just to go back up the list of alumni presidents and you've got the old guard, that the Alumni Association should not be dominated by the university, that it should be supportive, relate to it, be involved in things, but should be able to influence it, not become its puppet. And I think Murphy was

early to identify that, and the fellows who sought him made that clear, so he was not quick to try and just gather it into the university fold. In fact I'd say that that was more done by Young than it was--in looking in the long picture--than it was by Murphy. Murphy was setting it up, but where the real dominant group now is probably the Chancellor's Associates, and the Alumni Association is somewhat secondary at least in visibility.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I think I was thinking particularly in terms of what we now call development. Fund-raising beginning with what we always forget was originally called the student Memorial Activities Center, [Edwin W.] Pauley Pavilion, of course. But back when it was first proposed . . .

ALSHULER: Yes, I've got some interesting memories on that. That was a fascinating time, because we raised more money than had ever been raised before. It was Franklin's confidence and experience combined with a lot of strenuous work by the alumni involved to raise more money, which at this point looks like penny ante. But prior to the Pauley Pavilion, the big effort was to

raise money for the scholarship fund. It was, you know, in the hundred-thousand-dollar variety for the year, not the multimillions that were needed for what became Pauley, and of course the things that have happened since. But Murphy was an instrument in that, a strong instrument in bringing the thinking to a level that we should be raising millions, not thousands or hundreds of thousands. He looked at the big picture, and rightly so. And the raising of the money for Pauley Pavilion was the first sort of the proving grounds that the resources were there if the job was done right.

TRELEVEN: And that really got started while you were the president of the association, it seems to me. Because I think it was proposed . . .

ALSHULER: I lose track of perspective on that.

TRELEVEN: It was initially proposed about '60, '61, and then the fund-raising . . .

ALSHULER: We were certainly talking about it. I think that [H. R.] Haldeman was picked as the . . .

TRELEVEN: That's right, he was.

ALSHULER: Originally it seems to me it was Davis, it was [W. Thomas] Tom Davis.

TRELEVEN: Right. You were the association president '61-'63. Then Tom was '63-'65.

ALSHULER: I think Tom. . . . Now Tom and [M. Philip] Phil Davis were others I forgot to mention that went to the house parties and were very involved and knew all of the old-timers. They both were early casualties so that they sort of fade from view, but very strong and very ardent UCLA separatists. They were the ultimate separatists. But I think Tom recruited Haldeman to be the. . . . Or was Tom the. . . ? I've forgotten now. Well, I know Haldeman was very involved in that effort. And Haldeman became quite a confidante of Franklin Murphy's, too, in the process. But then all of us did, because he became very close to each president of the Alumni Association and never leaned on them, you know, worked with them to evolve what has happened.

TRELEVEN: Well, part of your responsibility it turns out is to show up at a board of regents' meeting, which you did in June of '61. That was Bill Forbes's last meeting as an Alumni Association regent and your first appearance according to the minutes of the regents. Then from that point on for a year

you were recorded as being in attendance. I really want to get. . . . Well, first of all let me do a little bit of jabbering here, because I want to perhaps help you remember where things were at that time. Between '58-'59 and '63-'64 the total enrollment goes from about 43,000 to about 64,000.

ALSHULER: We were building like mad as I recall.

TRELEVEN: There, yes. Building which I want to turn to, but between those in that five-year period, the state of California's contribution jumps from \$91 million to \$160 million.

ALSHULER: Operating or capital?

TRELEVEN: Well, what I have here is current fund revenue. No, that is not capital, that comes under planning, so this is operating.

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: U.S. [government] contributions go from \$22 million to \$82 million in that five-year period. The revenue to support the Atomic Energy Commission laboratories almost doubles in that period, \$142 to \$248 million. And just to give you some other benchmarks, in '58 the regents approved building three new campuses. In 1960

the Master Plan for Higher Education<sup>1</sup>--it was the Donahoe [Higher Education] Act<sup>2</sup> in the legislature--and the Master Plan indicated that UCLA would have a maximum of 25,000 students plus 2,500 more in the medical school.

ALSHULER: [Laughter] Period?

TRELEVEN: UCLA and Berkeley alike. That was to be the max. The initial plan, University-Community Development Plan for Irvine is on . . .

ALSHULER: I remember visiting it.

TRELEVEN: . . . William [E.] Pereira's drawing . . .

ALSHULER: That was an exciting thing to see.

TRELEVEN: There is even a new campus sights committee and talk at that time--sounds ironic now--of a fourth campus in the San Joaquin Valley.

ALSHULER: Yes, I remember that.

TRELEVEN: The University of California, San Diego, is named not La Jolla but San Diego, quite a controversy at that time.

---

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

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

ALSHULER: Well, I think there was a regent [James W. Archer] from San Diego, not from La Jolla. I've forgotten his name, but there was.

TRELEVEN: Yes, well, there was later, DeWitt A. Higgs.

ALSHULER: Oh, before Higgs.

TRELEVEN: You're right.

ALSHULER: He was a lawyer.

TRELEVEN: Yes, and I'm not going to come up with his name. A lot of talk about medical center expansion, not only at Los Angeles and San Francisco but on the newer campuses as well as existing campuses.

ALSHULER: Well, you've got expansion of everything.

TRELEVEN: [Thomas M.] Storke offers property for sale to build a new Santa Barbara campus . . .

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: . . . over in Isla Vista. We're up to '61 now. San Diego County Board of Supervisors offers fifty acres so a medical school can be built in San Diego. Jules Stein Eye Institute at UCLA.

ALSHULER: That was Franklin Murphy's doing.

TRELEVEN: Well, we'll talk more about that. The Cowell Foundation up at Santa Cruz offers property to build what is now the Santa Cruz campus.

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Several propositions<sup>1</sup> on the California ballot to support higher education, which was in '62, June and November.

ALSHULER: Bond issues.

TRELEVEN: Bond issues, right. Thanks for straightening that out. Then farther along in '62, of course, the start of the Santa Cruz campus planning; continuing discussion about the Irvine campus development; additional property for San Diego through the Black property I believe it was called and Camp Kearney and all that issue.

ALSHULER: Yes, I believe it was Black, yeah.

TRELEVEN: So, but this is your interview, not mine.

ALSHULER: Well, I'm glad to get that refreshment, because I really don't . . .

TRELEVEN: I was just kind of interested in bringing up some of those things, some of which we'll want to come back to. But I guess to begin in a very small way, what recollections do you have of going to that first meeting that I mentioned?

---

1. Propositions 1, 2, and 3 (June 1962); Proposition 1A (November 1962).

ALSHULER: I really don't have any whatsoever other than I know my philosophy at the time was to keep your mouth shut and listen, which is always hard for me to do in a meeting. But that was a learning curve that I figured I needed to. . . . And also I thought the whole assignment of an alumni representative to the board is somewhat a mixed bag. You really can't. . . . I don't think you're accepted as a full. . . . You know, you're a passing regent. So the ultimate was to get some of your alumni onto the board as regular members, because that's where the strength lies, not in the passing through.

TRELEVEN: As a fully appointed regent such as Bill Forbes.

ALSHULER: Yes, such as Bill did. Yes, I think that. . . . So the passing through, the short-term assignment was more of an education of bringing that information back to the alumni constituency, you might say, than it was to do a hell of a lot of influence of policy, because you really don't have a lot of clout.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, in your first year . . .

ALSHULER: You listen anyhow.

TRELEVEN: . . . the Berkeley representative has the vote.

Is that all you did is listen during that first year?

ALSHULER: Oh, I guess there were occasions where I spoke up, but I don't think that it was. . . . You do more listening than talking by a long shot. And getting acquainted. You operate better in an area where you know the people you're talking with, which in those days was a very amicable group. There was very little. . . . I know it went from that to just the opposite, of rancor and great stress and immense disagreement. This group was able to. . . . Maybe the problems weren't as great. It's hard to say that. Each segment of time has its own set of problems. But there was general cordiality among the various regents. And the first year, what you're doing is getting acquainted with them.

TRELEVEN: So they were generally easy people to meet, get to know?

ALSHULER: Yes, yeah. There were wonderful people involved. I enjoyed knowing [William M.] Bill Roth, who was a very quiet, unassuming kind of a guy with a great deal of background and ability. There was a lady from San Francisco

that . . .

TRELEVEN: Catherine [C.] Hearst?

ALSHULER: No.

TRELEVEN: [Elinor R.] Ellie Heller?

ALSHULER: Ellie Heller was tremendous.

TRELEVEN: Why? Why do you say she was tremendous?

ALSHULER: She was bright, broad-minded, open to new ideas, had lots of clout--I mean in terms of wealth, of support of the university, of community respect, all positive things. I thought she was a wonderful person and very, very capable and very interested in the university. Hearst was a mixed bag, really. [Laughter] It may be an unkind thing to call her a bag. I really meant that her personality was highly emotional. And I don't think she. . . . She was sort of out of place in that environment. I don't think that was her big bag, but she did it out of service and commitment.

TRELEVEN: Well, since we're on the subject of women on the board, there's only one other one, and she was Dorothy [Buffum] Chandler.

ALSHULER: And she was great. Buff was always a strong person on that board. You never doubted where

she stood on things. She was a constructive regent. I could never. . . . You know, I never knew the Chandler family at all until the board meetings. The Chandler family was of course something I knew about from just growing up in L.A., so I sort of was in awe of her in the beginning. She turned out to be a very easy lady to be with and to understand her motives, and they were all good. She really was a constructive person. It was a good board. I mean, people liked one another in general, which changed.

TRELEVEN: While . . .

ALSHULER: No, after. Fortunately after. The only incident was with the fellow we talked about earlier.

TRELEVEN: Oh, Norton Simon.

ALSHULER: Norton, who came on the board either during those two years I think.

TRELEVEN: In '60.

ALSHULER: So right at the beginning. We came on about the same time. Well, Norton was a disruptive influence. Sometimes, you know, he was on the right track. But it didn't matter if he was on the right track or the wrong track, he would

throw what I would call a tantrum. I couldn't believe that a man as talented, smart, as great an achiever as he had been had to use these tactics. But at times it was embarrassing. And I guess this was the forerunner of the way the board started to go. But only once or twice did he really get embarrassingly out of line in my mind. He just almost went into a rage. It was hard to understand why a man of his stature and achievement could do this and couldn't get things done better by conviviality or at least strong position, but not these tactics. In any event, I recall that vividly as being a reaction to Norton that was disappointing.

TRELEVEN: Well, I'm not sure after thirty years if you can remember what he was excited about, but I wonder if it was over Irvine?

ALSHULER: I can't really. . . . I couldn't really tell you what the issue was. It could have been. . . . It was a major decision, and it seems to me that he was opposed to Irvine, but even that I don't remember that clearly. But I sometimes thought that his motivations had nothing to do with principle. They had to do with some personal

relationship or lack thereof at times in his what I might call vindictiveness. On the other hand, when not cranked up he came up with great ideas. He was very bright, he had lots of answers to questions, ways to get things done. But when his button got pressed, he was hard to handle. There was one terrible incident, I can't even remember now, fortunately, I guess, what it was all about or what he did, but it was bad. Something I'd never seen in any group. And I thought well especially in the regents where you expect people to be at a level where whatever their differences, they resolve them amicably. And generally that had been the way they were handled. We did away with I think compulsory physical education while I was on the board.

TRELEVEN: You did away with compulsory ROTC.

ALSHULER: ROTC? Was that it? Then phys ed was after that or before. I don't remember.

TRELEVEN: Well, no wait. You may be correct. Phys ed may have preceded . . .

ALSHULER: That bugged the devil out of me. I never liked that.

TRELEVEN: Phys ed or ROTC?

ALSHULER: Well, I didn't like either of them being removed, but I could understand why. . . . I was more sympathetic to compulsory ROTC being voluntary. But I felt that compulsory phys ed was a big mistake and still is. Compulsory military, there are other ways to solve the problem, and it probably wasn't doing it. But . . .

TRELEVEN: That seems like a lenient attitude for a . . .

ALSHULER: Former ROTC? Well, you know, I don't think it was the alpha and omega of solution to the armed forces, particularly as things have changed. The military needs kept changing. And to just teach somebody how to march and to maneuver a rifle and the military code was not the solution to our military problems. So I don't know that the university was the best place for that anyhow as we changed. At one point it was part of the land grant heritage, but phys ed to me, all the clutzes that needed it didn't do it and wouldn't do it unless they sort of had it built into them to do it. So that was kind of a pet peeve. But it went by the board too.

TRELEVEN: Getting back to Simon, one theory is that Simon was not happy that there were several regents on

the board of the Irvine company, namely [Victor R.] Hansen.

ALSHULER: Vic Hansen?

TRELEVEN: Hansen left as a regent while you were on the board. But maybe more importantly Edward [W.] Carter. This picture you have of everyone getting along pretty well, I've gotten some sense from some other discussions that Simon and Carter sort of mixed like oil and water.

ALSHULER: Oh, I didn't mean that. . . . I meant that everybody except Simon got along quite well, and that at times there was a tranquility when they were on issues that didn't relate to a point of disagreement. But it was not an ongoing, everything, all-out battle except on those particular subjects. But Vic Hansen retired, didn't he? He wasn't removed.

TRELEVEN: No, his term ran out.

ALSHULER: Term ran out and he didn't get reappointed.

TRELEVEN: Right. Judge Hansen. And . . .

ALSHULER: He was another one who went to a lot of the house parties.

TRELEVEN: That's right, he was a southerner. Also while you were there, [Jesse H.] Steinhart, his term

expired also. I don't know if you remember that.

ALSHULER: Yes, I'd forgotten him.

TRELEVEN: Yes, Jesse Steinhart.

ALSHULER: But he was very ill and didn't come to many meetings. His history was of course that he was one of the most respected of the northern regents and highly thought of even by the fellows from down south, who generally thought we were done in by the northern regents.

TRELEVEN: Okay, when you first start attending meetings a southerner is in the chair, namely [Edwin W.] Ed Pauley.

ALSHULER: Yes, but Ed wasn't. . . . His health was failing already and he wasn't at a lot of the meetings.

TRELEVEN: And I don't know his vice chair. It could have been [Gerald R.] Hagar who succeeded him.

ALSHULER: I don't even remember Hagar.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

ALSHULER: No disrespect, it just doesn't come to mind. But Ed was already failing, and I don't think that he was in attendance at quite a few of the meetings. Are you going to interview Bobbie [Barbara Pauley]?

TRELEVEN: Everyone seems to ask me that and everyone encourages me to do that.

ALSHULER: Wonderful lady. I'm sure she still pretty much can give you a lot of interesting information. But she was sort of propping Ed up at that time.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: I can remember, when was it? Ed used to drink quite a bit, and so at one of our gatherings, he was a real casualty. He just had lost his effectiveness by then. He just wasn't with it enough. Bobbie would bring him to the meetings more or less, and it was. . . . He was on the down side of the mountain. So I don't have any strong memories of Ed's leadership in that era. Carter was a very strong person, a lot of influence on the board.

TRELEVEN: I was going to say about Pauley, he still seemed to have a good deal of influence in Washington [D.C.], that tie with the [President Lyndon B.] Johnson administration and so on.

ALSHULER: Pauley had a lot of political clout, but as far as running things or being in the forefront, he liked to pull strings in the back more than . . .

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: I'd say Carter had taken over as the southern leader probably.

TRELEVEN: Okay, so if we were to look at it we'd have Dickson, of course, then you could say Pauley after that, and Carter, in terms of leadership of the southern or L.A. faction?

ALSHULER: Well, Phil Davis has to come in there. Now, I can't remember whether Phil ever served as a regent. I don't think so.

TRELEVEN: Yes, Phil was . . .

ALSHULER: Not Tom but Phil.

TRELEVEN: Back in '38-'41 he was the Alumni Association . . .

ALSHULER: President. In that period they didn't go to board meetings.

TRELEVEN: Whoops. Oh, you're right.

ALSHULER: But Phil was a congressman or a state assemblyman.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: And a very aggressive guy. He was a powerhouse for southern autonomy, you might say, for making UCLA. He was a supporter of Dickson and a confidante of Dickson. Phil was the stronger of the two. Tom was sort of in the shadow but stepped up when Phil started to fade a bit. But yes, that's probably the visible succession, from Pauley to Carter.

TRELEVEN: What was so impressive about Carter in your experience as a regent?

ALSHULER: Well, he wasn't a hip shooter. He thought things through pretty well. He could articulate them. I think he just had, like most of us had, a reaction of a businessman's approach to solving problems in a logical way. He was a builder. He had built his company and he was supportive of building the university. I always was an admirer of Ed's. I thought he was a good regent.

TRELEVEN: During your second year when you were especially invited to serve on the Investment Committee, did you serve alongside Carter then?

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Because when I think of Carter I often think of the Finance Committee.

ALSHULER: Yes, he had a fine grasp of the financial end of things. I asked to be on that committee, because I figured that was more in my line. Two committees it seems to me I was active in, and the other one was Buildings. . . . I don't know what they called it.

TRELEVEN: I have it, Grounds and Buildings.

ALSHULER: Grounds and Buildings, yeah. Those are the two

that I enjoyed.

TRELEVEN: You were on Audit Committee.

ALSHULER: That you never enjoy.

TRELEVEN: With Roth, [Cornelius] Haggerty, [Philip L.] Boyd, and [Arthur E.] Wilkens.

ALSHULER: Haggerty was interesting. I'd forgotten all about him. Phil Boyd was a grand man.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Good regent, too. Boy, he was a very good regent. Wilkens, was he the Berkeley? I don't remember him.

TRELEVEN: I think he was the Mechanics Institute [of San Francisco].

ALSHULER: That's probably right. Strange arrangement.

TRELEVEN: So, let's see. You were on University Relations Committee.

ALSHULER: Don't remember much about that one.

TRELEVEN: With Boyd; Hearst; [Roy E.] Simpson, who was [Superintendent of] Public Instruction; Sullivan, Jerd [F.] Sullivan [Jr.]; Glenn [M.] Anderson; Jesse M. Unruh; and Elinor Heller. Must have had to do with politicking or something. Maybe a committee . . .

ALSHULER: I think it must have been. I've forgotten.

TRELEVEN: Where you worked with [James H.] Jim Corley when needed or something, much as I can figure out.

ALSHULER: Yes, I don't remember that activity too well.

TRELEVEN: And Subcommittee on Investments.

ALSHULER: But the Investment Committee was interesting because of the magnitude of it with the university and the philosophy in regard to it, most of which I have now forgotten. I can't even remember that, because of my. . . . I know they weren't in real estate loans, and that always bugged me, because I thought they ought to be. Then later they did get into it. They tended to follow the more classical type of investment pattern that guys like Carter would institute that didn't really think about mortgages as an investment.

TRELEVEN: So what would one say then, a somewhat conservative portfolio?

ALSHULER: Very conservative.

TRELEVEN: Very conservative.

ALSHULER: Oh yeah. There was no worry about apartheid.

TRELEVEN: Apartheid.

ALSHULER: Apartheid. No, it was a pretty conservative investment, which it should have been and it was.

TRELEVEN: Well, say my retirement funds are in there. Why

should I want it to be that conservative, because, you know, shouldn't I want to maximize my profit? Where do you draw the line between risk and . . . ?

ALSHULER: Well, preservation of capital has to be the first line of responsibility for anybody in a fiduciary capacity.

TRELEVEN: Okay, because you're a trustee of a trust.

ALSHULER: You're damn right. So obviously you don't go for high fliers. You just can't. I mean, you're better to get in that now it's changed, because they've been able to introduce devices that protect you. But to get 4 percent at minimal risk than to get 6 or 8 percent at high risk, because if you lose the principle. . . . Now as we go through this interview you'll find I've been back in the investment community again at a later date on the board of a savings and loan right back where I started, full cycle.

TRELEVEN: We'll get back to that.

ALSHULER: It was taken over by the federal government.

TRELEVEN: Aha. My goodness. What I wanted to ask you about investments, were you saying then that at the time that the regents might have invested in

something like, what would you term it, blue-chip real estate?

ALSHULER: They had some. I don't think they were really much into real estate other than the university campuses. My recollection was that blue-chip stocks and bonds.

TRELEVEN: Yes, but in terms of mixing the portfolio . . .

ALSHULER: Oh, you mean what I thought they should, you know, get into blue-chip real estate. Right, which could be housing in a modest sense. There was some housing done. I've forgotten now, it was through the retirement fund or something like that, some modest amount. But that kind of basically, the university's investments were extremely conservative. They had good input. That part of it they had pretty good feed from the Hellers and other folks who were strong, Ed Carter, and folks from San Francisco who were strong in the financial community. So they got pretty good counsel.

TRELEVEN: Well, it wasn't during your period, but in later years Simon would complain more loudly about the conservativeness of the investments.

ALSHULER: I think he might have in our era too, but he was

just bouncing off the wall there. He didn't have a chance. Later on I think he became more vocal on it, because there was a change in the proportionate representation politically.

TRELEVEN: Yep, that's right. After Reagan was elected governor.

ALSHULER: I've forgotten that.

TRELEVEN: And took office in '67. Reagan went to his first meeting, and UC needed a new president after the first meeting. Then of course came more Reagan appointees along the way.

ALSHULER: That kind of cleaned up that act, or changed it. No, but between when Reagan came in and when I was on the board, there was a turn to the left. There were more Democratic appointees through [Edmund G.] "Pat" Brown [Sr.].  
Incidentally, wasn't Pat Brown the governor then?

TRELEVEN: He certainly was.

ALSHULER: Yes, and I liked Pat Brown. He was one of the fellows that I thought really was committed to make the university better.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I think it. . . . I don't know if he said it at the time. It's been said if nothing else by others that he really wanted to be the education

governor.

ALSHULER: Yes, he supported the university was my recollection and impression. I always admired him and his interest. He came to more board meetings than I had heard other governors had done.

TRELEVEN: Well, his appointment record was kind of interesting because he appointed some . . .

ALSHULER: He appointed Bill Forbes.

TRELEVEN: . . . liberally-inclined people.

ALSHULER: After Bill Forbes.

TRELEVEN: He appointed Simon, a liberal Republican like you. He appointed Forbes . . .

ALSHULER: Simon. [Laughter] He was a little further over. Forbes and Simon are two different liberal Republicans, I'll tell you.

TRELEVEN: On the other hand, one appointee who came along during your era was [Frederick F.] Fred Dutton.

ALSHULER: Yeah, I remember Fred. Now he was as far left as you're going to get on the board at that time. I don't know, but I remember Fred now that you mention it.

TRELEVEN: At the same time moving ahead a little . . .

[End Tape 2, Side A]

[Session 2, December 3, 1991]

[Begin Tape 2, Side B]

TRELEVEN: Okay, we're back on. It's the afternoon of December 3. This morning--or maybe earlier this afternoon is when we broke off--you seemed to be alluding to, if I could maybe paraphrase, achieving something like parity for UCLA, or UCLA becoming a "full-fledged" campus like Berkeley. In some contexts you used the word separatists.

ALSHULER: Well, remember we were at one point called the Southern Campus.

TRELEVEN: That's right, Southern Branch.

ALSHULER: Southern Branch. The general movement was to establish UCLA on a parity. The movement on part of the fellows in the south was to establish UCLA on a parity with Berkeley, which as I alluded earlier, Dickson had to be the front-runner, the leader in that battle.

TRELEVEN: So that's going way back. So in terms of improving the outlook for parity, in that sense

Murphy was a latecomer.

ALSHULER: But professional schools were still a struggle, to get approval of professional schools at UCLA compared to having them all at Berkeley. So, you know, each particular professional school took a little time to get into the swim of things. Engineering I think was the first one.

TRELEVEN: That's correct. Well, after education.

ALSHULER: Yes, well, education was there when I was there, because they were creating teachers and that sort of thing. But . . .

TRELEVEN: The engineering as you suggest . . .

ALSHULER: Medical.

TRELEVEN: Medicine, law . . .

ALSHULER: Dental. That's related to medicine, but it was later. All those . . .

TRELEVEN: Business administration.

ALSHULER: Yes, business administration was quite a bit later.

TRELEVEN: Was this kind of factionalism or separatism or whatever you want to call it between north and south, was that evident on the board, visibly evident on the board of regents?

ALSHULER: Only when it came down to a particular grad

school or something, and the resistance to adding those kinds of things seemed to me was where you would get into it in terms of adding buildings, for instance. We were building a lot more buildings at UCLA by then. You know, we were into additions to that med school, which now seem like insignificant things, but we were filling in all the vacant spots around UCLA. Other campuses of course were all in various stages. We were looking at buildings all the time. But I don't recollect any total partisanship north against south at the time I was on the board. There probably were some incidents, but I don't remember them as being ongoing and a major stumbling block to getting things done, which they would be if you were constantly fighting.

TRELEVEN: Were you ever aware that some Los Angeles regents would get together socially and talk regents' business?

ALSHULER: I don't think so, but I wouldn't be surprised. It could have been going on when I was alumni president, and I wouldn't have been aware of it I presume.

TRELEVEN: Well, certainly the key . . .

ALSHULER: See, again, my referral to when you're a two-year regent, you're not really in the in-group and you're just a passer through. And to that end I can see, well, they're only going to be there a couple of years. When they're out they may say things we wish we hadn't divulged. But it doesn't surprise me that there might have been.

TRELEVEN: Okay. At the time you served in terms of political persuasion, would liberals as opposed to conservatives, was that kind of thing evident? Political liberals?

ALSHULER: Yes, evident by fellows like Dutton. He was probably the most visible example of the ultimate liberal in the group. Roth was a quasi-liberal but by comparison. He and Dutton were buddies as I recall, just came in a flash. Roth was much, much less vocal and less aggressive than Dutton. As I said, fortunately he didn't come to a lot of meetings, because he was in Washington [D.C.]. I think he was in Washington. And I'd forgotten all about Dutton until you mentioned him in the course of events.

TRELEVEN: Who comes to mind, lets say, on the conservative side amongst that group you served with?

ALSHULER: Well, who was the fellow from Santa Barbara?  
Storke, was he already out?

TRELEVEN: Storke left the regents about 1960.

ALSHULER: He may have been on during my apprentice year.  
For some reason I think I've met Storke and  
that's why I think it might have been. He was an  
arch-conservative.

TRELEVEN: Interesting person, because his newspaper took on  
the John Birch Society, which is usually thought  
of as being pretty far right.

ALSHULER: I'll say. That's interesting. Let's see, who  
else would be? Well, Phil Boyd was quite  
conservative. And certainly Carter, although  
being considered a liberal in that context. He  
was probably more conservative politically. I'm  
trying to think of other folks. Well, Buff  
[Chandler] wasn't as conservative. . . . And you  
get into what's a definition of conservative.

TRELEVEN: Yes, that's right.

ALSHULER: And a liberal. In Russia now the liberals are  
conservatives and the conservatives are liberals.

TRELEVEN: That's right, the problem with a changing  
definition, because Canaday was considered to be  
a fairly conservative person too.

ALSHULER: Yes, he was. That's right. Canaday was. Forbes was generally conservative. You don't live in Pasadena and be called a liberal very easily.

TRELEVEN: But that whole definitional thing, it's problematic, because you talk about a conservative during your regency and then in '63 comes [Maxwell L.] Max Rafferty [Jr.]. Well . . .

ALSHULER: Yes. That's right, we missed Max entirely, but he was there. That started the year where I was very happy that I was off of the board. I thought, "Boy, I don't envy the fellows that are on the board" as the turmoil started to build up. I talked to them about it and read about it in the paper.

TRELEVEN: We just got you on the board, and you're happy to be leaving. [Laughter]

ALSHULER: Yes, indeed.

TRELEVEN: Well, before you leave, tell me, if you want to talk a little about your impressions of the person that became the eye of the storm, really, Clark Kerr. What were your personal impressions of Kerr in the context of the associations you had with him?

ALSHULER: That's kind of tough to answer. He was a much

colder individual than, say, Sproul. Sproul, no matter what you said about him, you really could kind of like him. He was jolly. He may be Machiavellian and conspiring while he's laughing and slapping you on the back and asking you, you know, personal things, but he was much more a great politician than Kerr. Kerr was a colder man and had probably a little different mission. I think he was a more intellectual type than we've had before. I'm not sure how great an administrator he was. I'm sort of ambivalent on Kerr. I don't get enthusiastic and yet I don't think he was a problem child. I mean, he never got me real t.o.'d [ticked off] at him.

TRELEVEN: Were you in a . . . ?

ALSHULER: Is the secretary of the board still alive?  
Marge?

TRELEVEN: Marjorie [J.] Woolman? Yes, she is.

ALSHULER: Have you guys interviewed her?

TRELEVEN: We haven't interviewed her. I suppose . . .

ALSHULER: That would dwarf and diminish all of our input if you could. If she's as bright as she was, or anywhere near, she could tell you stories that would keep you busy for a week just recording

them.

TRELEVEN: I'll just get an explanation of what gets put in the minutes and what doesn't.

ALSHULER: Well, that's. . . . You know, I've been in a few organizations and corporations, and that's true everywhere.

TRELEVEN: I know. It sure is. [Laughter] Were you somewhat aware that relationships between Kerr and Murphy were strained during the period you were there?

ALSHULER: Yes, I think I was. Murphy didn't want Kerr on his back all the time and wanted more autonomy than he was getting. It kind of has faded back into memory, but I guess you're right. You bring up that thought, and it's true there was strife between them. It related to I think Franklin being able to. . . . Well, all chancellors, but Franklin being the ringleader of them, having more authority in their own home ground. Kerr wanted to keep a more centralized authority. That's sort of my recollection of what was going on. But I've forgotten all of that infighting.

TRELEVEN: Well, there was a bit of it. In terms of the staffers on Kerr's staff, did you get to know Jim

Corley at all, the legislative . . . ?

ALSHULER: I met Jim and I know who you're referring to, but I didn't really know Corley that well. But he was. . . . Corley was there with Sproul too.

TRELEVEN: Yes, he was. Corley went back a few years.

ALSHULER: Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Right.

ALSHULER: Yes. Corley was a powerful figure in Sacramento as I recall it. And pre-Kerr by quite a bit. I sort of visualized him more with Sproul.

TRELEVEN: Yes, Corley was getting near the end, maybe another half dozen years or so I think. He was the man in Sacramento.

ALSHULER: But my guess is nobody ever replaced him as thoroughly as he did his job, I don't know. But he was pretty good at that.

TRELEVEN: That's what I understand, yeah. Cunningham, on the other hand, you'd known well for years.

ALSHULER: Cunningham, I always knew Tom, enjoyed him, knew his wife, had, you know, dinner with them on occasions separately and socially, enjoyed seeing him at the regents' meetings, pleased that he was the university counsel. I think he was pretty well suited to that. I think he went from being

a judge to that. He was a judge and became the university counsel and resigned his judgeship.

TRELEVEN: Well, it was your tenure, even your short tenure, that just happened to be the period that Cunningham came to the regents through Kerr and the crush of business on the legal counsel was becoming more oppressive all the time. There were just more and more issues to have to deal with because of the expanding campuses and contracts. I suppose even then more people were attending . . .

ALSHULER: You mean, was Cunningham canned while I was . . . ?

TRELEVEN: No, no, he needed additional . . .

ALSHULER: He needed more support, yeah.

TRELEVEN: . . . help. Yeah.

ALSHULER: That's what I thought. That seemed to me more like I can remember Tom pleading for additional . . .

TRELEVEN: That's what the minutes show.

ALSHULER: Well, you know, there was so much going on I can see where that's very possible.

TRELEVEN: We talked a bit about Murphy. Were there some other chancellors in particular that . . . ?

ALSHULER: Well, I didn't know [Sherman M.] Mellinkoff very well, but he was the original dean of the med

school.

TRELEVEN: Well, he came after Stafford [L.] Warren.

ALSHULER: Oh, Staff Warren, well, I knew Staff Warren. And that's right, he wasn't the original dean, Staff Warren was. But he was sort of a mixed deal as I recall. Staff, he was sort of a political animal, too. And I can't remember, did he and Murphy get nose to nose or not? But there was even some movement I think to get him to take Murphy's place, but I sort of had that feeling.

TRELEVEN: Murphy hadn't been there too long and Warren went on a year of phased retirement.

ALSHULER: Yes, I think that's right.

TRELEVEN: And Mellinkoff . . .

ALSHULER: They brought Mellinkoff in, right.

TRELEVEN: And Mellinkoff stayed for twenty-five years.

ALSHULER: Yes, I'd forgotten. And I knew Stafford better than Mellinkoff and I'd just forgotten about that. But he was more of a political administrator.

TRELEVEN: How about chancellors on other campuses? Any you recall?

ALSHULER: Yes, [Daniel G.] Dan Aldrich [Jr.].

TRELEVEN: Dan, yes.

ALSHULER: I followed his successful career at Irvine.

TRELEVEN: Would you have in the context of being on the Grounds and Buildings Committee . . . ?

ALSHULER: I had contact with him there.

TRELEVEN: You would have. . . . He was the founding chancellor.

ALSHULER: I think he was appointed to that job while I was on the board or just before I was.

TRELEVEN: I don't want to say absolutely, but I'm 99 percent sure.

ALSHULER: That was about the time because that's when we were exploring what was proposed to be built down there and the academic program for there. And that's where I got acquainted with Dan. Let's see, I knew several of the other chancellors to visit with. Santa Barbara, I was trying to think who that was.

TRELEVEN: I think maybe [Samuel B.] Gould.

ALSHULER: I remember Gould, but it seemed to me he replaced somebody else. Gould came out of Berkeley.

TRELEVEN: Yes, he's the one who began the education abroad program.

ALSHULER: Yes, I remember Gould. I don't have any strong impressions. Who was at Riverside?

TRELEVEN: Was it [Ivan] Hinderaker?

ALSHULER: Ivan Hinderaker. Sure, he was a poli sci professor at UCLA who went out there. Yes, I remember Hinderaker. But I really have no vivid impressions one way or the other.

TRELEVEN: Of course, McHenry you . . .

ALSHULER: And Dean [E.] McHenry I do have impressions of. There was a lot of controversy about whether to have Dean have that job or not. There was a lot of discussion. But he lived and died on that job. I mean, he really gave it a lot of attention when it became sort of his mission. He fought for that specialized type of school, which it is. I don't know how successful it is. It must have cost the state a lot more to run a school like that. I don't know whether they. . . . Is it still adhered to? Is it still the same kind of an operation?

TRELEVEN: Pretty much so. I think the integrity has remained more so than, say, San Diego, which also was a cluster college.

ALSHULER: Also, it was going to be scientific, heavy duty scientific. They put I've forgotten. . . . The first chancellor down there was a pretty renowned

scientist as I recall.

TRELEVEN: Yes, whose name [Herbert F. York] I'll fill in in the transcript because . . .

ALSHULER: But he was no administrator.

TRELEVEN: Roger [R.] Revelle comes to mind, and I'm not quite sure that's accurate. I'll come up with it.

ALSHULER: Right now I can't think of who was up at Davis. So I guess I can't remember too many of the chancellors.

TRELEVEN: Okay. How about Pat Brown? I take it you must have had a chance to meet him personally if he showed up at some meetings.

ALSHULER: And I have seen him since through the years.

TRELEVEN: You have?

ALSHULER: Oh yeah. A favorite anecdote of ours is when we were at Chuck Young's house here ten years ago maybe for one of his I think it was a Christmas party. We were standing in line, but the line was in front of the bar. We were waiting to step up to the buffet, and this fellow whisks in front of Patsy [Chisholm Alshuler] and grabs a plate and starts to go down the line. And Patsy [Laughter] taps him on the back and says, "What do you think you're doing? This is the line."

Here, go get at the end of it." [Laughter] Just like that. And he turns around, and I look at Patsy and I started laughing. "Do you know who you just told to go to the end of the line? The former governor of the state of California." And he was most. . . . You know, he said, "Oh, oh, I'm sorry. I didn't realize there was a line." And whips back and gets in the back of the line. So that's one of my more recent encounters. Although at a subsequent time we chided him about that, and he blushed and admitted that he had sure goofed that night. But I've had a lot more admiration for him than his son [Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown, Jr.]. Let's put it that way. And Pat, well, like we. . . . A couple of us went up there to plug for Forbes's nomination for the regents.

TRELEVEN: You did?

ALSHULER: Canaday and I went up and interviewed the governor. And he was very candid. He said, "Well, you know, Forbes is a Republican." He said, "I'm a Democrat." Redundant but necessary to emphasize. And, well, we pointed out all the good features about Forbes and needing a southern

regent, more southern regents, just as a pitch, you know, for him. And he was perfectly willing to listen, and obviously, ultimately, for whatever reasons did appoint Bill. So I can't have too hard of feelings about Pat Brown. And as I say, he had an interest in education more than some of the other governors have had. More than the universities.

TRELEVEN: Yes. At the time you were on the board, did he show up?

ALSHULER: Not too regularly because of the governorship, I think. He came maybe every other meeting or something. I don't know, you could look at the records.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: But it seemed to me that he wasn't a consistent attendee. But it seemed to me he went more later on when the fights got in, that he. . . . But you'd have to ask some of the fellows like Forbes.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I picked that up from the minutes. But when he did attend, did he butt in?

ALSHULER: I thought he listened a lot.

TRELEVEN: Listened?

ALSHULER: That's sort of my recollection, that he didn't dominate the conversation or jump in and become . . . . I tell you that's kind of vague, but I didn't have any feeling. . . . Mostly at this point in time I run by something that I remember because it was so vivid, and there was nothing vivid about his being a dominating figure at a board meeting or demanding the floor or anything like that.

TRELEVEN: The political members of the board like Unruh, Glenn Anderson, [Mervyn M.] Dymally, were they around enough for you to mingle with or associate with at all?

ALSHULER: Anderson was a very dedicated attendee. I always thought he was a pussycat. I didn't like his political views. I liked his wife who was a cute gal. [Laughter] I can remember all the important things. But I didn't agree with most of Anderson's viewpoints, but I give him an A in attendance. I don't think he ever missed a meeting. He was a good attendee. I don't even remember that Unruh was on the board. Are you sure he was on the board?

TRELEVEN: Yes, he became speaker of the assembly in '62.

And you were there until June of '63, so . . .

ALSHULER: Then he didn't come much would be my impression. I certainly remember Unruh and his political activity, but I don't remember him in relation to the board at all. And who was the other one you asked about?

TRELEVEN: Dymally.

ALSHULER: Dymally wasn't on the board when I was in there.

TRELEVEN: Well, senate pro tem?

ALSHULER: Still I never saw him.

TRELEVEN: See, Ralph [M.] Brown was pro tem until '62.

ALSHULER: I have no recollections of Dymally at all.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: Sometimes you just blot those out because you like to, but I mean subconscious, but I don't remember him. It's all right, he probably doesn't remember me.

TRELEVEN: Okay, and maybe one other general question, and that is, what was the routine like for you personally beginning with maybe, what, getting something in the mail from Marjorie Woolman?

ALSHULER: Oh, you mean the amount of material?

TRELEVEN: Yes, in other words . . .

ALSHULER: You got a lot of it.

TRELEVEN: . . . leading up to a meeting, first you'd get  
. . .

ALSHULER: Well, you know I don't really remember all the mechanics of it that much except that there was more material than you could read. You had to sort of pick out what you wanted to orient yourself to. It was very thorough. And of course, the committees got material specialized, like the Buildings and Grounds got all the drawings and plans for buildings and details like that and layouts for campuses. And I sort of forget, I do forget.

TRELEVEN: Given all the activity going on. But each of you got . . .

ALSHULER: Now, I don't remember whether we had small drawings or what, but we did see every building.

TRELEVEN: Wow.

ALSHULER: Well, we're spending big bucks.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, right.

ALSHULER: Not that in the end you don't agree, but you try to make sure that you're giving it enough attention that they don't pull something over on you, any more over on you than they can, if you put it that way.

TRELEVEN: Well, you have ten meetings a year. How many hours do you estimate you have to spend on this material that came for every meeting?

ALSHULER: Gosh, I forget. There have been a lot of other events since then.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: I was on this savings and loan, and it was the same kind of thing. We received material, a tremendous amount of material. The board was the same way, and it was very difficult to read it all. So usually you had to decide how far into something to go because there was more material than anybody could assimilate even in the time they gave us. But I've forgotten now what the routine was, whether they had to get it out to you a week ahead of time. I would just be making a wild guess at whether I spent eight hours or two days or what. But if you want to. . . . You had to read it. You had to read the key things. You didn't have to read it all, but you had to in order to get anything out of a meeting because you. . . . You know, you went to class on the assumption that people knew what the proposals were. And those that didn't, it became

vivid in a hurry that they didn't. I'm sure that's one of the reasons Pat Brown kind of shut his mouth. And others who were involved in a lot of other things couldn't possibly have absorbed the material necessary to engage in the discussion unless it was on an issue that they were well involved in. But I just remember it being very thorough. I remember having the greatest admiration for Marjorie. I thought she was a top-flight lady, well organized.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, I've heard that said before.

ALSHULER: Oh yeah.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: If a meeting is up at Berkeley, then what would you do? Fly up to Berkeley?

ALSHULER: Yes, always fly up.

TRELEVEN: Did you go up the night before?

ALSHULER: Gee, I can't remember that except that we did have, you know, we would have dinner meetings and things of that nature which I can't really put my finger on now. And there were certain meetings where you took your wife because there was some social activity involved and other meetings where you didn't. Our meetings were generally not

attended by the public, but obviously open to the public. We hardly ever got anybody there. This was before the big . . .

TRELEVEN: No students pounding on the doors at that time, huh?

ALSHULER: No student members. You know, they've got a student . . .

TRELEVEN: Student regent now.

ALSHULER: . . . regent now, and that doesn't make a hell of a lot of sense to me, I must say. That's like asking a private in the army to serve on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That doesn't make a lot of sense.

TRELEVEN: Well, it's only one vote out of . . .

ALSHULER: Oh yeah, I know, but it seems more political than practical.

TRELEVEN: Now as a member of Grounds and Buildings Committee, did you travel to all the campuses? Is that what you were . . . ?

ALSHULER: Well, we did meet on different campuses at different times to see sites. I don't remember that we always went to every site of every building that we approved. But I can remember visiting. . . . Of course, see, we had also

switched. . . . Our meetings weren't always at Berkeley or UCLA.

TRELEVEN: That's right. There was beginning to be . . .

ALSHULER: . . . some dispersion of the meetings.

TRELEVEN: Some dispersion of the meetings, right.

ALSHULER: And I've forgotten how that went. But we did visit some other campuses.

TRELEVEN: Well, for instance, while you were on the board did you go to the sites of the three new campuses?

ALSHULER: Yes, Santa Barbara or . . .

TRELEVEN: Santa Cruz.

ALSHULER: Santa Cruz we did visit. Santa Cruz, Irvine, and San Diego, yeah, we did. You know they had the plans out for us to. . . . They were in various stages of the development plans. I don't think any of them were doing anything more than laying out ground at the time. I can't quite remember those things clearly, too. Each of those three campuses were so different it was interesting to visit and see how the ground was going to be used and how it would relate to what they were planning on doing there.

TRELEVEN: You mean like what you were going to do with a

quarry sitting in the middle of Santa Cruz?

ALSHULER: Well, yes, you know all those big trees. How were they going to put big buildings up in the middle of all that stuff? And still even then there were environmentalists that were strongly opposed to chopping down a single tree in there. But that was a magnificent site. I remember thinking, "Boy, if I were younger, wouldn't I like to go to school here!"

TRELEVEN: And the San Diego site is nothing to sneeze at either.

ALSHULER: Well, neither is Irvine. All three of them were magnificent pieces of land.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Yes, they're all . . .

TRELEVEN: In your recollection, was there much going on relating to this possibility of the fourth campus in the San Joaquin Valley?

ALSHULER: I only remember discussions of it, but I can't really. . . . I think we had a platter full was about the basic attitude, that even if it was justified, Davis was on the margin of it and we had three big campuses to develop. I guess you get down to it that maybe they didn't have enough

political clout to put it over.

TRELEVEN: And today looking into it again.

ALSHULER: Well, sooner or later they deserve one. I would think that probably it has some merit. It's a major part of the state and contributes a lot to the state economic growth.

TRELEVEN: Yes, I suppose we should add here that while UC was building, beginning to build three new campuses, there were six new state colleges being built simultaneously.

ALSHULER: I'd forgotten that, but they surely had proliferated. And junior colleges were being converted. As I recall they were making those more. . . . Didn't they make some of those into state colleges?

TRELEVEN: Yes, that's right.

ALSHULER: So there was a whole separate system growing up there.

TRELEVEN: Aside from the growth, the beginning of the development of these campuses while you're on the board, I was struck by the amount of attention being given to medical education.

ALSHULER: I think this was at a time when there was a shortage of doctors, which is hard to envision.

But I think there was a point in time when we were in a cycle of a shortage of doctors, and the university really had one, that school in downtown San Francisco. I think that's right. And here, you know, there are giant cities like L.A. area and San Diego area without any university med facilities. And so it was easy to justify that effort.

TRELEVEN: On the basis of the need for . . .

ALSHULER: Population.

TRELEVEN: The population growing, the need for doctors.

ALSHULER: The need for the medical facility.

TRELEVEN: It turns out to be an expensive proposition.

ALSHULER: Extremely. Extremely.

TRELEVEN: Something else you missed by not being on the board in subsequent years.

ALSHULER: Yes, I don't know what the solution is, however, then or now. I mean, what do you do, have one large, centralized medical school? How do you solve it?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Medical schools are just plain expensive because medicine is expensive because there's a change every day.

TRELEVEN: Yes, the cutting edge of new technology shifts.

ALSHULER: That's the word. Tremendously fast. So a medical school has got to be at the cutting edge, and to do that you've got to be buying new equipment and hiring the doctors who are the ones with the new breakthroughs. On the other hand, look at how I had open-heart surgery. Well, there's doctors down at the universities in Texas, I guess they were the guys that started that, able to perfect it. And look at how many lives that are now saved when you think about it.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: So there's lots of illustrations of that, I guess, but it costs money.

TRELEVEN: When you were on Grounds and Buildings, were you involved with all of the residence hall expansion that was going on? And in the discussion where 25 percent of the students on the larger campuses would be housed in residence halls and 50 percent on the smaller?

ALSHULER: I remember something about that. I can't really say I remember that that's what we decided. Did we?

TRELEVEN: Yep.

ALSHULER: Well, that had to be a theory. [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: That was the goal.

ALSHULER: Yes.

TRELEVEN: Yes, that was the goal at that time with expanding student population but still nothing quite matching what happened later.

ALSHULER: Well, of course I felt sympathetic to that, particularly with UCLA being such a commuter campus and having some ground that they could use for dorms, I thought it would be cohesive. Some of the other schools didn't have the housing problems that you have in West L.A. I mean, it's just hard to measure that against any other university as a result of our problems that we discussed. Even then I can remember that the cost of a professor coming in there, his housing was so much higher than it was where he came from that it added to our problem on how to solve that one.

TRELEVEN: A serious recruiting problem had developed.

ALSHULER: Then, and I guess it's been worse since, become worse.

TRELEVEN: That's right. It has not improved. As these buildings are going up, just to get this

straight, you're a member of Grounds and Buildings. Once it's decided to go ahead with the structures and so on, do you pretty much leave it in the hands of the president's office and his staff to take it away after that? Or do you actually as a member of the committee go visit these sites?

ALSHULER: Well, I think again this is, boy, hard to put your finger on. More that when we visit a campus--we would meet at different campuses from time to time instead of at Berkeley or at UCLA--we'd go see the building mainly just to drive by, just to see how it was forming, how it fit in the landscape and that sort of thing. And there was that, but we didn't oversee the construction of the building. You can't do that.

TRELEVEN: No, I didn't mean oversee, but I'm just trying to get a sense to what extent the committee members are involved in a building once it's . . .

ALSHULER: Well, you take a fellow like Phil Boyd, he lived and died with the Riverside campus. I think he knew every bit of it because of it being his constituency in a way. And Phil was very active in making sure that campus developed

appropriately, so he was there a lot. And those of us who lived around UCLA, we were constantly seeing the change up until it got so busy later on.

TRELEVEN: You can't even find parking.

ALSHULER: Yes. I think we heard about them if there was some kind of cost overrun or construction problem or something of that nature. They come back in.

TRELEVEN: Right.

ALSHULER: But if they weren't having troubles, we didn't hear much more about them.

TRELEVEN: There's some sort of story about how [Donald H.] McLaughlin liked red tile roofs. Can you verify that? [Laughter]

ALSHULER: No.

TRELEVEN: Don McLaughlin, he was on the Grounds and Buildings Committee.

ALSHULER: I remember Don. Now, there's a . . . Now you've brought up a name I'd forgotten all about. Little Scotsman. He was an arch-conservative. There was a conservative fellow. I guess he liked red tile roofs, but I've even forgotten that eccentricity. He certainly ran out of them.

TRELEVEN: Speaking of running out, we're just about out of

tape, so let me change this.

ALSHULER: Okay.

[End Tape 2, Side B]

[Begin Tape 3, Side A]

TRELEVEN: One thing I wanted to ask you about specifically is that during your voting year you were a member of a Subcommittee on Graduate Student Housing at UCLA. You were on this committee with several other Los Angeles area regents. Why was that kind of a committee needed at that time? Or what do you remember about the background of it?

ALSHULER: I don't remember a thing. I do remember something about graduate student housing because we didn't have any as far as I know. I don't think we had any. And what was involved was more family-type housing because I think it implied husband and wife cohabitation-type units rather than straight dorms. And it seemed to me there was talk and maybe they were built on the Westside up along Veteran [Avenue] there somewhere. The units that are below the dorm but up towards Veteran and run along the edge there, I think those were the ultimate graduate student dorms. But beyond that, I have forgotten the ins

and outs of why.

TRELEVEN: Okay. Do you remember anything about south on Sepulveda [Boulevard] a place called Park Vista apartments? Were you involved in that at all? Or Sepulveda Park was another one. These were . . .

ALSHULER: Off-campus sites?

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

ALSHULER: Where they wanted to integrate it?

TRELEVEN: Large apartment units built in part with federal money.

ALSHULER: I don't remember that.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: My recollection is there was a general sentiment to keep contiguous property. There wasn't a feeling for leapfrogging away from the campus. And tried to keep. . . . There's sort of a conduit of university-owned property down into the edge of Westwood. And they didn't want to jump down the street and on around. That's just a philosophy I seem to remember, but I sure couldn't expand on it.

TRELEVEN: Well, that seems to be correct because before the new Federal Building was built, that was vacant

VA [Veterans Administration] land, and UCLA expressed an interest in it. But at that point the feds decided to build what is now the office building.

ALSHULER: But that was quite a bit later.

TRELEVEN: Not too much later.

ALSHULER: Not quite a bit, no. Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Anyway, these apartment complexes, that did get underway while you were a regent.

ALSHULER: It did? I don't remember that at all.

TRELEVEN: UCLA owns that to this day.

ALSHULER: I don't. . . . University owned, federally financed?

TRELEVEN: No, these were originally built as federally-subsidized apartment complexes.

ALSHULER: For students.

TRELEVEN: No, for the general public. Low-income housing is the way we might term it now.

ALSHULER: Yeah? And how did UCLA get involved? I don't remember that.

TRELEVEN: Well, if these looked interesting enough and they could purchase them, they would. And if they couldn't purchase them, they'd use public domain, eminent domain I mean.

ALSHULER: Gosh, I don't remember that.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, we tried. Remember much about the discussion of faculty compensation to maintain . . .

ALSHULER: Parity?

TRELEVEN: . . . parity with other major universities?

ALSHULER: Yes, but I don't remember much. Seemed to me it was that there was a report we would get. And I've forgotten whether we got it once or once a year on where we stood relative to other universities on our pay scale. This came at a time when we reviewed the pay scale of the university faculty. But the details, the mechanics, that sort of thing I don't remember. But I remember that we did have comparatives, and our objective was to stay on the upper level of it.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: Another area, in '62 there were bonding initiatives that went on the California ballot. Three in June of '62, which were Prop[osition]s 1, 2, and 3, and then Prop[osition] 1A in November, 1962. Prop. 3 failed, but the others succeeded. My question to you though is to what

extent were you involved in inducing people to be interested in these issues and, more importantly, voting yes for these bonding initiatives since they did concern the University of California?

ALSHULER: Well, I think that the Alumni Association always ran an article in the alumni magazine when there were these. . . . Particularly in those days, I think less later on. But in those days when there was a university initiative they were publicized in the alumni magazine but not much beyond that. We never went on the political trail in any sense or lobbied. Lobbying wouldn't make any difference on something of that nature anyhow. But I think it was mainly. . . . And, you know, at an alumni gathering or any function we would try and plug it. But we didn't run a specific campaign through the Alumni Association. You're quite vulnerable to that I think, if I remember correctly. If you get too politically active, you lose your tax exempt status.

TRELEVEN: Yes, there can be a conflict of interest.

ALSHULER: Yes, so . . .

TRELEVEN: Well, I was asking because Canaday and Pauley

were quite involved in sort of citizens committees, I think they were called, in support of one or the other of these props. And I just wondered if you personally were that involved yourself.

ALSHULER: No.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: They both had the mechanism to do something about it. Really the only mechanism of mine related to it was the alumni magazine where you had a medium to work with.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, okay. Also while you were a regent, there was a battle going on of sorts between the University of California and [Charles] Hale Champion who was the head of finance. And it was over the division of . . .

ALSHULER: Jesus, I'd forgotten his name even. Yeah, I remember him.

TRELEVEN: In fact, he was most recently involved in the [Michael S.] Dukakis [1988 presidential] campaign as I understand it.

ALSHULER: How in the world? Well, anyhow.

TRELEVEN: Anyway, the issue was the . . .

ALSHULER: Well, now he was. . . . There was another fellow

named Bob something or other who was the university. . . . What was Hale Champion? What was his title? I don't even remember that. I just remember his name.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think he was [director of] finance and I think there was a guy by the name of Fred Carr I think who was there a little earlier. But that's on the government side. I mean it's on the state government side, not the UC side.

ALSHULER: Not. . . . Yeah.

TRELEVEN: Yeah.

ALSHULER: Champion's name I remember, but I can't put it together with anything other than finance.

TRELEVEN: Yes, the issue was the university would get a contract or a grant. Then there's an overhead percentage, and the issue was who should get what percentage of the overhead? State or the university, and the state wanted more of course. But none of that seems to be ringing a bell with you.

ALSHULER: No, it's not ringing any bell.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: It doesn't mean it wasn't all happening, but those things didn't linger.

TRELEVEN: Right. A few more things here. ROTC compulsory versus voluntary, that came up at the time you were a regent. We've talked a bit about that. And if I recall, you said your position by the early sixties is that it could be voluntary or should be voluntary.

ALSHULER: It didn't bother me that much. If that was the desire of the administration to change the operation that I didn't think that that was a very key issue. It didn't bother me like the phys ed thing did. Those are very personal observations on it.

TRELEVEN: Student involvement--here I don't mean a student regent--but at the time you were a regent, were there any students at all in sight with signs or chants or anything like that that early? Now I know there was when we get into the question of the Free Speech Movement in '64, but . . .

ALSHULER: Yes, I think we were a little before all of those problems and I can't remember any. . . . My only recollection was my son flunked out of Berkeley while I was on the board of regents.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter] But he didn't come to a regents' meeting.

ALSHULER: He got an A in beer drinking in San Francisco. [Laughter] Yeah, but I don't really remember. Kids were still at war. He was right at the front end--because I look now and that's when John was at Berkeley--at the front end of the drug scene. It wasn't really coming on strong. I look back and thought, "Boy, were we lucky." Although he was in college for several more years, he managed to miss it. And so I think to that extent it also is true of student activists who weren't too vocal with it at the time.

TRELEVEN: Okay, I don't want to say never, but it would be unlikely that you'd go to a regents' meeting, and say there was a group of students who opposed . . .

ALSHULER: I don't remember there being any . . .

TRELEVEN: Any opposition to anything.

ALSHULER: . . . any demonstrations or anything.

TRELEVEN: No students were opposing the university running the radiation laboratory? Los Alamos [Scientific Laboratory], anything like that?

ALSHULER: That sentiment hadn't really. . . . It may have been there but I don't remember that being a big item.

TRELEVEN: It just wasn't an issue at that point.

ALSHULER: Not to my recollection. No, I don't think it was then.

TRELEVEN: Another issue that came up was speakers who are communists.

ALSHULER: Now you're ringing some bell, and I can't remember what it was.

TRELEVEN: It was discussed, policy was implemented finally in September '63 to allow communist speakers but certain conditions being placed with a moderator and the speaker allowing questions from the audience and so on. But what were your own feelings on that?

ALSHULER: Well, I'm really not sure that I remember what they were.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: You know, time changes that, I must say.

TRELEVEN: That's right.

ALSHULER: Who gives a damn now? [Laughter]

TRELEVEN: But it was a hell of an issue to some people way back, it seems.

ALSHULER: Yes, well, yes, I don't remember that being a worrisome question to me. I think that I probably wasn't pleased with the idea at the time of allowing communists who by their doctrine were

advocating the overthrow of the U.S. government to speak. But this is just an impression of what I think I felt. And I can't remember it being a burning issue.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: I can't remember. Was it Angela [Y.] Davis?

TRELEVEN: No, it was before her time.

ALSHULER: She was shortly after that, though. She was in the next couple of years.

TRELEVEN: There was a case in Riverside when you were on the regents and it involved a speaker who was an alleged communist.

ALSHULER: I'll bet you Hinderaker didn't let him talk.

TRELEVEN: The person who was denied sued the university. And that forced the regents to take another look at the policy in view of some court decisions and so on. Certainly there must have been an alleged party member or two speaking at Berkeley once in a while.

ALSHULER: I can't imagine that there wasn't. Under what guise, you know, it could have been something different. Yeah, it'd be hard to imagine that.

TRELEVEN: When I was giving you that sort of overview in getting into the regents' business, one of the

figures showed that between '58 and '64, the amount of money coming to the university from Atomic Energy Commission grants had about doubled in that period of time. And this is to run Los Alamos and the two radiation labs, one at Livermore [Lawrence Livermore Laboratory] and one at Berkeley [Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory]. Is that the kind of business the university should be in, do you think?

ALSHULER: Are you talking now or then or . . . ?

TRELEVEN: Then and now because it's still an issue. There are still complaints that . . .

ALSHULER: Well, I guess I'd have to respond that I don't think it's any more out of line than a lot of other things the university is in. I think the university could be out of it. On the other hand, at least in its early stages, it had to be in some major part academic. They had to come up with the scientific theories and the methods of forming the atomic fusions. I would guess that I don't think it was a major issue at that time. I mean, I don't think we went head to head on should we be in that business or not, which I know came up later on. I don't think anybody

really was too concerned that we were doing it. And it was generally I think thought of that we were providing a service that was needed to the government.

TRELEVEN: That's sort of the impression I get, that this is pretty close to Sputnik, post '58. So it's not that far removed in time from Sputnik for the great amount of concern that the U.S. is falling behind and they need to push.

ALSHULER: And if it takes academia to do it. . . . I don't think that this was a big concern. I don't recall that at all: "Should we or shouldn't we be in the atom business?" It was rather obscured too. I don't think it was brought up too often.

TRELEVEN: Okay, while you were a regent there began to be some concern expressed about what we now recognize as equal opportunity for nonwhites in terms of students and staff and faculty. Do you recall any of those discussions?

ALSHULER: Not in the particular.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: There were a lot of these things that you mention that seem to me to be subject matter that we

probably talked about. I just don't remember any monumental issues or decisions from them.

TRELEVEN: Right. And in this case, for good reason, because it took till the end of '63 before a Special Student Scholarship Fund was set up. That was one of the outcomes which came from the [Regents] Opportunity Fund which you'll probably recognize the name of from being on the Investments Committee. It was one of the funds the university had. And getting near the end here, nondiscrimination clauses for student organizations. The regents had a policy on this beginning in July of '59, and then they reaffirmed it. Was that ever a problem, say, in your own student organization, I mean, in your own fraternity?

ALSHULER: Oh, there was discrimination in the sense that they'd like some guys and voted them in and didn't like others. And there were certain fellows who were predisposed to never want a Jew in the fraternity or never want a black guy, and we had all of the above in the course of events. Maybe not so much then as later on. I talked to them about bringing Hitoshi Yonemura in at one time,

and that didn't receive a lot of enthusiasm. There have since been a number of Japanese boys. So I guess you'd say there was. . . . Well, I'm thinking of when I was in school, and you're talking about, and I get these mixed, you're talking about when I was on the board.

TRELEVEN: Yes, because . . .

ALSHULER: In my fraternity when I was on the board. I think they had come a long ways from when I was in school.

TRELEVEN: I had asked you about your own fraternity because there were some problems with some fraternities and some sororities not so much at the local level . . .

ALSHULER: The national.

TRELEVEN: It was at the national level where national charters . . .

ALSHULER: Most of the nationals either changed the charter or backed off the campus. And I don't remember if that occurred while I was a regent or after.

TRELEVEN: My guess would be after because policy reaffirmation and then try to enforce it. And I guess one last specific question here. Back in the late fifties or 1960 the regents, before your

time, the regents expressed--I'm asking you this because you're interested in athletics--the regents expressed a preference for the University of California balancing academics and athletics along Ivy League lines. What's your opinion of what happened to that preference?

ALSHULER: I don't think it's ever had a lot of support at the decision-making level. I think the fellows from Berkeley as well as the fellows from UCLA didn't really find that attractive.

TRELEVEN: Because?

ALSHULER: Well, I think they liked the athletic program. They were interested in athletics as a way of identity for the university. I know Franklin Murphy felt that way, and certainly Chuck Young has followed that suit. And I think Berkeley has shown right now that they're back in the swim too.

TRELEVEN: Yes, yes.

ALSHULER: And I think that that never had very strong support in the regents. There were a few who vocalized it, but I don't think I remember that being a very burning issue other than it just got obscured because of the lack of enthusiasm. Now

that doesn't mean there wasn't a lot of concern over how athletes were treated in terms of overdoing and financing them and living within the rules that were set and setting rules that could be lived with. But I don't think there was any strong feeling that it should be deemphasized to the Ivy League level. And it certainly has never followed that route.

TRELEVEN: It doesn't seem to have.

ALSHULER: Even the other campuses who don't have the same level still play in some pretty competitive areas. Irvine's basketball team has been quite active and their level of competition has been pretty good. Most of the other campuses have tended to be more Ivy League.

TRELEVEN: Yes, Santa Cruz certainly . . .

ALSHULER: They're totally. Now that would reflect McHenry too. You said he's still alive, huh?

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Still as sharp as ever?

TRELEVEN: He's very sharp yet. He's got a small vineyard up by his place outside of Santa Cruz.

ALSHULER: I thought Dean was a great guy.

TRELEVEN: Yes.

ALSHULER: Not many people had the energy he had. Man, he was a real doer.

TRELEVEN: Let me just sum up then maybe by asking first what was most satisfying about being on the board during that short time you were, the two-year period?

ALSHULER: Oh, I guess it was the opportunity to meet and get acquainted with some very outstanding people who were members of the board and from a lot of different walks of life. I think to me that was the most satisfying. I couldn't hope to get some particular program or plan or anything through. It was more of a representation of the UCLA alumni. And we had good representation already because we had Canaday there and Forbes so that we were. . . . I've forgotten whether Bill was appointed after or during.

TRELEVEN: He was appointed before you left.

ALSHULER: Before I left, yes, that's what I thought. So there was really an outstanding group of regents and a very dedicated group. So the experience of working with people that capable and from a lot of different walks of life was extremely interesting and enlightening. I'd say that was

the primary . . .

TRELEVEN: From the standpoint of being a representative of the UCLA Alumni Association, did you feel that progress then continued to be made towards reaching this goal of a fairer share or parity?

ALSHULER: Oh, I think we were way along on that program by then. It was just a matter of when, not whether.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: Particularly with the arrival of Franklin who kept that rolling and as you alluded to may have been one of the reasons why he and Kerr didn't see eye to eye.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: I think that got worse later. It was just, you know, at the front end when we. . . . I think the alumni associations are well served by having their president. . . . I don't know how they do that anymore because of the other campuses.

TRELEVEN: I think there's one more representative in the cycle, and the other campuses are integrated.

ALSHULER: Say that again, now I couldn't tell.

TRELEVEN: I think there's an additional slot.

ALSHULER: One? And they rotate it?

TRELEVEN: So I think there's three in the rotation, and

they rotate amongst the various campuses. So Irvine for instance is included now. San Diego is included.

ALSHULER: So it's rotated in three, only three. . . . Do UCLA and Berkeley alternate?

TRELEVEN: That I don't know.

ALSHULER: Yes, I don't know how it works anymore either.

TRELEVEN: But it's still going on.

ALSHULER: It's good, it brings. . . . You know, another thing I should have mentioned in benefits, it enables a person out of the group of alumni to come back to the group and tell them how the university functions. To that end maybe the strongest benefit to the Alumni Association, the president comes back and makes a report to the alumni board, and that's made up of twenty or thirty people who are interested in hearing how the university went through the mechanisms of deciding this and that and what issues were on the table, things that may not be headline news but of interest to them.

TRELEVEN: So it's really an important line of communication.

ALSHULER: It is.

TRELEVEN: Between the policy-making board . . .

ALSHULER: It may be the most important benefit for the whole university.

TRELEVEN: What were you most disappointed about? Or maybe there weren't any disappointments.

ALSHULER: Well, I guess I've sort of alluded to it, just the conduct of some regents didn't seem to be in keeping with the responsibility they had and the capability they had.

TRELEVEN: Okay.

ALSHULER: That's more personal, you know, individual than it is. . . . There weren't any major disappointments, I guess.

TRELEVEN: Seems like a pretty exciting period with all the activity going on.

ALSHULER: Well, it was a nice period. It was a period where things were happening that were all affirmative. There wasn't a lot of negativism that came in. It was growth time, and that's kind of positive.

TRELEVEN: Right.

ALSHULER: So that's why I say I felt lucky because the attacks and the viciousness, internal and external, came a little later. I'd read about

them in the paper and say, "Oh, boy."

TRELEVEN: Okay, if we can filter that out, because I can understand how in hindsight in view of what happened after you left the board, you're glad you weren't part of it. But otherwise, how did you feel about leaving the board when you did after those two years and getting into the routine a bit and the reports and the meetings?

ALSHULER: It didn't bother me a bit. I thought I had served. I had no desire to go back on the board for the time necessary. I still had a going business that I was trying to build and I was a small businessman by comparison to most of those present. Either that or they had jobs that were very compatible with the activity of the regents. So that it took time out of my business that was still being built so I didn't have any remorse over going off. I thought, you know, it was a great experience, and I'm glad I did it. I hope I was constructive, but it wasn't a burning ambition to follow Bill and become another UCLA regent. I really didn't have that desire. Bill had the time, the capacity. He was well suited to it. I'm delighted that he got it. Also, I

thought it had a lot of political commitment to it that I guess I wasn't either in a position to exercise or pursue.

TRELEVEN: Political commitment?

ALSHULER: To get an appointment as a regent.

TRELEVEN: Oh, to get an appointment. Had you been offered a full term would you have accepted it?

ALSHULER: I don't think so, but that's hard to say. It's such an honor. Maybe what I'm saying is a rationalization, but I did have a relatively small business and I don't know that I could have afforded the time that it takes to be a good full-time regent.

TRELEVEN: Okay, well, let's catch you up to the present. First, are you still active in the Alumni Association?

ALSHULER: No, but I was active in the Chancellor's Associates for a while. I guess I'm an honorary trustee or something like that of the Chancellor's Associates, so I get invited to all the meetings of the trustees, but I hardly ever go. I've sort of run out of gas. Also, I got out of the habit when I moved to the desert. It's a long commute.

TRELEVEN: Right, and you were living in where was it? Palm Desert?

ALSHULER: Rancho Mirage.

TRELEVEN: Rancho Mirage, yeah. That's right. That's a long haul in.

ALSHULER: I kept my athletic tickets, but I would go to one basketball game or two and one football game or two.

[Interruption]

TRELEVEN: So you still get magazines or anything?

ALSHULER: Oh, I get the alumni magazine and read it.

TRELEVEN: So you're keeping up in that way.

ALSHULER: Oh, sure, sure. I read the alumni magazine pretty regularly and I get the trustees' minutes [of the Chancellor's Associates] of the meeting and things that they're into. And I've gone to some of the fund-raising events from time to time. And I had a very close friend [James A.] Jim Collins who was just president a few years ago and then moved from there up to the board of trustees and that sort of thing and gave a huge gift and raised a bundle. Fine guy. So yeah, we keep pretty good tabs. But you know a lot of things get by. I didn't know Johnny [Jackson],

for instance, had had a stroke. They say it's happening fast these days. Stepping up.

TRELEVEN: Well, Johnny is in his mid-eighties right now, so  
. . .

ALSHULER: And I thought when I saw him last he looked just great and sure was aware of everything that was going on. Wonderful. So, no, I keep track of UCLA, but I sort of figured I put in some time and I'm happy to see it grow and prosper.

TRELEVEN: How about the entire University of California? Do you look back today, and what's your assessment?

ALSHULER: I think it's a great system. I think we have a good. . . . I think we probably did the right thing to disperse the university. It's a diverse state. It has different geographic communities that need representation in terms of how their people are educated and the employment it creates there and the chance for the local kids. I think diversified campuses turned out to be a good move and I'm in support of it. I'm in support of the university. I think it's, you know, the great university system in the U.S., total system, state system. It's got a lot of weaknesses and

it's got a lot of questionable practices, among them this as I told you when we first discussed.

TRELEVEN: Doing an oral history?

ALSHULER: Yes, I just wonder whether compared to some other things that are needed whether this is one of them.

TRELEVEN: [Laughter]

ALSHULER: But seeing as it's for your betterment, I'll just make that passing observation.

TRELEVEN: The state archivist will get a laugh when he reads this in the manuscript.

ALSHULER: I'm not sure that anybody is waiting to read what you have just taken down, hear or read later on. Ever. But if somewhere in the thing it's constructive, good.

TRELEVEN: Yeah, well, I'm a true believer, of course.

ALSHULER: You've got to be.

TRELEVEN: So I think it will be useful. To wind things up then, why don't you tell me how you've never really retired personally?

ALSHULER: Never really retired.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think on the way to lunch you were alluding to the fact that you are if anything as much in business as you always were. But would

you explain what you meant by that?

ALSHULER: Well, I don't know that I said exactly that.

TRELEVEN: Not exactly.

ALSHULER: I don't know where the days go. I think that I have an active retirement. Oh, five years ago I was on probably six or seven boards of corporations of various sorts, and now I'm on none. Two years ago I was president of an international organization [Chief Executives Organization, a graduate organization of the Young Presidents Organization] which I have now retired from. I still go to meetings and that sort of thing, but I seem to find enjoyment in somewhat trivial things, what may seem trivial. I love to play with that dumb dog [Abercrombie] that comes meandering through here and to go out and smell the roses in the garden and take a good swim in the morning or talk with my broker about staying alive and keeping some money flowing. And I keep in touch with a lot of friends. It's amazing how you can keep busy. I like to play golf and I play golf with some regularity. It's easy to. . . . I didn't find it difficult to retire at all. It's just been very

progressive. It's been progressive for fifteen years because I sold my company in 1970, worked for them for eight years full-time and then part-time for another three or four as consultant, then got involved in other boards and was on those boards and gradually went off of those boards and got involved in another organization. It has a way of keeping you busy enough. And as time goes on you welcome a little more free time. So it isn't all that difficult.

TRELEVEN: So you're totally out of business consulting at this point?

ALSHULER: Yep. Yeah, I don't have any consulting, any boards. I strictly control my own time, which seems to be full always. But I had some fun experiences. That savings and loan board was a humdinger. A very major savings and loan, it was called Imperial Savings [and Loan Association]. We were taken over as they have been doing, only it's now almost two years ago. We didn't really have any. . . . The directors were as dedicated as regents. They were a terrific board of directors, but we'd had a few people down on the staff that we didn't identify until too late as

being less than honest. But the basic problem was we weren't capitalized for enough. And when they changed the rules, our capital looked so thin it didn't take long. But that was a real experience. The other boards. . . . I was on the board of Everest & Jennings, Inc., which was a company very supportive of UCLA. [Gerald M.] Jerry Jennings was very active. It's a wheelchair company, one of the major manufacturers of wheelchairs in the U.S., in the world at one time. So I've had some interesting boards to serve on. Now I can just kind of have some fun.

TRELEVEN: Great, well, I hope today you've had as much fun as I have. I mean this has been enjoyable. I really enjoyed this conversation.

ALSHULER: Good.

TRELEVEN: And I think there's a bit more meat here than you think there is.

ALSHULER: I didn't think there was much. There's a few old anecdotes and stuff, but in any event if it's been at all constructive, good.

TRELEVEN: Well, I think it has. I knew coming in of course that you'd been on the board a short time

compared to, you know, some of the sixteen-year people I've interviewed. But we do like to get various people's perspectives on what took place within their period of service, and you've given me that. And I thank you very much.

ALSHULER: You're welcome. I wish my memory were better, but I wish that every day. [Laughter]

[End Tape 3, Side A]